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ABSTRACT

This study served to determine if sworn officers experiencing low or high levels of Leader-Member Exchanges (LMX) are more likely to engage in behaviors or have attitudes that can ultimately lead to more negative or positive performance outcomes respectively. Five research questions assisted in revealing the perspectives of sworn officers as they act under the auspices of their superiors. The following research questions were answered throughout this study: (1) Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisors are aware of the officer's professional needs? (2) Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisors have confidence in their professional ability? (3) Do sworn officers perceive their supervisors as supportive? (4) Do sworn officers perceive the working relationship with their supervisors as effective? (5) Do high quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within law enforcement agencies, from an officers' perspective?

A non-experimental tool in the form of a questionnaire was utilized primarily to retrieve data. The data were reviewed and analyzed quantitatively to provide a concise illustration of the perception of sworn officers regarding the quality of LMX experienced. Based on the data retrieved in comparison with the literature reviewed, this study identified the perception of officers surveyed. Based on the recorded responses and analysis, this study revealed that supervisors within the law enforcement agency examined have successfully established high LMX, from an officers' perspective. This study also revealed that a number of supervisors examined were perceived as deficient in relation to
establishing or maintaining high LMX.

The data retrieved from this study resulted in 5 suggested recommendations. First, it is recommended that the law enforcement agency examined extend this study with the purpose of collecting additional demographic data to provide a more descriptive illustration of the perception of sworn officers. It is also recommended that the agency examined conduct additional research by surveying supervisors, permitting an ethnographic study to take place within the agency, develop an educational curriculum, and implement mandatory supervisory leadership training programs.
Chapter 1: The Problem

As crime is inevitable, law enforcement agencies (LEAs) will continue to hire and deploy sworn officers into communities to protect civilians and property and provide services. The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department’s (LACSD) mission is to “lead the fight to prevent crime and injustice. Enforce the law fairly and defend the rights of all. Partner with the people we serve to secure and promote safety in our communities” (LACSD, 2009a, para. 4). In an effort to fulfill this mission, LEAs must meet the astounding demand for a continuous cycle of disciplined, adequately trained, and cohesive group of officers. Personnel are challenged to meet the needs of the communities as the demand for additional officers continues to rise. Billboard and internet advertisements, career fairs, and events hosted for specific sex and ethnic groups represent some of the recruitment strategies used to enlist officers for LEAs to meet the demand of public safety in a growing population.

As LEAs expand and departments diversify, the importance of interconnectedness within each agency increases. Interconnectedness involves the ability of a group (two or more individuals) to function appropriately and productively as a cohesive unit. It also ensures continuity and continuous progression in the event that a member of the group is absent. Essentially, it fosters reliability, dependability, as well as confidence. The interconnectedness of LEAs, as this dissertation argues, is achieved through consistently applied leadership. Leadership, as defined by Northhouse (2007), is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. Though
various leadership styles exist and are employed throughout organizations, it is imperative that, despite their leadership style, leaders within LEAs build relationships with officers that foster trust, confidence, ethical decision making, and respect. As LEAs such as the LACSD commit to preventing crime and injustice through partnerships that promote safety, while simultaneously maintaining the highest ethical standards, it is imperative that those selected to lead such an organization or its subunits possess leadership skills. This dissertation supports the notion that good leaders, based on the perception of their followers, will be better able to guide the growing agencies in upholding the stated mission, thereby enhancing the operational success of LEAs in the city of Los Angeles.

**Statement of the Problem**

Leadership becomes an increasingly crucial aspect to the overall performance of sworn officers as LEAs are continuously expanding. This study has measured the perceptions of the quality of Leader-Member Exchanges (LMX) held by sworn officers within the LACSD by taking the first steps toward building theoretical linkages between sworn officer’s perceptions of their leaders’ leadership abilities and levels of interconnectedness and cohesion within the department. For the purpose of this study LMX will be defined as the relationship between supervisors and line officers. This study predicted that those sworn officers feeling misunderstood or undervalued by their supervisors are more likely to engage in behaviors or have attitudes that can ultimately lead to poor performance outcomes. At the very least, low levels of LMX will harm the levels
of cohesiveness within departments and limit their ability to function as units. In a profession in which officers rely on each other and supervisors on a daily basis, trust and mutual respect between officers and supervisors are essential to ensuring better law enforcement outcomes and for the overall safety both of officers and the public they are sworn to protect. Because of the importance of establishing and maintaining cohesive relationships laterally as well as top down, this study was initiated.

**Background**

In agreement with Tepe (2008), this study began from the premise that leadership is a critical component for the success of LEAs. According to Bergner (1998), leadership begins at the beginning. The standard begins with directors, supervisors, sergeants, lieutenants, chiefs, and moves to each position throughout the organization, forming a cohesive unit within which each member acts in tandem. From this expectation, the ethics, morale, diligence, confidence, and self-satisfaction of each member is distilled into a unified code of behavior and serves as the basis for the culture of the organization. In reference to the importance of leadership in a private enterprise, Pande (2007) states, “The culture, personality, and performance of businesses are determined by its leaders throughout the organization—at various levels, in different business units, in locations around the country or the world” (p. 1).

These explanations of leadership hold true in the case of LEAs, where sworn officers operating in highly stressful circumstances are expected to act in tandem with their colleagues and supervisors to carry out their daily
assignments. It is in carrying out responsibilities that supervisors are also expected to maintain substantial rapport with sworn officers that will equip supervisors with the ability to channel challenges and adverse circumstances into positive outcomes. Leaders who neglect the importance of established rapport may struggle to transcend challenges adequately and risk compounding stress of sworn officers, potentially creating or deepening any tension or chaos within a department.

**LMX.** The value of incorporating high quality LMX into one’s leadership style has been substantiated by many researchers such as Erdogan and Bauer (2010). According to Erdogan and Bauer:

> The relationships leaders forge with employees are the cornerstone of leadership. LMX theory refers to the idea that leaders form relationships based on trust, liking, and respect with some employees they work with, whereas with others the relationship does not go beyond the basic terms of the employment contract. Meta-analytic evidence suggests that the quality of the relationship with a leader is positively related to employee work attitudes and performance levels. (p. 1104)

As a result of the value of high LMX, with respect to LEAs, if applied, supervisors are likely to encourage and influence sworn officers to perform adequately. In contrast, low LMX may inhibit sworn officers from maximizing their performance, which may reduce their ability to work well among others and alongside their supervisor. According to Erdogan and Bauer (2010), in a study comparing the advantages of experiencing high LMX and the disadvantages of
experiencing low LMX, the following was concluded:

A high-quality exchange can be highly advantageous for members, as it is related to faster advancement in the organization and salary progression (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994), and wielding greater influence within the organization (Sparrowe & Liden, 2005). Although high-LMX members enjoy several positive outcomes, this means that low-LMX members may be at a disadvantage in terms of resource distribution and influence potential. (p. 1104)

Given this researcher’s assumptions regarding the impact that LMX may have on sworn officers within LEAs, this study was designed to review and examine the perceptions of sworn officers as they relate to the quality of LMX established with their supervisor.

**Purpose**

The overall purpose of this study was to review and examine the quality of LMX within LEAs based on the perspectives of sworn officers. The review entailed the process of discerning the current perceptions of sworn officers while the examination looked closely at the potential behaviors illustrated throughout leadership literature and linked the behaviors to the quality of LMX perceived. Essentially, the compilation of these data and these details are intended to raise awareness within LEAs regarding perceived supervisory relationships from the perspectives of sworn officers. Although this study identified the extent to which sworn officers perceived that their respective supervisors were confident in their professional abilities and supported their professional decision making, the larger
purpose of this study was to determine the quality of LMX that existed between the interrelated parties. This study provided snapshots of officers experiencing the varying qualities (i.e., very low, low, moderate, high, or very high) of LMX. Such results served as points of departure for further research to determine how well sworn officers are supported by the implemented leadership skills of the supervisors assigned to guide and motivate them throughout task completion.

The purpose of this study was to bring awareness to LEAs regarding how a supervisor can impact levels of trust and cohesiveness within departments with such simple gestures as taking an interest in the needs of sworn officers. It was, in short, an attempt to highlight the value of good relationships between all members of the organization as they seek to meet personal, professional, and financial benchmark goals throughout their service to the public and through their chosen career paths. The high level of risk that characterizes the profession means that officers are inclined to behave in ways to minimize disruptions in relationships. This makes conducting studies in LEAs quite difficult. The results of this study regarding the need for strong leadership illustrated some of the resistance to taking on the issue of intradepartmental relationships and provided the impetus for further study on the quality of LMX.

**Research Questions**

Using the LMX questionnaires filled out by 50 randomly selected research participants, the following research questions were answered by sworn officers throughout this study:

R1: Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisor is aware of the officer's
professional needs

R2: Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisor has confidence in their professional ability?

R3: Do sworn officers perceive their supervisor as supportive?

R4: Do sworn officers perceive the working relationship with their supervisors as effective?

R5: Do high quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within law enforcement agencies, from an officers’ perspective?

Research Hypotheses

As a result of the anticipated survey responses of the research participants the following five statements were hypothesized:

H1: Sworn officers perceive that their supervisor is aware of the officer’s professional needs.

H2: Sworn officers perceive that their supervisor has confidence in their professional ability.

H3: Sworn officers perceive their supervisors as supportive.

H4: Sworn officers perceive the working relationship with their supervisor as effective.

H5: High quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within law enforcement agencies, from an officers’ perspective.

Practical Significance of Study

Enhance leadership skills. This study began with the process of raising awareness within the LEAs regarding the components of leadership and
supervisor’s role in building strong departments. In this study, officers were asked to evaluate their supervisors’ ability to engage and establish a quality LMX. Ultimately, the responses provided will shape the educational enhanced leadership training curriculum to be recommended for those assuming leadership roles in local LEAs. It will also help supervisors understand the value of leadership, the perspectives of sworn officers, and importance of establishing quality LMX. Instead of replacing supervisors, this study served as a means to initiate a statewide training curriculum, where necessary, that will enhance each supervisor’s ability to lead a group of focused, content, and committed officers.

Currently LEAs around the world, including LACSD and the Los Angeles Police Department, access the training curriculum at the West Point Leadership Program at California State University of Los Angeles. According to Jenks, Carter, and Jenks (2007):

The conceptual foundation for leadership adopted by the program is the process of influencing human behavior so as to accomplish goals. Influencing human behavior is calculated through a leader’s ability to meet the needs of individuals within his or her command, and goals are defined as those of the organization. The [West Point Leadership Program] focuses on improving individual ability to maintain a balance between the needs of subordinates and the demands of superiors at all levels of the command. They define the program as using a decision-making model based on the scientific method. The [West Point Leadership Program] refers to this process as Intellectual Procedure. Intellectual Procedure
helps focus command staff attention in situations where personal attributes and goals such as motivation, performance, and satisfaction are in direct conflict with the goals of the organization. (p. 108)

Although this program does offer insight on leadership procedures from an administrative perspective, this 16-unit curriculum that costs approximately $2,500 per officer has not proved to educate officers regarding specific leadership practices that could potentially improve performance of sworn officers and the agency. In an effort to reduce organizational expenses, LEAs have opted to provide in-service training that typically allows each agency to develop its own training objectives and standards. According to Jenks et al. (2007):

In-service training has historically dealt with a variety of limitations (Jang, 2005). First, training programs to improve job performance are often viewed by many in law enforcement as superfluous and ineffective, especially if that training is not provided in a traditional format. Second, in-service training often focuses on the more “exciting” topics for officers such as firearms, defensive tactics, use of force, and emergency vehicle driving while excluding other areas of need in law enforcement, including supervision and leadership. In his evaluation of in-service training within the State of California, Jang (2005) found that only 17% of officers desired training that related to supervisory and leadership roles. This level of preference for academic topics was reflected throughout Jang’s (2005) research and is symptomatic of the need for better in-service leadership training. Third, a number of in-service training programs suffer from the
inclusion of participants who lack police-related work experience and job commitment. (p. 107)

Based on these studies, LEAs are still in need of a leadership curriculum training that will enhance the leadership skills of supervisors while assisting them in communicating with, motivating, and building professional and cohesive relationships with sworn officers.

**Bridging the gap between supervisors and Officers.** This study also highlighted a gap between supervisors and sworn officers. This study emphasized the importance of leadership through the effectiveness of knowledge of people rather than just knowledge of policies. It served to emphasize the importance of intraworking relationships among supervisors and sworn officers and the influence that this relationship has on job satisfaction, performance, decision making, ethics, and morale.

**Key Assumptions**

Several key assumptions were acknowledged. Those six assumptions were: (a) appropriate selection of target population, (b) appropriate selection of survey instrument, (c) honesty of research participants, (d) application of research finding by LEAs, (e) accuracy of researchers cited, and (f) appropriate selection of applicable theoretical support.

**Appropriate target population.** Currently, there are more than 30,000 sworn officers serving in Los Angeles area, with the LACSD employing approximately 9,700 deputies (Wikipedia, 2011). Of these 9,700 sworn officers, 50 were randomly selected and surveyed. This target population was identified
as the most appropriate source of data, as sworn officers are best suited to provide information about their perceptions of their relationship with their supervisors. Although the sample size was quite small in relation to the total number of sworn officers in Los Angeles, it is an appropriate number because it served to provide a generalized insight that assisted in initiating further study of additional officers as well as additional LEAs.

Supervisors were not surveyed during this study, as the researcher deemed the perceptions of sworn officers more valuable. Prior to conducting this study, the researcher assumed that the data collected would affirm the stated hypotheses, but also highlight areas of improvement. The information served to strengthen the needs for change within LEAs. The next phase in studying this topic may be to have supervisors evaluate themselves in addition to their subordinates. It should be noted that the researcher does not discount the perception supervisors have regarding their own leadership skills, as future studies will incorporate their perspectives; however, such self-evaluation was postponed.

Appropriate survey instrument. In addition to selecting the appropriate population, the survey instrument was deemed appropriate when surveying the aforesaid population. The validity and reliability of the survey instrument was substantiated throughout its repeated successful employment by researchers such as Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) to solicit information regarding LMX between supervisors and subordinates. It allowed each sworn officer to provide his or her perspective of the leadership exhibited within his or her organization without
divulging the specifics to researchers or public entities. In addition, the validity of the survey instrument was confirmed.

**Honesty of survey participants.** It was the assumption of the researcher that all participants agreed with the larger purpose of improving leadership methods and LMX throughout LEAs. Sworn officers were made aware that they were submitting data that would not jeopardize the integrity of LEAs. Sworn officers were also instructed to submit honest responses to improve organizational productivity, culture, and behavior. It was assumed that throughout the confidential data collection process, participants were diligent in providing truthful information based on their professional experience.

This study also assumed that the perceptions of sworn officers, although not perfectly correlated with an objective view of the quality of leadership of supervisors, are, in fact, more important than an objective view. How a supervisor makes a sworn officer feel was at the core of building a strong rapport with the sworn officer. Thus, although some sworn officers may have a personal bias against their supervisors or have performed poorly, these sworn officers were assumed to be the minority of respondents, rather than the majority, as they appeared as outliers when pooled with the results of other sworn officers.

**Application of research findings.** As this study serves to generate awareness within LEAs of concerns regarding leadership and its potential impact on sworn officers’ performance, it was primarily assumed that most of the organizations would take heed to the data found and adjust accordingly. Organizations are able to respond to such information by initiating further
research, adjusting leadership approaches, or simply taking the time necessary to build quality LMX with sworn officers.

**Accuracy of research cited.** The researcher assumed that all cited and referenced research works, journals, and case studies represented accurate data and findings that were produced by diligent researchers. It was also assumed that all the cited or reviewed research works throughout the development of this study provided truthful accounts of their research procedures and data collection methods.

**Appropriate selection of applicable theoretical support.** Last, the researcher assumed that the theoretical perspectives and support detailed throughout the literature review were applicable to this study. It was the assumption of the researcher that the theoretical support provided assisted in vividly describing leadership, the needs of employees, and potential behaviors of sworn officers who perceived low LMX as well as high LMX.

**Limitation of Study**

There were several limitations, as this study sampled the perspectives of the one the largest LEAs in the United States of America. First, the study only sampled 50 out of 9,700 deputies. This limitation was considered temporary, as the researcher planned to expand the study to additional officers as the data collected (very low to moderate levels of LMX) prompted further investigation. Second, this study did not identify specifically, the supervisors who were perceived as maintaining very low to moderate levels of LMX, from an officer’s perspective. Because the data collected in this study prompted further
investigation, the researcher’s expansion of the study would incorporate a method of identifying the specific supervisors who are perceived as establishing low, moderate, and high LMX with sworn officers. Third, this study did not incite sworn officers to detail the behavioral effects experienced or observed as a result of low or high levels of LMX. Although the literature review explained the potential behaviors of officers experiencing low or high LMX, this study will be expanded, based on the outcome of the data collected, to solicit qualitative data (written accounts) from sworn officers as well as supervisors.

Definitions

The following terms familiarize the reader with how particular terms are defined and utilized within the parameters of this study.

LACSD Deputy. The LACSD represents sworn officers and they assume similar responsibilities as the Los Angeles Police Department, but on a countywide basis. In addition, the sheriff’s deputies are also responsible for detaining inmates prior to their sentencing by a judge. According the LACSD (2009b):

Sheriff deputies are responsible for the following: (1) Enforcing compliance with federal and state laws, local ordinances, and judicial compliance orders; (2) Guards, transports, and maintains the security and safety of sentenced and pre-sentenced inmates by enforcing detention policies and procedures. (para. 2)

Leadership. Throughout this dissertation, according to Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010), leadership will be assumed to refer to “a
process of social influence, in which one or more persons affect one or more followers by clarifying what needs to be done, and providing the tools and motivation to accomplish set goals” (p. 314). According to Huberts, Kaptein, and Lasthuizen (2007), many scholars as well as practitioners argue that leadership is one of, if not the most important, factor influencing the ethics and integrity of employees. Leadership has a number of specific components, namely interpersonal communication, charisma, ethics, and credibility, as will be discussed in greater detail in the literature review.

**LMX.** According to Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, and Rosen (2007), LMX is defined as the quality of the social exchange between leaders and followers, characterized by mutual trust, respect, and obligation. As an element of this study, LMX will be utilized to explore the perceptions sworn officers have regarding the leadership exhibited by their supervisors.

**Los Angeles County Probation Department Officer.** Los Angeles County Probation officers assist in the rehabilitative process of both juvenile and adult offenders. The responsibilities of such an officer range from detaining youth to surveillance of both youths and adults. According to the Los Angeles County Probation Job Bulletin (2007), officers serve as members of small teams responsible for the order and security of a unit of juveniles, they provide situational counseling as necessary, and transport minors to medical care facilities, courts, or other locations.

**Los Angeles Police Department Officer.** A sworn officer responsible for protecting and serving the communities within the City of Los Angeles and who
has the primary purpose of deterring criminal acts. Entry-level officers are
sometimes called patrol officers. According to the Los Angeles Police
Department (n.d.a), a patrol officer investigate crimes, make arrests, patrols
communities to make them safer, works with the community to solve problems,
conduct community meetings, mediate disputes, investigate traffic collisions and
provide general police services.

It is at this level that sworn officers are often supervised according to the
chain of command. The structure of the chain of command establishes officers
who have the title of sergeant, lieutenant, or chief. This study seeks to gain an
understanding of the perceptions of the sworn officers toward their sergeants.

**Transformational leader.** This dissertation, according to Barbuto (2005),
supposed a Transformational Leader, or, “one who is able to lift followers up from
their petty preoccupations and rally them around a common purpose to achieve
things never thought possible” (p. 26), is the standard all leaders should strive to
attain. Distinctively, the success of transformational leadership rests on the ability
of leaders to enroll followers in a quest toward success and high performance.

According to Northouse (2007):

Transformational leadership is concerned with improving the performance
of followers and developing followers to their fullest potential. People who
exhibit transformational leadership often have a strong set of internal
values and ideals, and they are effective at motivating followers to act in
ways that support the greater good rather than their own self-interests. (p. 181)
Transactional leader. A transactional leader can be defined as a superior who initiates and facilitates an exchange with subordinates. In essence, it describes a supervisor performing the minimal tasks as stated in his or her job description. This dissertation argued that, although it is a less desirable form of leadership, it is often more characteristic of the kinds of leadership currently employed by supervisors within LEAs. According to Aarons (2006):

Transaction leadership is based more on “exchanges” between the leader and follower, in which followers are rewarded for meeting specific goals or performance criteria. Rewards and positive reinforcement are provided or mediated by the leader. Thus transactional leadership is more practical in nature because of its emphasis on meeting specific targets or objectives. An effective transactional leader is able to recognize and reward followers’ accomplishments in a timely way. (p. 1163)

Outline of Proposal

The Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature that focused on defining leadership and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), as well as explaining the needs and potential behavioral outcomes associated with sworn officers perception with regard to low or high LMX. Once the literature provides the reader with information pertaining to the importance of effective leadership and establishing high LMX, Chapter 3 then describes the methodological data collection process implemented to retrieve the quantifiable data used to assist in answering the research questions. Chapter 3 also assists in detailing the purpose, validity, and reliability of the primary survey instrument, Leader-Member
Exchange (LMX 7) questionnaire, in addition to highlighting how the data collected utilizing the LMX 7 was linked to confirm the hypotheses. Chapter 4 details the data numerically and describes the analysis conducted using the LMX 7 questionnaire as well as responses provided on a demographic questionnaire. Last, a conclusion was formulated and recommendations for further study were declared in Chapter 5.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Whisenand and Rush (1988) stated, “To live effectively is to live with adequate information” (p. 1). This section provides detailed information that serves in illustrating the pivotal role of leadership within LEAs. The review of literature discusses 5 key areas: (a) leadership styles: transactional versus transformational, (b) LMX and its application in the field of law enforcement, (c) leadership roles and characteristics, (d) generation gaps within an organization, and (e) job satisfaction and performance.

Theoretical Leadership Perspectives

In an effort to examine leadership and the specific impact and importance of establishing quality relationships within LEAs, various forms and styles of leadership and its benefits were explored. First, two distinct leadership styles were discussed in order to distinguish between rudimentary forms and the form promoted by LMX theory. LMX represents the primary theoretical perspective at the foundation of this study and illustrates the ideal and mutually beneficial relationship between law enforcement supervisors and sworn officers. In addition to the LMX theory, 5 supportive theories were identified to provide theoretical support and illustrate the needs of employees, particularly the intrinsic and extrinsic needs and sources of motivation for sworn officers employed within LEAs. The 5 supportive theories include: Albert Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Clayton Alderfer’s Existence Relatedness Growth (ERG) theory, attribution theory, expectancy theory, and equity theory.
Leadership styles: Transactional and transformational. Defining the concept of leadership was key to identifying and illustrating the significance of a mutual beneficial exchange between law enforcement supervisors and sworn officers, or an LMX. According to Huberts et al. (2007), both scholars and practitioners argued that leadership is one, if not the most important, factor influencing the ethics and integrity of employees. Two often-discussed leadership styles include transformational and transactional leadership. This dissertation makes the case that transactional leadership is the style most often practiced by law enforcement supervisors and transformational leadership—that which falls more in line with LMX theory—is the kind of leadership leaders should aspire to in order to generate better performance outcomes.

Transactional leadership. Broadly, it may be said that at some point all leaders utilize transactional leadership to accomplish goals as they persuade employees to complete tasks based on the immediate rewards following their completion. Transactional leadership, as defined by Goethals (2005), occurs when leaders contact followers to propose an exchange of valued things or services. The valued things may be economic, political, or psychological. The exchange relationship is a business arrangement and the exchange is not mutual. Aarons (2006) states, in this form of leadership, “followers are rewarded for meeting specific goals or performance criteria [and the] rewards and positive reinforcement are provided or mediated by the leader” (p. 1163).

However, Aarons (2006) states this more practical form of leadership and its “emphasis on meeting specific targets or objectives” (p. 1163) may not be
optimal for any organization. There is a lack of effort among leadership to innovate or go beyond basic, predetermined requirements. Scott (2003) states, “Workers are not motivated to give anything beyond what is clearly specified in their contract” (p. 37).

Aarons (2006) states leadership of this from is considered effective when the leader “is able to recognize and reward followers' accomplishments in a timely way” (p. 1163). The focus on timeliness as a criterion of effectiveness is clearly important, as Aarons illustrated, in making the point that “poor transactional leaders may be less likely to anticipate problems and to intervene before problems come to the fore, whereas more effective transactional leaders take appropriate action in a timely manner” (p. 1163). But, if it is the only criteria, it can have a negative effect on worker motivation. Scott (2003) found that workers “not challenged and rewarded for extra effort” (p.37) may instead “choose to utilize their excess brain capacity by consulting or starting their own business” (p. 37), rather than investing that energy in their jobs.

**Transformational leadership.** In contrast to transactional leadership’s focus on timeliness and meeting of targets, transformational leadership is measured by the effect a leader has on a follower. According to a study by Burns (as cited in Barbuto, 2005) the transforming leader is described as “one who is able to lift followers up from their petty preoccupations and rally them around a common purpose to achieve things never thought possible” (p. 26). Burns also highlighted (as cited by Barbuto, 2005) that “transforming leaders are rare” (p. 26). Furthermore, Bolman and Deal (2008) described them as individuals who
“evoke their constituents’ ‘better angels’ and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes. They are visionary leaders whose leadership is inherently symbolic” (p. 368). As scholarship has evolved on this style of leadership, its description has expanded. According to Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010), transformational leaders are courageous, value-driven, lifelong learners, believe in people, and have the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty. Goethals (2005) further described transformational leadership as the ability to engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality.

The success of transformational leadership rests on the ability of leaders to enroll followers in a quest toward success and high performance. As such, there are several qualities transformational leaders may have that make achieving higher levels of success easier. Northouse (2007) suggested that such leaders “often have a strong set of internal values and ideals, and…are effective at motivating followers to act in ways that support the greater good rather than their own self-interests (p. 181). Similarly, Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) highlighted charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation. These four factors make up the DNA of transformational leadership. The first and most significant element of a transforming leader is charisma. Barbuto (2005) states charisma—to be described in greater detail in a later section—“is described as the leader’s ability to generate great symbolic power” (p. 28). Hater and Bass argue (as cited in Barbuto, 2005) that charisma entail leaders passionately communicating a future
idealistic organization that can be shared. Deluga argues (as cited in Barbuto, 2005) that charisma entails leaders encouraging employees to approach old and familiar problems in new ways. In addition, Barbuto (2005) describes the charisma as leaders acting in the role of employee mentors.

Each element of the transformational leadership process is vital to overall quality of LMXs as well as the performance of the organization. As it relates to leadership within LEAs, failure to lead a group of sworn officers with such effectiveness may result in penalties that are detrimental to the organization. According to Schafer (2009):

The absence of effective leadership (or perhaps worse, the presence of ineffective leadership) can produce real and tangible consequences in the workplace (Buzawa, 1984; House & Podsakoff, 1994; Kelloway et al., 2005). Negative outcomes include poor productivity, dissatisfaction, stress, attrition, and absenteeism, among other concerns. (p. 241)

Transformational leadership focused on the effect of the leader on the subordinate. LMX theory builds on this, looking at the quality of that exchange and the process by which it occurs.

**LMX.** The dynamic dyad known as the LMX, grounded in social exchange theory, has been interpreted in a number of ways by different scholars. For Chen et al. (2007), it is defined as the quality of the social exchange between leaders and followers, characterized by mutual trust, respect, and obligation. For Watson (2010), LMX is a process—an ongoing social exchange relationship between a supervisor and a subordinate that is a continuous progression of reciprocal
exchanges that are developed and negotiated and that are mutually beneficial. Finally, for Erdogan and Enders (2007), it can be a product or the end result of “the social exchange and reciprocity [that] occurs when members observe that they receive support, trust, and other tangible and intangible benefits from their leaders” (p. 322).

Despite their difference, these scholars agree that the foundation of a positive LMX consists of trust, respect and loyalty and Brower, Schoorman, and Tan (2000) state, “behaviors that extend outside the employment contract” (p. 229). The more trust and respect employees are shown, argue Erdogan and Enders (2007), the more they will develop an obligation to reciprocate. Employees experiencing high LMX, therefore, “tend to demonstrate higher performance to repay their obligation to the leader” (p. 322).

However, this process of socialization, whereby subordinates internalize reciprocal behavior, is not a natural occurrence. It is only likely to happen over time and with the expressed effort of management to build the necessary foundations identified above with their employees. A Sin (2006) study illustrates this idea by focusing on the source from which the leader derives his or her power over an employee. For Sin, building a personal relationship that can allow for trust, respect, and mutual goal setting will help leaders and subordinates create a productive team-oriented atmosphere, where members will eventually be more likely to put the interests of the unit above their own.

Sin (2006) states that when leaders and subordinates are still in the stranger stage, the influence of the leader will be “largely contractual and driven
by the members’ goal to attain rewards (e.g., recognition, praise) and to avoid punishments (e.g., reprimand, poor performance evaluations)” (p. 4). Here, the “leaders’ source of power is based on their ability to supply and withhold resources that the members need” (p. 4). As the relationship develops and they move from being strangers to acquaintances, supervisors and subordinates work on clarifying their roles and obligations. If trust and a good working relationship have been established early on, Sin implies leaders can begin to rely on more social elements of influence, namely “mutual liking and the desire [of both parties] to enhance the quality of [their] relationships” (p. 4) to help participants internalize this more personal reciprocal behavior and move their professional relationships forward. Finally, at the mature stage of the relationship, Sin concludes, mutual trust has been fully established, and “both leaders and members have developed (or gravitate towards) congruent value and belief systems” (p. 4). In short, if leaders can socialize subordinates into internalizing reciprocal behavior, a positive LMX will be developed that will not only enhance the relationship between leaders and members, but also enhance the performance and output of employees.

From the perspective of the subordinate, the effort of leaders to go beyond contractual obligations to a relationship of mutual respect helps make the subordinate more confident that management has his or her best interest at heart. Employees perform better when they think supervisors will take active steps to protect their interests, agrees Krause (2004), and perform more poorly when LMX levels are low and an employee believes his or her supervisor
disregards his or her interests or fails to represent those interests in the organization.

Part of building a positive LMX and helping an employee feel that his or her interests are represented comes from a leader’s cultivation of an employee’s perception that direct supervisors, throughout the decision-making processes, diligently and consistently consider an employee’s input. Nardozzi (2003) states, “Having influence in decisions allows subordinates to practice managing” (p. 23) and “will lead to the employee feeling that they are an asset to the organization” (p. 23). Once the employees perceive themselves as valued contributors, mutual respect and trust are more easily established. As a result, employees become empowered, and “the organization receives the maximum output potential of an employee” (p. 23).

**Application in law enforcement.** One of the benefits of developing a positive LMX between supervisors and subordinates, claims Nardozzi (2003), is the socialization of managers into making positive changes to their own behavior. However, in the field of law enforcement, scholars have noted this is where the process can begin to break down. Many supervisors view empowering their subordinates as a risk to their own ability to lead and exert power over subordinates. As Brower et al. (2000) have shown this unfortunate reality can have negative repercussions for the department’s performance; empowering employees can lead to various positive outcomes, including higher levels of job satisfaction and performance, and lower rates of absenteeism and turnover. Moreover, as an Elkins, Phillips, and Townsend (2000) study demonstrates,
employees tend to reciprocate for benefits—or lack of—that they receive at work. An employee experiencing poor leader-member relations may reciprocate with negative behaviors comparable to those they perceive to be exhibited by management. Thus, the reluctance of a supervisor to motivate and build relationships with employees can be antithetical to high levels of satisfaction and performance.

A Langell (2006) study expands upon this point, illustrating that a poor LMX can initiate a compounding cycle of negative behavior between leaders and subordinates. In such cases where a manager does not demonstrate trust in employees by delegating responsibility to them or developing their professional abilities, “an employee may choose to ‘retaliate’ against a supervisor whom they perceive has not met their expectations (e.g., employee did not receive a promotion, raise, key assignment), by being absent” (p. 25). Particularly for law enforcement, where departments and public safety rely heavily on consistency in the presence and performance of employees at work, “this may make the supervisor ‘look bad’ to his or her supervisor” (p. 25). Such an outcome may make a manager feel even less obligated to the interests of the employee, and the employee, continually less invested in meeting basic expectations of attendance. Thus, concludes Langell, “it seems plausible to suggest that the state of the relationship between supervisor and employee may affect attendance behavior” (p. 25).

This is no small matter of concern for LEAs. In addition to potentially compromising the safety and integrity of LEAs, Nardozzi (2003) concluded that
relationships that are deemed to be low quality relationships may very well be costing police departments money, morale, performance, and employee satisfaction. Therefore, successfully making the transition to what Sin (2006) described as the mature stage of a working relationship is imperative for supervisors and employees. Once this stage has been reached, employees and supervisors will likely be better able to minimize organizational stress, absenteeism, dissatisfaction, burnout, and a host of costly factors associated with these behaviors. If supervisors and employees are unable to progress successfully through the three stages, negative reciprocity within an organization is probable and can negatively impact the overall performance of LEAs.

**LMX 7 questionnaire.** A common tool many researchers utilize (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) to measure the level of LMX that exists between supervisors and employees is the LMX 7 Questionnaire (see Appendix A). Graen and Uhl-Bien utilized this survey instrument to assess and illustrate the interpersonal relationships (LMX) within organizations. Although many instruments exist to measure job satisfaction and LMX, Yukl (2006) declared the LMX 7 as the most effective adopted questionnaire among researchers. In effort to adopt the questionnaire for this study, the principal investigator secured permission from Elsevier Limited publishing company through the Copyright Clearance Center (see Appendix B).

Northouse (2007) states that the LMX 7 Questionnaire is “designed to measure three dimensions of leader-member relationships: respect, trust, and obligation” (p. 168). According to Watson (2010), the development of the LMX
instrument has continued to evolve throughout the literature presented by researchers such as Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). The LMX 7 Questionnaire is designed with the dual purpose of illustrating perception as it relates to or is experienced by both supervisors and subordinates. Essentially, the seven-item questionnaire is worded to allow supervisors to rate themselves and it allows subordinates to rate their supervisors. According to Wu (2009), review articles claim that LMX 7 is the soundest measure of LMX, demonstrated by its significant correlations with outcome criteria. Watson (2010) states that the questionnaire is composed of seven questions, each requiring the subject to respond, “using a five-point ordinal Likert-type scale” (p. 46). According to Watson, the scores are summed for all items, resulting in a possible score between seven and 35. A high score indicates that a more positive (i.e., higher-quality) relationship was perceived by the subordinate with his or her supervisor. Conversely, if supervisors are surveyed, a high score would indicate the high level the supervisor perceives that he or she has successfully established high quality LMX with subordinates.

This study focused on outlining the perceptions that sworn officers had regarding the quality of leadership exhibited by their supervisors and the extent to which their needs were being met. The literature reviewed below explored both the concept of leadership and theories regarding needs, both personal and professional, of sworn officers that must be satisfied by their supervisors as well as the organization to ensure quality performance while employed by a Los Angeles LEAs.
Ideal Leadership

The section below explores the ideal leadership roles and characteristics associated with or implied by what scholars consider to be a positive LMX. The following will be described: (a) the role of a supervisor, (b) interpersonal communication skills, (c) charisma, (d) ethics, and (e) credibility.

Role of a supervisor. Supervisors play an important role in ensuring the strong functioning of probation, parole, corrections, and police departments, all of which make up the law enforcement profession. According to Schulenberg and Warren (2009) aside from knowledge of specific laws and procedures and their applications, police officers and supervisors are expected to be proficient in managing multiple roles and duties, have “a myriad of special skills” (p. 456), and aptly “handling all types of populations” (p. 456) within the correctional facilities and local communities. Owen (2006) state that although knowledge of specific laws and procedures is vital to the overall functioning of correction officers and probation departments, within these two branches of law enforcement supervisors are often additionally “responsible for administrative concerns, such as budgeting, program planning, scheduling, disciplining both inmates and staff members, dealing with personnel issues, and completing the ever-pervasive paperwork required of a correctional institution” (p. 166).

To comply properly with their duties and responsibilities, it is clear that law enforcement supervisors have little time to sit behind desks, drinking coffee and eating donuts. As in any field, the role of a supervisor is to ensure officers are completing tasks efficiently in order for the department to meet organizational
goals while simultaneously abiding by organizational rules and regulations. They must also possess the ability to confront and prevent the improper attitudinal and behavioral responses of officers daily. Whisenand and Rush (1988) state, in essence, the primary functions of a supervisor are, “(1) attaining desired organizational results through police personnel, (2) meeting individually desired needs through police management, and (3) coping with the constantly changing mix of desired results and desired needs” (p. 1).

To be able to do so, supervisors must possess the initiative, desire, and wherewithal to sustain leadership and influence officers assigned to their department. Chapin, Brannen, Singer, and Walker (2008) state that in the field of law enforcement, in particular, officers are also generally in need of significant emotional support from police chiefs, precinct commanders, and all levels of police supervisors to deal with their constant exposure “to the traumatic stressors that are part of police work” (p. 338).

These stresses, if allowed to accumulate in employees, can have a detrimental effect on employee job performance by impacting their attitudes toward their jobs. As Lambert and Paoline (2008) illustrate in a study examining the relationships between an officer’s occupational attitudes and their projected job performance, the unique complexities of correctional facilities meant that “overly stressed, unhappy, and uncommitted staff can lead to failure and disaster for a correctional organization” (p. 542), and even the outright failure of the organization. While conversely, they claimed, “satisfied, committed staff, who do not suffer from undue job stress, can help a facility become a model correctional
organization” (p. 542).

In order for departments to achieve organizational goals and uphold a reputation of integrity and ethics to the community, Daly (2008) implies that it is crucial that law enforcement supervisors are involved in interpersonal relationships with officers that offer emotional support and promote organizational productivity. In the event that officers experience occupational and traumatic stress, job dissatisfaction, or job burnout, the potential for productivity to decline is high.

The task of preventing such burnout falls squarely on the shoulders of supervisors. However, at the point that officers are experiencing such negative fallout from their jobs, it is almost too late for an intervention. Motivating the poor performers, noted Daly (2008), although positive in its focus on salvaging or rehabilitating a formerly productive employee, it is also a quite unpleasant and frustrating task for all involved. Moreover, it is a time and resource-consuming process, requiring that “supervisors…objectively document the existence of a performance discrepancy and outline a performance improvement plan for correcting the performance discrepancy” (p. 46). In addition to suggesting solutions and documenting discrepancies, supervisors must also recommend additional resources (i.e., counseling) to ensure officers aren’t endangering themselves or the organization.

According to Matier (2007) finding solutions to individual and structural causes of burnout are necessary to help human service professionals to function as they should. Matier also argues that:
Sociologists believe that human service professionals, such as teachers, view their roles as inconsequential because of the powerlessness they feel when they are repeatedly left out of the decision-making processes about their own involvement within an organization (Dworkin, 2001). These perceptions and feelings lead teachers and other professionals in helping positions to feel disconnected and unsure of their continued participation (Dworkin, 2001). (p.2)

Leadership according to researchers such as Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) and Schilling (2009) influences the levels of motivation and productivity of followers. If leadership is perceived by followers favorably the probability of employees exhibiting burnout behavior is reduced. Leadership, as well as its characteristics are identified below.

**Leadership characteristics.** Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) state, “Leadership is typically viewed as a process of social influence, in which one or more persons affect one or more followers by clarifying what needs to be done, and providing the tools and motivation to accomplish set goals” (p. 314). However, influence may take a number of different forms.

Some theorists, noted Schilling (2009), “would even limit the term ‘leadership’ to an exercise of influence resulting in enthusiastic commitment of followers” (p. 103). Those in favor of this view, he contends, have an overwhelmingly positive view of leadership with regard to “its intentions, means, and consequences” (p. 103). Schilling described those relying on authority and control over rewards, punishments, and information to manipulate or coerce
followers as not engaging in leading. Thus, he concluded, “it is not surprising that destructive behavior of people in leadership positions has often not been labeled as leadership, but received other names (e.g. abusive supervision)” (p. 103).

Leadership, in short, can be positive or negative, depending on the traits, practices, strategies, and objectives of the leaders in question. There are several characteristics of leaders that researchers such as Cole, Riggio, Riggio, and Salinas (2003), Gilley, Gilley, and McMillan (2009), and Schafer (2009) argue contribute to effective leadership. The characteristics argued by these researchers respectively are interpersonal communication skills, charisma, ethics, and credibility. They are discussed below in more detail.

**Interpersonal communication skills.** According to Riggio et al. (2003) since the inception of scientific research on leadership, the skill of interpersonal communication has been mentioned as a key element both in predicting and in determining the effectiveness of leaders. “Bass (1990) and Kanter (1983) noted apparent connections between communication skill/competence and leader and managerial effectiveness” (p. 83), but Stodgill (1974) had emphasized the link between the emergence of leaders and their effectiveness as early as 1974.

A Ropski (2008) study identified interpersonal communication as the “process of conveying and receiving information between two persons or between small groups of people, which triggers specific results and types of feedback” (p. 36). He went on to specify that at least two people must be involved and that each of them must be involved in both sending information and receiving and understanding it. Most notably, he referred to a participant in
communication as a “sender-recipient” (p. 36), making clear that simply sending out information in one direction does not qualify as communication.

Indeed, listening to one’s subordinates is a key component of successful interpersonal communication. Similar to establishing an interpersonal relationship among supervisors and employees, leaders should consider the feedback provided by employees. Such consideration throughout decision-making processes within an organization fosters trust and motivates employees to perform well. Ropski (2008) states that such communication also “creates specific social relations but it is also the expression of the culture of organization” (p. 36).

Having the ability both to send out and take in information to and from subordinates allows for leaders to develop other skills that enhance successful interpersonal communication and make it a powerful tool. Denehy (2008), for example, claimed that such skills will help leaders communicate effectively with a range of different audiences and “[keep] others informed of their contribution to the organization [and]…communicate with passion” (p. 109), all traits that help them “develop and maintain a network of support and resource people” (p. 109) and, perhaps most important, “inspire others” (p. 109) to perform at their optimum levels.

**Charisma.** Contemporary scholars of leadership such as Gilley et al. (2009) view the unspoken personality trait of charisma as an essential part of being a strong leader. Sankar (2003) states that charisma has been identified as a personality trait that “focuses on personality attributes such as dynamism, style,
image, inspiration, symbolic behaviors (House, 1977) impression management, emotional intelligence (Coleman, 1998), extroverted style, self-confidence, empathetic understanding and admiration for articulating a vision” (p. 46).

Based on research findings on this dimension of leadership, Harland, Harrison, Jones, and Reiter-Palmon (2004) state that “charismatic” (p. 5) describes an individual or leader who “behaves with confidence, engenders, respect and pride among subordinates, and seems to look beyond his or her own self-interest” (p. 5). Other researchers such as Yorges, Weiss, Strickland, Jacobsen, and House (as cited in Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010) depicted charismatic leaders as those who go beyond their prescribed role to set personal examples and make personal sacrifices. Shamir, Ehrhart and Klein, Jacobsen and House also argue (as cited in as cited in Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010, p. 314) that charismatic leaders communicate high performance expectations, exhibit confidence, take risks that oppose the status quo, and emphasize a collective identity.

Leaders demonstrating such behavior, in addition to their ability to articulate organizational goals and vision, may possess the ability to persuade followers to commit to a task and work diligently at a high level of performance. When leaders are successful at stimulating subordinates to perform, they may also improve an employee’s perception of job satisfaction. Riggio et al. (2003) state that such an outcome is based on the assumption that charismatic leaders “may have an even stronger effect on group members’ satisfaction with and evaluation of the leader (e.g., Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996),
presumably by virtue of these leaders’ abilities to communicate effectively to arouse, inspire, and motivate followers” (p. 85).

**Ethics.** Ethics is a leadership characteristic that helps leaders shape and influence the decision and behavior of employees. According to Schafer (2009): Leadership, or its absence, is recognized as a key force shaping outputs and outcomes in most formal or informal organizations. The need for effective leadership in policing is quite evident. One only needs to examine the range of historical and contemporary accounts of police officers and organizations breaching their duty to serve the public with professionalism, integrity, accountability, and the preservation of rights. At the core of too many of these violations is a lack of adequate leadership. (p. 238)

Because supervisors have such a powerful influence over the attitudes of officers Muir (1977) argues it is imperative that leaders establish relationships that seek to earn an employee’s’ trust. Robbins (2005) states, “Trust is a positive expectation that another will not—through words, actions or decisions—act opportunistically” (p. 173). Supervisors ultimately need employees to trust in management to operate from an ethical standpoint and, with that, supervisors must perform nothing short of such an expectation. Whether completing a task or disciplining employees, supervisors are expected to adhere to organizational policies, as deviation from such adherence should result in disciplinary action. Ethical behavior illustrated by supervisors cultivates an organizational culture of high morale and diligence. Ethics, as it pertains to the field of law enforcement, is
supposed to be exemplified by supervisors as it is mandated within precincts, but also as officers operate and interact within the community. Although many qualities of ethical leadership exist, Huberts et al. (2007) identifies, 

…three of the most often cited qualities of ethical leadership in relation to integrity violations of employees as: (1) Role modeling of managers through setting a good example for employees. (2) Strictness of managers in applying clear norms and sanctioning misbehavior of employees. (3) Openness of managers to discuss integrity problems and dilemmas. (p. 590)

All three characteristics are imperative when managing sworn officers within LEAs, as each characteristic demonstrates and promotes ethics and integrity.

Credibility. According to Campbell (as cited in Gradwell, 2004) credibility is a crucial component of successful leadership. Gladwell (2004) states that credibility is a characteristic of a leader who is believed, trusted, honest, fair, competent, qualified, and authentic. Kouzes and Posner (1990) argued that credibility is not a fixed quantity, but it grows minute by minute, day by day through exhibition of the four most admirable leadership qualities: (a) honest, (b) forward looking, (c) inspiring, and (d) competent. Similarly, they noted, it can be lost with one thoughtless remark or inconsistent act or broken agreement.

Supervisors need to be conscious of the need to present themselves as credible sources of authority as employees constantly examine, observe, and critique the level of credibility of their supervisors when seeking their assistance, information, and guidance. In other words, supervisors will need to present themselves as
knowledgeable, cultivate a reputation for effectiveness and productivity, and be responsible and able to lead by example. To build credibility, Kouzes and Posner suggested that leaders put into practice many of the things highlighted by the LMX survey, such as getting to know their constituents, standing up for their beliefs, speaking with passion, leading by example, and transcending adversity. If a leader is not deemed as a credible resource, creating high performance in an individual and among a team can be extremely difficult.

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs**

In the mid-1900s, Abraham Maslow first explored the hierarchical needs of human beings, setting the stage for future research in the areas of personality, behaviors, intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors, and the psychological and physiological needs of employees. Rouse (2004) states that Maslow’s construction of an employee’s hierarchical needs—including self-actualization, esteem, love and belongingness, safety, and physiological needs—are “typically illustrated within a pyramid-shaped model…with one’s physiological needs at its base and psychological needs at the top” (p. 27). The positioning of the physiological needs at the base of the pyramid, Rouse explained, is intended to convey that they are needs that “must be fulfilled before motivation can be derived from the psychological needs at the top of the hierarchy” (p. 27).

Although the physiological needs are initially more important, Khan (2005) states that the psychological needs “become most important as the lower ones are satisfied” (p. 1139), and in fact, argued Rouse (2004), become important “motivators of action” (p. 27). Verro (2009) stated, “Theoretically, one cannot
proceed to a higher level of needs gratification until the present state is satisfied. Therefore, humans are motivated to attain the next higher level only upon fulfillment of their present need state” (p. 47).

The study of Abraham Maslow (as cited in Verro, 2009) implied, most behavior is multi-motivated although the five needs of employees are placed on a five-tier hierarchical structure. In other words, any behavior is based not solely on one motivating factor, but an exponential combination of any of the five levels. In addition to Maslow’s idea of multi-motivated behavior (as cited in Verro, 2009), it is also important to acknowledge that the need of an individual varies among personality, culture, vision, and circumstance. Therefore, the unmet needs of an individual are the determining factors of the level they seek to attain. According to Maslow (1954), the most powerful need is the one that has not been satisfied.

**Physiological needs.** Physiological needs are positioned at the base of the hierarchical pyramid, as they represent the most basic needs of an individual. According to Verro (2009) the basic physiological needs are vital to one’s survival, health, and well-being and they include food, water, sleep, warmth, health, exercise, and sex.

**Safety.** The need for safety represents one’s desire for stability, security, and freedom. Coy and Long (2005) state that it is based on an unequivocal “desire for physical safety, economic security, and freedom from threats” (p. 367). As these needs were once met by employees’ guardian(s) throughout his or her childhood years, many employees now look to their employers to ensure that such basic needs are met at the workplace. Although categorized as a
physiological need, given the dangerous nature of their jobs, trust becomes an important part of safety among law enforcement officers. Sworn officers may take refuge in knowing that they work alongside supervisors and colleagues who they can trust to protect their physical and psychological well-being.

**Love and belongingness.** Coy and Long (2005) state that ranking third is love and belongingness, “a psychological need that is based on desire for affiliation, friendship, belonging, acceptance, and love” (p. 367). For sworn officers in an intense work environment and in an effort to meet sworn officers’ need for love and belongingness, it is important that officers build professional relationships with their colleagues and supervisors within an environment that promotes such harmony, as these help encourage trust, mutual respect, and reciprocity.

**Esteem.** Ranking second is esteem. Alderfer (1972) states there are two types of self-esteem needs that must be satisfied in order for an individual to surpass this stage and proceed to the self-actualization stage, “interpersonal self-esteem and esteem self-confirmed” (p. 25).

**Interpersonal self-esteem.** The first form of self-esteem refers to a need met while engaging in interpersonal relationships. Simply put, it’s what we get from others. According to Rowan (1998):

We perform our roles well and get rewarded. We look to others for our standards and want to know how well we rate with them. We want to be respected by those we respect. Satisfaction of this need leads to feelings of self-confidence, worth, strength, capability, and adequacy, of being
useful and necessary in the world. (p. 81)

With regard to sworn officers, it is the form of interaction integral to building relationships with leaders of the kind recommended by LMX theory.

**Esteem self-confirmed.** The second form of esteem lies within oneself. Rowan (1998) states, “It comes naturally and easily out of one’s own true inner nature, one’s constitution, one’s biological fate or destiny, out of one’s real self rather than out of the idealized pseudo self” (p. 81) or projected image of oneself. Maslow (1965) summed up his premise by declaring that authentic self-esteem rests on a feeling of dignity, of controlling one’s own life, and of being one’s own boss. Although the two forms of esteem can be differentiated, both are equally important needs that if met, will successfully motivate an individual to attain the ultimate level of self-fulfillment: self-actualization.

**Self-actualization.** According to Rouse (2004) self-actualization, a psychological need, is positioned at the top of hierarchy of the needs pyramid. Self-actualization involves an individual attaining “peak experiences” (p. 27) that provide a feeling of accomplishment and self-worth. Maddi (1977) and Rouse (2004) define self-actualization as the process of fulfilling one’s potential. As a person attains self-actualization, he or she becomes more complex, differentiated, and effective.

In conjunction, Dhiman (2007) also identified the process of self-actualization in relation to peak experiences. Peak experiences consist of the following attributes: wholeness, perfection, completion, justice, aliveness, richness, simplicity, beauty, goodness, uniqueness, effortlessness, playfulness,
truth, honesty, self-sufficiency, and meaningfulness. With respect to this study, peak performances may be experienced by officers who are retiring or after earning a promotional opportunity within the LEAs. Peak experiences represent the moment when officers realize that a once strenuous job can be completed effortlessly. It is the moment officers realize they have been afforded a unique and meaningful opportunity to be of service to the community. Such experiences satisfy the need of self-actualization.

**ERG Theory**

Alderfer (1969), once a doctoral student under the tutelage of the well-known theorist, Chris Argyris, developed a theoretical perspective depicting human needs. Similarly to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Alderfer theorized the needs of human beings as they seek self-fulfillment and satisfaction. Consequently, it was Alderfer who suggested that the five needs originally explained by Maslow be grouped into three simplified categories: existence, relatedness, and growth, or ERG theory.

**Existence.** Existence as a need represents the goal for any human being to exist. It represents the basic requirements for those which are necessities to live and function appropriately. Whisenand and Rush (1988) stated that the existence need is primarily “concerned with providing our basic material existence requirements” (p. 52) such as food, water, and oxygen. According to Norman (2005), existence needs correspond closely to Maslow’s basic level needs: physiological and safety. Although an individual’s need to exist commonly consists of the aforementioned existence requirements, one’s need to exist may
also be linked to one’s ability to provide and purchase necessities. For example, Alderfer (1966) states, “people may seek in the workplace: pay, fringe benefits, and working conditions” (p. 5) to ensure viable existence factors. This need to exist, to maintain stability, and to provide one’s basic needs can be directly related to circumstances of some sworn officers within LEAs. Officers have been observed complaining about their salary and the need to work extended hours (overtime hours) in order to provide sufficient resources and the basic necessities for themselves and their families.

**Relatedness.** The need for relatedness is categorized so as to encompass the need for validated interpersonal relationships. Norman (2005) states that relatedness includes “all socially oriented needs, including Maslow’s social needs and part of the esteem needs” (p. 59). Whisenand and Rush (1988) state that it represents “the desire we have for maintaining important interpersonal relationships” (p. 52) and “require[s] interaction with others if they (the needs) are to be satisfied” (p. 52). Consequently, it is unlikely for employees within an organization to experience satisfaction without sufficient interpersonal or intraworking relationships; a mutual exchange of information and emotions that foster trust.

In his dissertation, Alderfer (1966) highlighted how job satisfaction evolves from one’s feeling of relatedness. Relatedness needs are assumed to be like existence needs in that their satisfaction contributes to a person’s overall sense of security. Relatedness he suggests, means that all parties involved must be satisfied in order for either party to be satisfied. Hence, organizational
interdependence is developed. This provides directly for the premise posited for an appropriately needed level of interpersonal relationships within organizations.

**Growth.** The need for growth represents the desire of human beings to maximize their potential. Whisenand and Rush (1988) defined it as “an intrinsic desire for personal development” (p. 52) and self-actualization as referred by Maslow. Career promotions, being entrusted with additional responsibilities, excelling in the classroom, and becoming an expert in a specific trade are examples of personal development as well as factors that increase one’s self-esteem. These developmental experiences represent the continual growth or learning process that satisfies one’s intrinsic need for success or incremental progression toward one’s full potential. According to Norman (2005), and similar to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, the ERG theorized that human beings seek to achieve unmet needs or goals based on their cultural, socioeconomic background, education, and other individually specific factors.

The ERG theory suggested that all sets of needs are active in all human beings, and that they are not in any hierarchical order of importance. Therefore, each human being seeks to meet his or her needs based on their unique experience, tools, and motivation to achieve. It is important to note that we, as motivated human beings, desire growth in various areas of our lives such as school, work, family, spiritual, and physical well-being. As a result of time constraints, we are unable to fulfill every growth goal. Norman (2005) stated, “Growth needs are desired more than they are satisfied” (p. 60).

Although Alderfer’s ERG theory is a simplified restatement of Maslow’s
hierarchical pyramid, it is representative of the supportive literature reviewed that confirms the importance of fulfilling the physiological and psychological needs of employees. Based on both of these theories, one can conclude that the basic needs (i.e., Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs) of employees impact their motivation to perform.

**Attribution Theory**

According to Batts (1998), attribution theory was developed from the discipline of social psychology to explain motivations, emotions, and social perceptions. This theory helps explain the logic behind an employee’s motivation to achieve, decision-making process, and response to managerial feedback. Although employees always have a choice as to how they respond to feedback, their responses are generally instantaneous, and usually based on the recalling of past experiences and interactions with their supervisors. In such moments, relatedness (Martin & Dowson, 2009) and the level of trust an employee has in the supervisor and his or her intentions seem to play a key role in determining the employee’s response to feedback.

Studies conducted by Cable and Furst (2008) have shown, for example, that people are more willing to accept negative feedback from sources they like and to whom they can subsequently attribute good intentions. Conversely, they are more likely to reject such feedback when the source is not liked or trusted to have good intentions. Barry (2001) concurred, suggesting that employees’ perceptions can determine the extent to which they will view the information conveyed by their manager as supportive and credible, or as manipulative and
self-serving. Therefore, depending on the interpretation or perception of a supervisor’s intention, employees will respond accordingly, perhaps by dismissing the feedback and disregarding the expectation held by the organization and supervisor. Indeed, if the supervisor is in fact deemed a self-serving and manipulative employee, it is probable that employees will begin to exhibit job burn-out behavior.

**Expectancy Theory**

Davis (2009) states that expectancy theory refers to “the momentary belief of the likelihood that a purposeful act will be followed by the desired outcome” (p. 58) and helps to reveal how an employee’s perception impacts performance and productivity. The key to understanding motivation is not a question of perceptions of fairness. According to researchers such as Hayibor (2008) and Reinharth and Wahba (1975), motivation is based on the perception of one’s likelihood of achieving or obtaining specific outcomes and the values, or valences, one ascribes to those outcomes.

According to studies conducted by Porter and Lawler, Vroom, and Lambright (as cited in Davis, 2009) the motivation model, involves the interactions among three different beliefs to determine motivation: expectancy, instrumentality, or “the perceived probability that individuals’ efforts will be sufficient to accomplish the performance targets for which they are held accountable” (Liccione, 2007, p. 17); and valence, or “the outcome’s anticipated reward value and not the actual reward value” (Davis, 2009, p. 58). Hayibor (2008) states that it is “a representation of the anticipated satisfaction associated
with the outcome, although it is common to interpret the term *valence* as the desirability or importance of an outcome” (p. 17). According to Lambright (2010), motivation can be simplified into the following mathematical formula:

\[
\text{Motivation} = \text{Expectancy} \times \text{Instrumentality} \times \text{Valence}
\]

Based on this formula, each factor contributes to an increasing level of motivation. If expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are fostered in multitude, an employee’s level of motivation will equate to the standard expectations of the employer.

**Equity Theory**

According to Bush (2009), equity theory implies that individuals engage in social comparisons of their inputs and outcomes with others whom they perceive as relevant. According to the studies of Adams, Walster, Berscheid, and Walster, Wilkens and Timm (as cited by Hayibor, 2008) the goal of equity theory is to understand when people will perceive that they are being treated fairly or unfairly, and how they will react when faced with an unfair situation. Similar to the theory of expectancy, equity theory, Hayibor (2008) states, is a “‘cognitive theory,’ one that focuses on people’s perceptions” (p. 6). Darke and Dahl (2003) state that it also incorporates an individual’s competitiveness and desire for fairness by presenting a “broad theoretical framework for understanding the manner in which social cues lead to perceptions of fairness” (p. 330).

Hayibor (2008) states, “Equity theory (Adams, 1963, 1965) asserts that people are most satisfied when they perceive that they are being treated fairly—that is, equitably—in their relationships with other people, or with groups or
organizat\textsuperscript{ions}‖ (p. 6). Bush (2009) states that their perceptions are shaped by the constant comparisons and contrasts they make to determine whether their perceived “ratio of inputs to outcomes is the same for their referent others” (p. 38). When the ratio of inputs to outcomes is perceived as the same in reference to others, perceived equity exists. However, “if the ratios are inconsistent throughout an organization, inequity is perceived to exist” (p. 38).

Many researchers such as Adams Wilken and Timm (as cited in Hayibor, 2008) argued that perceived inequity is at the heart of motivation, as individuals feel impelled to “redress unfairness, or inequity” (p. 7) in relationships. Employees who perceive equity are motivated to continue with an organization, and with that motivation, the person(s) will consciously perform at a sufficient level. However, many employees who perceive inequity are likely to exhibit behaviors of job dissatisfaction. Adams argues (as cited in Davis, 2009), to the degree that a worker perceives an imbalance in this ratio, he or she may exercise a wide range of options. These options include perceptually change inputs or outcomes, actually change inputs or outcomes, or leave the organization.

The goal of any organization is to limit turnover, burnout, or a cultivating culture of unsatisfied personnel while simultaneously and consistently motivating employees to perform well. Based on the literature reviewed, Davis (2009) concluded, “Both expectancy/equity models agree that individuals will perform as expected when they are confident they will receive equitable rewards for their effort” (p. 63). This also rings true in the field of law enforcement. Whisenand and
Rush (1988), for instance, state, “If police officers perceive that their success is a function of their own ability and efforts, they can be expected to behave differently than they would if they believed job success was due to chance” (p. 34).

Overall, the five previously mentioned interconnected theoretical perspectives (i.e., Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, ERG, attribution, expectancy, and equity) clearly defined sworn officers varied expectations, perceptions, individual mental, emotion, and physical needs, as well as their desire to engage in LMX with their supervisors. As these theories also detailed the detrimental organizational impact resulting from lack of LMX, this study, along with the implementation of the LMX 7 Questionnaire, served to enlighten law enforcement supervisors and organizations regarding the potential for unethical behavior and its link to the negative perceptions sworn officers have about the performance of their supervisors.

**Generation Gaps**

Throughout the review of literature, another factor that impacts LMX was revealed. The factor was labeled as generation gaps within an organization. According to Smith (2005), in every generation, there exists the entire spectrum of human values, attitudes, and beliefs; however, the times in which each generation grows up exert great influence on their attitudes. According to Landry (2009):

The concept of generational differences, or the generation gap as it may be popularly known, is a part of the fact and fiction combining to create the
understanding of the differences of young versus old among the people of society. This has only recently received close and rigorous study with respect to how generational differences can affect the fabric and continuity of the society at large and smaller groups such as the business unit. (p. 20)

The generation gaps represent an important element of leadership and LMX that could have been examined; however, this study did not identify the specific generation gaps of research participants during the data collection process. The information presented on generation gaps served to emphasize the unique qualities and needs of sworn officers that must be considered by supervisors.

Generation gaps, in relation to this study, represented the four generations that commonly exist in law enforcement organizations. According to Wieck (2007) the four generations present in the workplace consist of the Veterans or Traditionalists (1922–1945), Baby Boomers (1946–1960), Generation X (1960–1980), and the Millennials or Generation Y (1980–2000). To illustrate further the dynamics of the work environment within the LEAs, each generation was described to demonstrate the importance of acknowledging the various perspectives of sworn officers as supervisors seek to establish successfully high-quality LMX.

**Veteran generation.** The veterans represent a generation that is known as traditionalist. This group was born within a culture that honored men for their ability to labor and participate in combat; whereas, women were praised for
commitment as a dutiful housewife. Typically, the men of this generation are comfortable with authoritative, military, or top-down leadership practices, while the women are submissive and, Wieck (2007) states, "became homemakers whose major role function was to provide a happy home environment and raise the children" (p. 366). Woods argues (as cited in Jamerson, 2009) that members of this generation grew up in an era in which following directions and not questioning authority was the expected behavior. Cary (2008) wrote:

> Since Veteran colleagues have a strong work ethic, they tend to follow orders well and expect others to do the same. Baby Boomers, on the other hand, prefer to have meetings and reach a consensus as to how the job will be accomplished. (p. 118)

**Baby boomers.** In contrast to the veterans, the baby boomers essentially broke the tradition of laboring husbands and women bound to the home. According to Wieck (2007), this generation represents the largest generation in the workforce and consists of competitive individuals who are comfortable working in teams and grew up realizing that goals are best reached through collective actions. According to Jamerson (2009), tendencies of individuals in the baby boom generation include challenging authority, focusing on personal needs, and being competitive.

**Generation X.** Generation X, also known as “the offspring of baby boomers” (Wieck, 2007, p. 367) consist of individuals that are “extremely entrepreneurial, seeking to start at the top, avoid long hours, and have fun on the job” (Wieck, 2007, p. 367). Tulgan argues (as cited in Wieck, 2007) that products
of Generation X have little trust of the work environment or loyalty to it. According to Walker et al. (2006):

Due to the nature of the family structure changes that occurred during their formative years, these individuals are often described as highly independent. Many people of this generation were latchkey children, with either both parents working or, as a product of divorce, the single parent working. Collectively, they have little regard for corporate life and frequently challenge authority and the status quo. Members of Generation X are described as independent problem solvers, with a parallel thinking process, which has allowed them to perfect multitasking. They are technologically literate. Concrete thinkers who seek a balanced lifestyle, with work supporting leisure time. (p. 371)

**Generation Y-millennials.** Last, Wieck (2007) states, Generation Y, also referred to as the millennials, are those “who spend almost twice as much time on the Internet as on television, are changing the way America works, plays, advertises, and achieves” (p. 367). According to Walker et al. (2006):

Generation Y has been described as the most culturally diverse generation of all time…. This generation is becoming known for being self-reliant, questioning, and technologically advanced, beyond any other age group. They are compliant and respectful of authority, yet they do not hesitate to challenge authority. Members of Generation Y believe respect is earned and not granted just because of title or rank. This generation has a linear thinking analytical ability and is addicted to visual media. (p. 372)
According Gentry, Griggs, Deal, Mondore, and Cox (2011) most organizations today employ people who range in age from their early 20s to their 70s. Because of this age range, generational cohorts are receiving greater attention in the research literature. Many researchers such as Fyock (as cited in Gentry et al., 2011) have suggested that failing to account for differences among generational cohorts may lead to confusion, misunderstanding, and miscommunication.

An example of how a generation is forced to acknowledge the values of another generation within the law enforcement can be illustrated by the movement of women into this career field and progressively securing dominant roles in the workforce. Historically, and according to Levinson (2002), women first entered a police car as patrol officers in 1968 in Indianapolis, Indiana. During this time, the role of women policing in the United States was limited to duties considered appropriate and safe for women. As the LEAs revolutionized with the support of organizations such as the National Organization for Women, commanding officers that represent the veteran generation were forced to become accustomed to working alongside or under the leadership of female officers. In addition to acknowledging and adjusting to the perspectives of various generations, as illustrated in the stated example, supervisors within LEAs must also adapt as the respective departments frequently modify their policies, procedures, directives, and expectations in an effort honoring and protecting the rights and providing equal opportunities for officers representing various cultures and generations.
**Job Satisfaction**

Based on the literature reviewed thus far, all theoretical perspectives, elements of leadership styles and approaches, and defined generational gaps provide an abundance of information on leaders establishing high quality LMX with sworn officers. Next, the dissertation explores the link between high-quality LMX and job satisfaction, along with low-quality LMX and job dissatisfaction.

A large quantity of documented research exists regarding the primary function of determining the level of job satisfaction within various organizations in addition to research and recommendations on how an organization could ensure the satisfaction of its employees. Although literature exists, it is important to highlight that a limited amount of peer reviewed articles and substantiated research exists that has attributed to the knowledge of job satisfaction within LEAs. Ercikti (2008) states that “research on job satisfaction among police officers may provide invaluable information for city managers, police chiefs, police educators, and police officers” (p. 7), it is important for researchers to continue seeking an explanation of the methods that address and ensure job satisfaction and ultimately reduce dissatisfaction among sworn officers.

Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010) state that job satisfaction “is a subjective, individual-level feeling reflecting the extent to which a person’s needs are being met by a particular job” (p. 242). The job satisfaction of sworn officers and its probable impact on the local communities is of great importance. As a result of the potential negative impacts associated with the dissatisfaction of officers, Hoath, Schneider, and Starr (1998) provided additional
reasons why police job satisfaction is important for police organizations:

One is that negative worker attitudes, including job dissatisfaction, may adversely affect job performance, that is, both the quantity and quality of the law enforcement service an organization provides. Second, negative police attitudes may adversely affect the attitudes and views the public develops about a law enforcement organization and its officers, thus undermining police-community relations. Third, a police organization has a moral obligation to demonstrate concern for its employees and promote positive work-related attitudes among them. Fourth, job satisfaction promotes lower stress levels and, accordingly, fewer symptoms of stress (e.g., absenteeism, burnout, and alcoholism). (p. 338)

LEAs should maintain updated organizational assessments in an attempt to determine their successes and failures with regard to ensuring job satisfaction in light of the previously stated four reasons for the importance of job satisfaction among sworn officers. According to DeSpain (2008) job satisfaction is multifaceted and can be developed with company benefits, personal maturity, longevity in one’s career, and natural interest in one’s work. A Swanson and Talarico study (as cited in Chen, 2004) in the field of law enforcement identified that law enforcement officers’ perception of the organization as a whole was the factor that most influenced reported levels of job satisfaction. With the research findings of both Hoath et al. (1998) and Swanson and Talarico (1982) it can be concluded that an employee’s perception of the organization or personal level of job satisfaction is a determinant of an employee’s attitude, performance,
attendance (i.e., absenteeism), and stress levels. Of these four factors, job performance and stress were discussed throughout this literature review, in addition to job burn-out.

**Job Performance**

The level of job satisfaction perceived among employed sworn officers is directly related to their on-the-job performance and productivity. Although research conducted in the early 1900s, such as the empirical studies done by Hershey (1932) and Kornhauser and Sharp (1932) (as cited in Wright, Cropanzano, & Bonett, 2007), questioned the definite relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, it is countered by current work. Wright et al. (2007) stated, “More recent research has provided greater support for the happy/productive worker thesis” (p. 93). Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001) conducted a well-constructed review of the job satisfaction-job performance relation and concluded that job satisfaction was an effective predictor of job performance.

According to Harrison, Newman, and Roth (2006), job satisfaction, a major work attitude held by employees, and job performance directly affect organizational effectiveness. Researchers such as Murphy and Southey, O’Connell, Doverspike, and Cober, and Ostroff (as cited in DeSpain, 2008) found the work attitude of job satisfaction is significantly and positively related to the overall performance of an organization. DeSpain (2008) added to this knowledge regarding the relationship of job satisfaction and performance by defining employee behaviors attributed when dissatisfaction occurs. According to
Thomas, Sorenson and Yim (2009), “unhappy employees (those who are dissatisfied with their jobs) are more reluctant to give extra effort to job tasks. In extreme cases, these employees may exhibit counterproductive behavior (e.g., tardiness, absenteeism) or opt to exit the company” (p. 764). In addition to dissatisfied employees opting voluntarily to discontinue employment with an organization, they may also elect to remain employed and risk being involuntarily terminated as result of their poor performance. According to Daley (2008), supervisors have the unpleasant and frustrating task of salvaging or rehabilitating formerly productive employees. The task is frustrating, as supervisors observe “poor performers cost the organization lost productivity: the direct loss and compounded in terms of the bad example set for other employees and the inefficiency that is introduced into team efforts” (p. 45). Employees identified as poor performers “are regularly dealt with through termination (a relatively small proportion of turnover figures) and performance improvement plans” (p. 45). In addition to such an extreme behavioral response to a lack of job satisfaction, employees are challenged to cope with the stress that results from dissatisfaction.

**Stress (Inherent and Organizational Stressors)**

Many officers risk their lives daily in pursuit of deterring and investigating crime, as well as housing and doing surveillance on a range of disturbingly violent criminals. Stress is to be expected. Gershon, Barocas, Canton, Li, and Vlahov (2009) state, “Stress-related problems, such as hyper-aggression and violence, can lead to public distrust and erosion of support for law enforcement
agencies in general. Thus, police stress has both public safety and public health implications” (p. 277).

As a result of these implications, Gershon et al. (2009) state that many unique and effective programs have been developed during the past 2 decades to address stressors experienced by officers. These programs are typically staffed with former or well-trained law enforcement officers to provide a mentoring environment, allowing officers to receive assistance from peers as they attempt to cope with job-related stress. According to Robinson and Murdoch (2003), the underlying argument is that peers are in the best position to assist one another in recognizing and acknowledging work-related stress and facilitating an intervention if necessary. In addition to peer-supported programs, many organizations have implemented the Employee Assistant Program (EAP). According to Clavelle (2009):

EAP promotes the physical and mental fitness of employees thereby enhancing the productivity, reliability, and trustworthiness of the workforce…through a variety of programs including classes and workshops for managers and employees on a wide range of issues that affect morale, productivity, emotional stability, and mission accomplishment; consultation to managers on personnel and organizational matters; counseling services (usually short-term) and referral to community providers for specialized or longer term care; and educational and rehabilitative programs for employees with substance abuse problems and other addictions. (pp. 14–15)
Giga, Cooper, and Faragher (2003) state, "As organizations have become aware of the effects of stress, they have introduced EAP for employees who may experience problems emanating either from the work environment or from their personal lives" (p. 287). It should also be highlighted that despite some exhibited resistance, EAP is purchased by organizations for their employees to access in lieu of them separating from the workforce and filing disability claims. Resistance to utilize EAP services, according to Clavelle (2009), is the result of a stigma associated with EAP use—especially uses of its management consultation and counseling services. The stigma varied (e.g., shame, embarrassment, feeling weak, losing independence, losing respect) and had a significant impact on managers’ and employees’ willingness to access services for themselves. Although, program resistance is high and the overall effectiveness of EAP is unknown, it is still considered a valuable resource as employees and, specifically, sworn officers are confronted with inherent and organizational stress daily.

**Inherent stressors.** The stress sources for officers can be categorized into two definable stressors: inherent and organizational. According to Dowler (2005), inherent stressors refer to events normally happening within police work that have the potential to be psychologically and physically harmful to officers. These can include boredom, use of force, critical decision making, continual exposure to citizens in pain or distress, and exposure to danger and violence.

**Organizational stressors.** In contrast to inherent stressors, organizational stressors refer to stress generated directly from the structure of an
organization or law enforcement agency. According to Dowler (2005), the very policies and practices of the police department form organizational stressors. These stressors include, but are certainly not limited to, poor wages, excessive paperwork, bureaucracy, insufficient training, inadequate equipment, shift work, weekend duty, limited promotional opportunities, lack of administrative support, and poor intraworking relationships with supervisors or colleagues.

From an organizational perspective and according to Tang and Hammontree (1992), negative outcomes associated with police stress can seriously undermine the effectiveness of law enforcement agencies through poor productivity, excessive rates of turnover, difficulties in recruitment, high absenteeism, as well as health care utilization and workers’ compensation costs. These negative and potentially costly outcomes lead to the next important issue that organizations must acknowledge, address, and implement changes to reduce: job burnout.

**Burnout**

The term burnout, originally presented by Freudenberger (1980), serves to describe a condition of being exhausted, wearing out, or failing in response to an overload of demands. Griffin et al. (2010) state, “Job burn-out, as a state of fatigue or frustration, is a real possibility in the field of corrections” (p. 239). It is a psychological issue that is commonly associated with feelings of job dissatisfaction toward job duties, leadership, interpersonal working relationships, organizational policies and procedures, and a host of perceived disappointments. Essentially, inherent and organizational stressors coupled with an employee’s
poor performance and pessimistic attitudes can be identified as job burnout.

Job burnout, an observable behavior or attitude that stems from a continuance of feelings of dissatisfaction and stress, is a probable and common response for many sworn officers. With the primary task being to arrest, secure, and house actual and potentially violent criminals, officers tend to incur the aforementioned stressors in multitude. Inherent stressors coupled with organizational stressors increase the likelihood of job burnout. According to Gardner, Knight, and Simpson (2007):

Burnout research has continued to be an area of great interest because of its association with many adverse outcomes. Specifically, research has shown burnout to be associated with physical health problems (e.g., headaches, insomnia, and prolonged illnesses), mental health problems (e.g., decreased self-esteem, increased anxiety, and depression), and job performance (e.g., absenteeism, intentions to quit, and turnover). (p. 511)

According to the studies of Maslach and Jackson, Jackson, Schwab, and Schuler, Burke and Deszca, and Jackson, Turner, and Brief (as cited in Kohan & Mazmanian, 2003) negative correlates include deficits in work performance, increased absenteeism, and diminished organizational commitment. Maslach and Schaufeli, and Maslasch and Jackson argue (as cited in Kohan & Mazmanian, 2003):

Burnout is an extreme state of depleted resources that can result from chronic exposure to work stress. It has been conceptualized as a type of job stress with three components: emotional exhaustion (depleted energy
and fatigue), depersonalization (cynicism toward the organization and its recipients (i.e., supervisors, peers, clients), and diminished personal accomplishment. (p. 561)

The three stated components indicative of burnout are based on the perspective and definition of the Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter's (as cited in Gardner et al., 2007) multidimensional theory of burnout. It is throughout this theoretical perspective that law enforcement executives are warned about the probable results if employee job burnout is overlooked. A review of the effects of absenteeism was provided, although there are a multitude of equally important factors that are detrimental to the overall success of LEAs.

Absenteism. Absenteeism is often categorized as a job-performance factor. Throughout this study, absenteeism was defined as habitual absences, when an employee will frequently refrain from reporting to work or is consistently unable to complete an entire work shift because of a stated illness or injury. Hardy, Woods, and Wall (2003) state that it is a “behavioral manifestation of dislike for one’s job” (p. 306). Based on the definitions provided, an employee’s level of absenteeism may also be viewed as a predictor of staff turnover. Such a prediction involves the notion that employees tend to avoid attending or participating in an environment that fosters feelings of unhappiness. Absenteeism and employee turnover, both significantly associated with job burnout, have notably affected LEAs as they seek to rebound from or replace officers who are habitually absent, tardy, requesting to leave work early, or simply resign. Although research has made incremental steps in highlighting the elements and
factors contributing to job dissatisfaction and burnout, there are limited amounts of research focusing on how job dissatisfaction behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover are directly related to the overextended budget crises many organizations are struggling with since the 2008 global economic crisis.

Hardy et al. (2003) highlighted the various adverse effects of job burnout as he identified the financial costs that are associated with hiring new staff and the increased burden placed on remaining staff that is often expected to absorb the increased workload during the interim hiring and training process. For example, according to the Anderson (2010), in 2004, the Los Angeles County Probation Department was funded approximately $80 million to screen, train, and deploy approximately 901 additional officers to function adequately as an organization. According to the research and analysis Parks and Steelman (2008) conducted, it has been estimated that absenteeism costs organizations more than $26 million each year (Altchiler & Motta, 1994) and accounts for 10.4 million workdays lost each year (Ho, 1997). As a result, the exorbitant funds that an organization forfeits as a result of absenteeism, turnover, and burnout have led to the implementation of wellness programs, which have been instituted to reduce organizational costs and to protect the interpersonal relationships at the workplace.

Wellness programs. Throughout the past 2 decades, organizations have offered wellness programs to officers as a way of promoting health and wellness with regard to their career and personal lives. Competitive sporting events (i.e., the Baker, CA to Las Vegas, NV 120 mile relay race), weight loss programs, and
additional recreational activities have been incorporated throughout the Los Angeles LEAs to achieve the goal of honoring the physiological and psychological health of officers and reducing the probability of officers experiencing job burnout. According to Gardner et al. (2007):

Burnout research has continued to be an area of great interest because of its association with many adverse outcomes. Specifically, research has shown burnout to be associated with physical health problems (e.g., headaches, insomnia, and prolonged illnesses), mental health problems (e.g., decreased self-esteem, increased anxiety, and depression), and job performance (e.g., absenteeism, intentions to quit, and turnover). (p. 511)

As a result of the adverse outcomes associated with burnout and the potential for these factors to be detrimental to an officers’ career and the overall organization in which they work, wellness programs were instituted. According to Griffin et al. (2010):

Burnout is harmful not only to the employee but also to the friends and family members of the employee, to coworkers, to inmates, and to the organization….burnout cannot be significantly reduced without meaningful interventions and the commitment of the administration to assess and understand the possible effects of this stressful work environment on its employees. In the end, both the individual and the organization benefit when the likelihood of burnout is minimized. (p. 252)

According to Gronningsaeter, Hytten, Skauli, Christensen, and Ursin (1992), providing a work site wellness program will engender a positive attitude,
making employees happier with the organization and, therefore, more satisfied with their jobs. Parks and Steelman (2008) state, “Others suggest that the mere presence of a wellness program may help to demonstrate to employees that the organization cares about them and thus improve employee job satisfaction” (p. 65). Parks and Steelman also conducted a study on organizational wellness programs. The results of this meta-analysis indicated that overall participation in an organizational wellness program was associated with lower absenteeism rates and higher job satisfaction.

**Summary**

Based on the literature reviewed, LMX was defined as a mutually beneficial relationship that influences the perception sworn officers have regarding their supervisors. The importance of supervisors establishing LMX to address the personal and professional needs of officers was illustrated by supportive theories such as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, ERG, attribution, expectancy, and equity. In addition, leadership roles, styles (transactional and transformational), characteristics, and generation gaps were also identified, providing information that should be commonly utilized by supervisors to establish LMX while simultaneously and tactfully motivating officers to perform optimally. Furthermore, behaviors (stress, burnout, and absenteeism) streaming from job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were identified and linked to job performance.

The objective of this literature review was to provide each reader with a variety of supportive perspectives and factors that are interrelated to the
successful development of LMX within LEAs. Second, the literature reviewed served to generate curiosity among individuals or agencies interested in this study as it prompts the review of the quality of LMX within LEAs. The process of reviewing the quality of LMX is detailed in the next chapter: Methodology.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter describes the process of initiating, conducting, and analyzing data retrieved for the study of the quality of LMX within LEAs as well as the perception sworn officers have regarding the LMX established by their supervisors. This chapter includes: (a) description of the study and its design, (b) research questions and research hypotheses, (c) description of participants, (d) description of instrument, (e) reliability and validity, (f) administrative procedures, (g) analysis procedures, and (h) plans for Pepperdine University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Description of the Study

This study served to create awareness among LEAs regarding perceived supervisory relationships from the perspective of sworn officers. Based on these perspectives, this study illustrated, through data collection and analysis, the quality of LMX or social relationships between sworn officers and supervisors within LEAs.

Research Design

Based on the purpose and significance of this study, a nonexperimental tool in the form of a questionnaire, was utilized primarily to retrieve data. The data were reviewed and analyzed quantitatively to provide a concise illustration of the perception of sworn officers regarding the quality of LMX experienced.

Research questions. As stated previously, this study revealed the perspectives of sworn officers as they act under the auspices of their superiors. The following research questions were answered throughout this study:
R1: Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisors are aware of the officer’s professional needs?

R2: Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisors have confidence their professional ability?

R3: Do sworn officers perceive their supervisors as supportive?

R4: Do sworn officers perceive the working relationship with their supervisors as effective?

R5: Do high quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within law enforcement agencies, from an officers’ perspective?

Research hypotheses. As a result of the anticipated survey responses of the surveyed sworn officers, the following four statements are hypothesized:

H1: Sworn officers perceive that their supervisors are aware of the officers’ professional needs.

H2: Sworn officers perceive that their supervisors have confidence in their professional ability.

H3: Sworn officers perceive their supervisors as supportive.

H4: Sworn officers perceive the working relationship with their supervisors as effective.

H5: High quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within law enforcement agencies, from an officers’ perspective.

Participants. In 2009, there were approximately 25,000 sworn officers assigned to LEAs within Los Angeles. Because of the quantity of officers working in various capacities throughout the city and within multiple agencies, in addition...
to the limited resources allocated for this study, the officers selected as research participants were a representative sample to initiate further research. In effort to utilize appropriately the allocated resources available (survey materials and volunteer hours of the facilitator) in addition to minimizing the margin of error, 50 randomly selected sworn officers from the LACSD were recruited to participate in this study.

The target population consisted of individuals recognized as sworn officers in the state of California. Each participant was classified as a sworn officer or deputy within the LACSD.

**Inclusion and exclusion requirements.** In addition to being an sworn officer, inclusion and exclusion requirements were imposed. The inclusion and exclusion requirements were: (a) the sworn officer actively worked in any capacity (i.e., office duties, equipment manager, training officer, community patrol) within the LACSD; (b) the sworn officer completed his or her probationary period of employment; (c) the participant had at least 1-year’s experience as a sworn officer within LACSD; (d) the sworn officer was 21½ years of age and older and obtained at least a high school diploma or GED; (e) the sworn officer, at the time of survey completion, was not acting or concurrently assigned any supervisory role or responsibilities; and (f) the sworn officer reviewed the Informed Consent form provided (see Appendix C).

In an effort to assure that the participants met the stated criteria, the facilitator requested that each participant complete a brief Demographic Questionnaire (See Appendix D) that encompassed all six inclusion and
exclusion requirements. The Demographic Questionnaire was submitted confidentially and in addition to the Informed Consent form and the LMX 7 Questionnaire (See Appendix A).

Informed consent form. The Informed Consent form summarized the scope of this research, elucidated the potential risk associated with research participation, and acknowledged the human rights of the participants. It also highlighted that participation was voluntary and could be withdrawn at any point during the data collection process. The principal investigator and participants entered into an agreement by reviewing and signing the Informed Consent form, as the data were collected confidentially. Each participant was instructed to submit the signed form (containing identifying information) in one of the two sealable and embossed envelopes the facilitator provided. The facilitator emphasized that officers seal the envelope containing the signed Informed Consent form prior to submission as a precaution. Informed Consent forms were submitted in the provided sealable envelopes separate from the questionnaires to protect the participants and to prevent linking participants to their responses.

It should be noted that participants did not have to sign the consent forms or complete the survey before inserting and sealing them within their respective envelopes. The process of submitting the consent forms separately from the questionnaires served to prevent the facilitator or researcher from identifying participants who opted not to complete the survey packet in its entirety. Furthermore, submissions were not reviewed or discussed with the facilitator, as the principal investigator reviewed and quantified all survey data in a private
**Description of the instrument.** Northouse (2007) stated that the LMX 7 Questionnaire was “designed to measure three dimensions of leader-member relationships: respect, trust, and obligation” (p. 168). According to Watson (2010), the development of the LMX 7 instrument has continued to evolve throughout the literature presented by researchers such as Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). The LMX 7 Questionnaire was designed with the dual purpose of illustrating perception as it relates to or is experienced by both supervisors and sworn officers. Essentially, the seven-item questionnaire is worded to allow supervisors to rate sworn officers and it allows officers to rate their supervisors. The LMX 7 served as an adequate instrument since the purpose of this study focused on reviewing the perceptions that sworn officers have regarding the quality of LMX established by their supervisors. The questionnaire measured whether the aspects of an LMX (i.e., mutual respect, trust, and obligation) have been established by supervisors, but it also served to measure the quality (high, low, or moderate) with which sworn officers were experiencing this pertinent social exchange.

According to review articles Gerstner and Day, Graen and Uhl-Bien, (as cited in Wu, 2009) claimed that LMX 7 is the soundest measure of LMX, demonstrated by its significant correlations with outcome criteria. The questionnaire is composed of seven questions, Watson (2010) states, each requiring the subject to respond, “using a five-point ordinal Likert-type scale” (p. 46). According to Greguras and Ford, Scandura and Graen, Schriesheim, Neider,
Scandura, and Tepper, and Truckenbrodt (as cited in Watson, 2010), the scores are summed for all items, resulting in a possible score between 7 and 35. A high score indicates that a more positive (i.e., higher-quality) relationship was perceived by the subordinate with his or her supervisor. Conversely, if supervisors are surveyed, a high score would indicate the high level in which the supervisor perceives that he or she has successfully established high-quality LMX with subordinates. It should be noted that throughout this study, only sworn officers were solicited as participating subjects. Sworn officers with acting or official supervisory duties were not surveyed.

**Reliability and validity.** Many researchers such as Erdogan and Liden, Gerstner and Day, Graen and Uhl-Bien, and Schriesheim, Castro, and Cogliser (as cited in Mourino-Ruiz, 2010) have proclaimed the validity and reliability of the LMX 7 Questionnaire as a sufficient instrument. Northouse (2007) also identifies the LMX 7 as a seven-item questionnaire that provides a reliable and valid measure of the quality of LMX. Based on the continued use of such a tool, it can be concluded that this instrument adequately measures the social exchanges between supervisors and sworn officers within Los Angeles LEAs.

**Administration Procedures**

**Selecting a facilitator.** Convenience sampling was utilized in an effort to secure a research facilitator in a timely and succinct manner. Because of the principal investigator’s limited access to some LEAs, convenience sampling was chosen to ensure that the questionnaires were physically distributed to sworn officers by a fellow sworn officer and in a prescribed manner.
Professional relationships were formed with multiple sworn officers at various LEAs within the Los Angeles area. Prior to embarking upon this study, many officers were engaged in informal discussions surrounding their professional experiences. Although these discussions were informal, they prompted further investigation. Therefore, as a result of the information disclosed throughout the informal and off the record interviews, this study was initiated to illustrate formally quality LMX within LEAs.

Of the officers who were engaged in the informal and off the record discussions, one was asked to volunteer as this study’s facilitator. This officer, representing the LACSD, was selected after being identified throughout the informal discussions as an officer who demonstrated integrity and reliability. She is also an officer who is personable, trustworthy, inspiring, approachable, charismatic, and most notably she seeks to maximize the overall performance of her respective LEAs. This officer was deemed suitable to recruit, distribute, and administer the survey packets within her employed LEAs based on the nature of the proposed study and the aforementioned characteristics. The facilitator was Deputy Juleen Smith, of the LACSD.

Deputy Smith, the facilitator selected to recruit, distribute, and collect survey packets (each containing two sealable and embossed envelopes, one embossed Demographic Questionnaire, one LMX 7 Questionnaire, and two embossed Informed Consent forms) at her assigned work location (Men’s Central Jail), enrolled and completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative and IRB educational training. This training essentially equipped the facilitator with
knowledge of procedure, protocol, and ethics surrounding research involving human subjects. The facilitator was also informed that she would not be permitted to begin the data collection process without a Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative IRB certificate of completion. Upon completion of the training, the facilitator forwarded a copy her completion certificate to the principal investigator (see Appendix E).

In assuming the role of a research facilitator, the facilitator was required to attend a meeting held by the principal investigator. During this meeting, the purpose and overview of the study was provided, the research policies and procedures were explained, and the facilitator was encouraged to provide suggestions to enhance the expeditious retrieval of data upon department and IRB approval. Deputy Smith also served as a point of contact in seeking approval from LACSD to survey on-duty officers. A proposal was submitted to LACSD requesting permission for Deputy Smith to conduct research. The proposal included a letter of introduction (see Appendix F), Research Approval Signature form (see Appendix G), as well as drafts of the Demographic and LMX 7 questionnaires and the Informed Consent form. The principal investigator also provided the facilitator with a copy of the proposal submitted to her agency. Once approved, the facilitator provided the principal investigator with a signed Research Approval Signature (see Appendix H) form authorizing Deputy Smith to facilitate this study.

**Random selection.** Sworn officers were randomly selected and recruited to participate in this study. The facilitator was responsible for retrieving a master
list of the names or employee identification numbers of all officers assigned to her specific work location prior to recruiting officers to participate. The facilitator had daily access to the master list that contained the officers assigned work location(s) and work schedule. The facilitator's access to the master list is normal and did not require additional consent, as it is basic information accessible by all officers. The facilitator was responsible for retrieving the master list of employees rather than the principal investigator in effort to maintain privacy and protect any personal information that could have been presented on the master list. The principal investigator did not have direct access to the master list obtained from the LEAs. Each officer on the list was assigned a number, with the first officer on the list being identified as number one, the second officer number two, and so on. Once this list was retrieved and each officer was assigned an identifying number, these respective numbers were inserted into a randomizer using the random.org web site to assist with the random selection of the participants. As the randomizer ensured that each officer had equal probability of being selected to participate, the first 50 officers on the list produced using the random.org web site (see Appendix I) were recruited to participate in this study. If the facilitator encountered a situation in which an officer listed among the top 50 was unavailable or declined to participate in the study, the facilitator referred to the list generated by the randomizer to select the next participant listed. The facilitator was also encouraged to skip officers who she knew held supervisory positions, as they did not meet the inclusion requirements.

While initiating the recruitment process, the research facilitator was
responsible for identifying the exact work location of the randomly selected potential participants. Once the location was determined, the facilitator approached each potential participant directly and verbally requested his or her participation using a Facilitator Recruitment Script provided (see Appendix J). The facilitator employed the script when attempting to recruit all officers to participate in this study. The script assisted in facilitating a dialogue between the two parties (facilitator and potential participant) while simultaneously providing the potential participant with the appropriate information regarding the purpose of this study and the data collection process.

Although well-informed of the data collection process, the facilitator was also be equipped with a Facilitator Proctor Script (see Appendix K) to utilize while administering the survey packet. In addition, the facilitator was provided with a facilitator checklist (see Appendix L) to reference throughout the process of recruiting and administering survey packets to each participant.

**Research materials.** The facilitator was provided 50 survey packets. Each survey packet consisted of two large sealable envelopes. One envelope contained two printed Informed Consent forms. One of the two forms was submitted to the facilitator in the sealed envelope provided. The facilitator encouraged the participant to retain the second copy for his or her records. The second envelope contained one printed Demographic Questionnaire and one LMX 7 Questionnaire (double-sided copy). All questionnaires, informed consent forms, and sealable envelopes pertaining to this study were identified by the same, yet unique, embossment.
It should be noted that the facilitator was provided with exactly 50 printed Demographic Questionnaires and 50 LMX 7 questionnaires, all containing a unique embossment, along with 100 uniquely embossed Informed Consent forms, and 100 uniquely embossed large sealable envelopes. The facilitator was held accountable for all research materials within the survey packets in an effort to protect the research participants and the confidentiality of their questionnaire responses. For example, if the facilitator administered the survey packets to 42 sworn officers, the facilitator would be held accountable for the submission of 42 uniquely embossed Demographic and LMX 7 questionnaires and 42 Informed Consent forms within 42 embossed sealed envelopes. The facilitator also was responsible for providing the remaining eight survey packets that were not distributed.

It should be noted that during the data collection process, the facilitator was equipped with a portable and lockable file box. The facilitator was responsible for placing completed survey packets in this portable locked file box. The principle investigator retrieved the completed survey packets from the locked file box on a weekly basis. Implementing this protocol made the facilitator accountable for proper handling and submission of the research materials and also reinforced the protection of confidentiality of the research participant.

**Instructions to research participants.** Research participants were provided with an Informed Consent form that summarized the purpose of the study, detailed their rights as participants, in addition to the contact information of the principal investigator to address further questions or concerns. The Informed
Consent forms completed by each participant also served to ensure participant confidentiality. Each participant was instructed to review and sign the Informed Consent forms. Participants were also instructed to submit one of the signed forms in one of the provided embossed sealable envelopes and to retain the second Informed Consent form for his or her reference or personal record. The facilitator also informed the participants that in order to protect their rights and integrity of the study she (the research facilitator) would not be allowed to view the responses submitted. In fact, to ensure further privacy and protection of responses, the facilitator exited the room or area while participants attempted to complete the survey packet. The facilitator was provided with a Facilitator Recruitment Script, a Facilitator Proctor Script, and a Facilitator Checklist to reference throughout the data collection process to ensure participants were aware of their rights as well as the procedures employed throughout this study.

**Distribution of survey packets.** The data collection process was scheduled to be conducted throughout a 12-month period (beginning August 15, 2011) or until 50 randomly selected participants completed a survey packet. Throughout this 12-month period, the research facilitator was responsible for reserving and securing a private office or conference room location at her work location to administer the survey packets, which contained the LMX 7 Questionnaire. As a result of officers’ varied responsibilities (i.e., patrol, inmate or detainee supervision, desk clerk, and special assignments), officers were instructed to report to the designed location when time permitted (i.e., before or after shift, when properly relieved of duties, or during a periodic break). As a
result of officers’ various duties as well as the safety and security of officers throughout the LEA, officers were not surveyed in a group setting. In fact, officers were surveyed individually. Therefore, there was only one officer at a time completing his or her survey packet in the location designated by the facilitator. To ensure privacy and protection of each participant’s confidential responses, the facilitator exited the designated area while participants completed survey packet. Each participant was informed that he or she had up to 30 minutes to complete the survey packet. No additional time was given to participants failing to complete the survey in this time frame. Whether fully completed or partially completed, all survey packets were submitted to the research facilitator at the conclusion of 30 minutes.

Two precautionary measures were taken throughout the administering of the LMX 7 questionnaire to protect the subjects, produce sufficient data, and maintain the integrity of the participating parties (i.e., participant, facilitator, and researcher). First, the LMX 7 questionnaires and Informed Consent forms were administered directly (face-to-face) to sworn officers.

According to Wood (2003), police researchers often administer surveys to police officers in a group setting (face-to-face). Typical of these efforts, the surveys are given to officers for completion on their own during shift changes, roll calls, training sessions, and conventions. Direct administering of survey packets was selected in an effort to maximize the number of responses from subjects, and, as Doyle (2005) indicates to,

…ensure, for example, that respondents do not skip ahead or “phone a
friend,” as they might do when filling out a mail survey, or that they do not watch TV or surf the Internet during the interview, as they might do during a telephone survey. (p. 2)

This method was also confirmed as the most appropriate method through the written research and testimonies of many researchers such as Devine (2007), Doyle (2005), and Wood (2003). According to these researchers, who have completed comparison research on various effective surveying methods as well as experienced administering surveys to sworn officers, administering the survey directly to officers is a common and suitable method.

Direct administering of the survey packets was also selected in contrast to U.S. mail, as many officers, for safety reasons, could decline or be apprehensive about providing their personal mailing address to an outside entity. In addition, administering the survey packets by mail was not selected, as many researchers, such as Devine (2007), reported receiving only a 30% return on the survey distributed to sworn officers by mail. Wood (2003) highlighted the benefits of directly administered surveys, which included higher response rates, uniformity in data collection conditions, opportunities to answer and clear up ambiguities, and savings in time and postage. Administering the demographic and LMX 7 questionnaires directly to sworn officers was undoubtedly preferred in comparison to administering by mail.

Administering the survey packets directly was also preferred in comparison to e-mail and survey web sites (i.e., SurveyMonkey.com). Although e-mail is a leading method of communication at this time, the distribution of
questionnaires via e-mail could have jeopardized the confidentiality of the study participants. Such a preference is justifiable, as outgoing and incoming e-mail can be tracked, monitored, reviewed, and duplicated by employee personnel administrators. Distribution of questionnaires via e-mail could have relinquished the possibility of confidential submissions, as e-mail messages typically include identifying information about the participant (i.e., first or last name in full or partially, employee number, or assigned work location), linking officers to their responses. In addition, surveying via e-mail or Internet could have reduced the response rate, as many officers, depending on their assigned work location (i.e., jail supervision, patrol, courtroom supervision, transportation), do not have access to computers with Internet access.

The second precautionary procedure that was employed to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of each participant’s submission insisted that officers submit their completed embossed questionnaires in the sealable embossed envelope provided. Officers were instructed to submit the Informed Consent form in a separate embossed envelope to ensure that the responses were not linked to an officer. To ensure confidentiality of each participant, the following two-phase data collection was implemented:

Phase One:

- The research facilitator provided the participant with two Informed Consent forms, one sealable envelope, and verbal instructions (refer to Facilitator Proctor Script).
- Facilitator exited the designated area or room.
• Upon completion of the Inform Consent form, the participant sealed it within the provided envelope.

• Participant retained second Inform Consent form for his or her personal records.

• Participant notified the facilitator (standing outside the designated area or room) of completion the Inform Consent form.

• Facilitator entered the designated area or room, retrieved the sealed envelope containing Informed Consent form, and placed it directly in the lock box.

Phase Two:

• The facilitator provided the participant with the Demographic and LMX 7 questionnaires along with a second sealable envelope.

• Facilitator exited the designated area or room.

• After completion of questionnaires, the participant notified the facilitator (standing outside the designated area or room).

• Facilitator entered the designated area or room, retrieved the sealed envelope containing Informed Consent form, and placed it directly in the lock box.

In addition, this precautionary procedure ensured that the participating officers were protected from the facilitating officer. The submission in the uniquely embossed sealed envelope ensured the participant that additional steps had been taken to protect the officer from any backlash or benefits for his or her truthful (positive or negative) responses.
**Statistical procedures.** The analysis process was begun once the facilitator submitted all 50 survey packets to the principal investigator. For each survey packet, the research materials were retrieved from two once-sealed envelopes. The standard procedure for the initial opening of the sealed envelopes and the initial review of the consents and questionnaires entailed each item being separated to form three piles: (a) signed informed consent forms, (b) the completed demographic and LMX 7 questionnaires (double-sided copy), and (c) a pile of once-sealed envelopes. It should be noted that the principal investigator removed the signed Informed Consent forms and completed questionnaires from the once-sealed envelopes at a private office location.

Once the three piles were formed, the initial review of data began. Initially, the Demographic Questionnaires were reviewed to confirm whether participants met the inclusion requirements. When it was determined that a participant did not meet the inclusion requirements, the survey packet (with the exception of the signed Informed Consent form) was placed in file labeled LACSD Excluded Participants and filed in a locked cabinet. Conversely, after reviewing each Demographic Questionnaire and identifying that the participant met the inclusion requirements, the primary investigator continued to review the survey packet. Next, the investigator entered the data collected onto an electronic spreadsheet. These steps continued and in this sequence for the remaining survey packets. Once all data were entered onto the spreadsheet, all packets were placed in a locked file cabinet. Data retrieved from LACSD were placed in a file labeled LACSD Data 2011. It should be noted that the LACSD Data 2011 file, along with
the LACSD Excluded Participants file, were retained and filed in the same locked cabinet.

**Data entry.** Responses from the Demographic Questionnaire were entered onto an electronic spreadsheet. In contrast to entering data from each Demographic Questionnaire, each item response on the LMX 7 Questionnaire was assigned numerical values (numerical values ranged from 1 to 5 per response and are located on the questionnaire directly below the selected response). Based on the responses selected on the LMX 7 Questionnaire, the corresponding numerical value for each response was entered onto an electronic spreadsheet and later compiled using NCSS to compute statistical results. In addition to determining and entering the numerical value for each response, each LMX 7 Questionnaire was scored in its entirety based on the cumulative responses and corresponding values (range 7 to 35). Once each questionnaire was scored, the scoring interpretation in Table 1 provided by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) was utilized to determine the level of LMX.

Table 1

**LMX 7 Cumulative Scores Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMX</th>
<th>Minimum LMX Score</th>
<th>Maximum LMX Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scores in the upper range indicate stronger, higher quality LMX, whereas scores in the lower ranges indicate exchanges of lesser quality.

Once the scores were retrieved from the completed questionnaires and entered onto a spreadsheet, analysis of the questionnaire responses was
conducted. Throughout the process of analyzing the responses of sworn officers the principal investigator determined whether the 5 stated hypotheses were valid or null.

**Analysis**

Each of the aforementioned hypotheses was identified as valid or null based on the scores recorded from the questionnaires. In part, the first stage of the analysis involved calculating the percentage of sworn officers with an LMX 7 Questionnaire score reflecting very high, high, moderate, low, or very low LMX relationships. The five calculated percentages were analyzed. For example, if 55% of survey responses indicated that officers were experiencing low LMX, this statistic and LMX relationship would have been analyzed along with a detailed interpretation of the potential impact low LMX might have on an organization.

**Levels of LMX.** Analyzing the percentages of the five levels of LMX included an additional review of item responses sworn officers provided on the LMX 7 Questionnaire. To continue with the previously stated example, each response on the 55% of the LMX questionnaires that represented the 55% of officers who were experiencing low LMX were analyzed. The first objective at this stage of analysis was to identify the item responses on the LMX 7 that were rated poorly based on the perception and experiences of the sworn officers.

The second objective of the analysis highlighted any patterns or parallels within the responses provided. For example, if data illustrated that 95% of the sworn officers were experiencing high LMX, the data were analyzed once more to affirm the perceptions of sworn officers that contribute to the high quality of
LMX. Patterns were linked to the probable impact on the officer’s performance by restating the research findings or theoretical perspectives detailed in the literature review of this study.

To clarify the analysis process in terms of linking the questions presented on the LMX 7 and the research questions of this study, a research question and LMX 7 Comparison Chart (see Appendix M) was developed. The table illustrates how the subjects’ responses to the LMX 7 were used to answer the research questions. Based on these findings, each of the five previously stated hypotheses were revisited and asserted as valid or null.

**Limitations**

When selecting to survey human subjects for this study, several limitations were considered. With such consideration, precautionary procedures were implemented to maintain the integrity of this study in addition to the integrity of the participants. Based on the procedures implemented, each participant had the opportunity to express fully his or her opinion with freedom from judgment, retaliation, and humiliation. Each precautionary procedure served to protect as well as empower the sworn officers to contribute to research that could improve or enhance the overall organization and, more specifically, their working environment.

**Truthfulness.** One of the limitations of this study is whether research participants were compelled to select answers throughout the questionnaire that represented their true experience as a sworn officer. The research facilitator was strategically selected in an effort to encourage and empower sworn officers to
select answers throughout the questionnaire that accurately illustrated the quality of LMX with their assigned supervisor. A sworn officer without supervisory responsibilities was purposely selected as a facilitator to provide a calm, trustworthy, and supportive environment that would compel officers to answer each question truthfully.

**Confidentiality.** In any profession, subordinates might feel threatened by their superior when asked to evaluate or express their personal or professional opinion about the leadership exhibited by a supervisor. The law enforcement officers are by no means an exception to this occurrence in the workplace. The questionnaires submitted were done so confidentially in an effort to relinquish any fear of retaliation from supervisors.

**Willingness to participate.** Officers opposing participation in this study were considered as a result of the level of secrecy or the blue code of silence that might exist within many law enforcement organizations. A sworn officer was selected as the facilitator in an effort to reduce the likelihood of officers refusing to complete the questionnaire. Deputy Smith was selected as a facilitator, as opposed to a civilian, to support the officers as they responded truthfully on the questionnaires provided. The facilitating officer served to provide an environment of trustworthiness and also to be someone who fully understood the importance of protecting his or her fellow officers.

**Varied perspectives.** The LEA examined within this study provide services to the public 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The availability of officers varies, as they are commonly scheduled to work during one
of three work shifts: day, night, and graveyard. Although the facilitating officer was assigned to only one of the three shifts, she committed to recruiting officers based on the names produced by the randomizer, regardless of shift. This served to provide various perspectives from officers regarding various supervisors assigned to the three shifts.

**Plans for IRB**

The IRB was designed to protect human subjects participating in the rigorous research and data collection process. It represents the federal and state statutes serving to ensure each research participant’s constitutional rights are maintained, as well as the overall integrity of the research developmental process. The IRB also provides specific policies and procedures for the protection of the participating human subjects. Woo (2005) states that a carefully constructed policies and procedures manual explains and implements the policies and guidelines governing human research protections which may include assuring confidential or anonymous participation, as well as the appropriate storage and disposal of pertinent research data.

Woo (2005) wrote:

It is the policy of Pepperdine University that all research involving human participants must be conducted in accordance with ethical, federal, state, and professional standards for research and that all such research must be approved by one of the University’s Institutional Review Boards (IRBs).

(para. 7)

As a result of regimented guidelines, an IRB educational component, a
human subjects training, was completed by the principal investigator (see Appendix N) as well as the research facilitator to reinforce the guidelines, policies, and procedures. Following the completion of the mandated educational component, research methods and data collection details employed throughout this study were submitted as a formal written proposal and forwarded to the IRB for review. Once the proposal was submitted for review, it was approved. Upon receiving approval from the IRB, the 12-month data collection process was launched in accordance with the timeline stated in the original IRB proposal.

Following the conclusion of the data collection process and the overall study, the IRB guidelines continued to be applied. All documents and notes pertaining to this study will be securely stored in a locked cabinet for 5 years (based on current IRB guidelines). Upon the conclusion of the required 5-year storage period, all documents will be destroyed by placing them in the principal investigators’ personal shredder.
Chapter 4: Findings

The data collection process was launched upon receiving written approval from Pepperdine University’s IRB. On August 15, 2011, the survey process began and concluded on September 9, 2011, when the research facilitator notified the principal investigator of the completion of the final survey packet. Although a 12-month period was allotted for data collection, the research facilitator was successfully able to survey 50 sworn officers in less than 30 days. The following findings represent the quantified data retrieved from the completed Demographic and LMX 7 questionnaires.

Demographic Questionnaire

The data analysis process began once the survey packets and research materials were retrieved by the principal investigator. Initially, the demographic questionnaires were reviewed to determine if each participant met the following inclusion requirements: (a) the sworn officer actively worked in any capacity (i.e., office duties, equipment manager, training officer, community patrol) within the LACSD; (b) the sworn officer completed his or her probationary period of employment; (c) the participant had at least 1-year’s experience as a sworn officer within LACSD; (d) the sworn officer was 21½ years of age and older and obtained at least a high school diploma or GED; (e) the sworn officer, at the time of survey completion, was not acting or concurrently assigned any supervisory role or responsibilities; and (f) the sworn officer reviewed the Informed Consent form provided.

Based on this inclusion and exclusion requirements, 11 (22% of target
population) LMX 7 questionnaires were excluded from the data set, as 11 officers disclosed that they were currently serving or acting in a supervisory role within their currently assigned LEA. An additional survey (2% of target population) was excluded as a result of an officer disclosing that he or she had yet to complete his or her employment probationary period. Because of the 12 (24% of target population) excluded surveys, 38 (76% of the target population) surveys were analyzed (n = 38). Refer to Appendix O, Figure O1.

The responses provided on the 38 demographic questionnaires that met all six inclusion requirements revealed the following: 100% of the officers surveyed reviewed and signed the Informed Consent form, and 100% of the officers were at least 21 years of age, with 33% of the officers disclosing prior military experience. The responses recorded on the demographic questionnaire also revealed the education experience of sworn officers who participated in this study. According to the data retrieved, 5% of the surveyed population selected GED as their highest level of education completed, 61% selected high school, 11% selected Associates in Arts, 21% selected undergraduate degree, and 3% selected graduate degree as the highest level of education completed. It should be noted that none of the officers surveyed disclosed completion of doctoral-level education. Refer to Appendix O, Figure O2.

**Research Question versus LMX 7 Questionnaire**

In an effort to confirm or reject each of the 5 aforementioned hypotheses, each research question was reviewed according to the corresponding questions presented on the Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Chart. The
Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Chart (see Appendix M) detail how the researcher linked the research questions to the survey questions presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire. Creating the comparison chart simplified how the researcher interpreted the feedback or categorized the responses sworn officers provided.

The first research question sought to determine, based on the sworn officers perspective, if supervisors were aware of the officers’ professional needs. Two of the survey questions presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire were selected to determine awareness or lack thereof in an effort to determine whether supervisors were aware of the professional needs of officers. The two questions selected were:

Survey Question 1: How do you know where you stand with your supervisor...[and] do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?

Survey Question 2: How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs?

These 2 survey questions were selected, as they both sought to reveal the perception officers had regarding their supervisor’s ability to communicate, acknowledge, or understand their professional needs.

The second research question sought to determine whether sworn officers perceived that their supervisors had confidence in their professional ability. If effort to determine whether supervisors within the examined law enforcement agency were confident in the sworn officers, two of the survey questions
presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire were selected. The 2 survey questions selected were:

Survey Question 3: How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?

Survey Question 6: I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so?

Survey question 3 was selected to measure the confidence perceived, as the researcher sought to determine if supervisors were successful in instilling or communicating confidence with officers by recognizing, acknowledging, and communicating their professional potential.

Survey question 6 also assisted in illustrating whether officers perceived their supervisors had confidence in their professional ability. This survey question speaks to the reciprocal behavior highlighted throughout the literature review. Although this question instructs officer to express whether they are confident in their supervisor, it alludes to an officer being confident in his or her supervisor as a result of the supervisor being confident in his or her ability or potential as well.

The third research question sought to determine, based on the sworn officer’s perceptions, if supervisors were supportive. In an effort to determine whether supervisors were perceived as supportive, two of the survey questions presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire were selected to determine if supervisors were in fact perceived as supportive. The two survey questions selected were:

Survey Question 4: Regardless of how much formal authority he or she
has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?

Survey Question 5: Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at his or her expense?

These 2 survey questions were selected, as they both sought to reveal the perception officers had regarding their supervisor’s willingness to provide various levels of professional support.

The fourth research question sought to determine whether sworn officers perceived the working relationship with their supervisors as effective. In an effort to determine if officers perceived their working relationship with their supervisor as ineffective or effective, the following survey question was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire:

Survey Question 7: How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?

The fifth and final research question sought to determine whether high-quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within the examined law enforcement agency, based on the sworn officer’s perspective. In an effort to determine if the high-quality relationships exist based on the perception of the surveyed officers, all responses provided on each of the 7-item Likert-scaled questionnaires were scored. The sum of each questionnaire, ranging from 7 to 35, illustrated the perception of each officer surveyed regarding the quality of relationship established by his or her supervisor.
**Hypotheses: Rejected or Confirmed**

The responses provided by sworn officers on the LMX 7 Questionnaire that corresponded with the research questions were analyzed to determine whether the hypotheses were rejected. In analyzing the research data, the following topics were addressed, as they represent the research question simplified: Awareness of professionals needs, confidence in professional ability, support, effective working relationships, and quality relationships.

**Awareness of professional needs.** The first research question posed sought to determine if sworn officers perceived that their supervisor(s) was aware of the officers’ professional needs. According to the Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Chart, the responses to the following survey questions (presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire) assisted in answering the research question posed, thus confirming or rejecting the previously stated hypothesis:

Survey Question 1: How do you know where you stand with your supervisor…[and] do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?

Survey Question 2: How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs?

Using NCSS, a descriptive analysis was conducted on the recorded responses of the participants serving as sworn officers in the LACSD.

Survey Question 1: How do you know where you stand with your supervisor…[and] do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?
According to the responses recorded on the LMX 7, 3% of the surveyed population perception consisted of officers “rarely” knowing where they stood with their assigned supervisor and “rarely” knowing how satisfied their supervisor was with what they did, 26% agreed that they were “occasionally” aware of where they stood with the supervisor and “occasionally” knew how satisfied their supervisor was with what they did. Of the surveyed population, 50% expressed that they were “sometimes” aware, 16% perceived that they were aware “fairly often,” and 6% conveyed that they were aware “very often.” The recorded responses and percentages are illustrated in Appendix O, Figure O3.

Survey Question 2: How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs?

According to the responses recorded on the LMX 7, 5% of the surveyed population perception consisted of supervisors understanding job problems and needs “not a bit,” 26% expressed that their supervisor understood their job problems and needs “a little,” 50% expressed that supervisors understood a “fair amount” of their job problems and needs, 11% perceived that their supervisor understood “quite a bit,” and 8% perceived that supervisors understood their professional needs “a great deal.” The recorded responses and percentages are illustrated in Appendix O, Figure O4.

**Hypothesis.** The principal investigator hypothesized that sworn officers perceive that their supervisors are aware of the officers’ professional needs. Based on the data retrieve, the hypothesis was confirmed.

**Interpretation of data.** Based on the data retrieved, each officer surveyed
disclosed that at some point throughout his or her interaction with his or her supervisor, the supervisor communicated and informed officers of the level of satisfaction regarding the officer’s job performance as well as understood the officer’s job problems and needs. It should be highlighted that although each officer perceived some level of communication regarding performance satisfaction and some acknowledgement of job problems and needs, not enough officers perceived their supervisors as understanding of job problems or communicating satisfaction “quite a bit,” a “great deal,” “fairly often,” or “very often.” In fact, only 18% of officers (those that selected “quite a bit” or a “great deal”) surveyed confirmed that their supervisors consistently communicated performance expectations and expressed satisfaction or dissatisfaction with officer’s performance. In addition, only 21% of officers (those that selected “fairly often” and “very often”) surveyed confirmed that their supervisors consistently acknowledge the officers job problems and needs.

The data also demonstrated how the frequency and consistency of supervisors communicating expectations or acknowledging the needs of officers impacted the perception of officers. This was illustrated by the responses to corresponding survey questions, where 50% of the participants disclosed that they “sometimes” knew how satisfied their supervisor was with their work and that the supervisor understood their job problems and needs “a fair amount” of the time. The selected terms “sometimes” and “a fair amount” are both terms that reveal the inconsistency of supervisors. It revealed how “sometimes” supervisors are successfully communicating satisfaction, but the data also reveals that
“sometimes” they do not. Although, officers who selected “sometimes” or a “fair amount” on the LMX 7 perceived more consistency than approximately 30% of the survey population, a need for consistent communication of personal and organizational goals and objectives, while simultaneously acknowledging and addressing personal and professional problems and needs, was apparent.

**Confidence in professional ability.** The second research question posed sought to determine if sworn officers perceived that their supervisor(s) had confidence in the officers' professional ability. According to the Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Chart, the responses to the following survey questions assist in answering the research question posed, thus confirming or rejecting the previously stated hypothesis:

Survey Question 3: How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?

Survey Question 6: I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so?

Using NCSS a descriptive analysis was conducted on the recorded responses of the participants serving as sworn officers in the LACSD.

Survey Question 3: How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?

According to the recorded responses on the LMX 7, 5% of the survey population selected “not at all” when questioned on how well their supervisor recognized the officer's potential; 28.95% of survey population perceived that
supervisors recognized their potential “a little”; 39% expressed that supervisors recognized their potential “moderately”; 21% said “mostly”; and 5% conveyed that his or her supervisors “fully” recognized their potential. The recorded responses and percentages are illustrated in Appendix O, Figure O5.

Survey Question 6: I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so?

According to the recorded responses on the LMX 7 Questionnaire, 5% and 29% of the survey population selected “strongly disagree” or “disagree” respectively, when asked if he or she had enough confidence to defend and justify their supervisor’s decision if their supervisor was not present to do so; 45% of the survey population conveyed that they would remain “neutral”; 13% and 8% of the population survey selected “agree” or “strongly agree” respectfully, to having enough confidence to defend and justify their supervisor. The recorded responses and percentages are illustrated in Appendix O, Figure O6.

**Hypothesis.** The principal investigator hypothesized that sworn officers perceive that their supervisor has confidence in their professional ability. Based on the data retrieve, the hypothesis was confirmed.

**Interpretation.** Based on the data retrieved, many of the officers surveyed disclosed that their supervisors recognize their potential. According to the data, nearly 30% of officers surveyed confirmed that their assigned supervisor “mostly” or “fully” recognize the officers’ potential. Based on this disclosure, one can conclude that many supervisors are consistently and successfully building
professional relationships with officers by recognizing and communicating individual areas in which the officer is expected to excel. The data revealed that some supervisors are also successfully building professional relationships with officers that foster confidence and trust. Although the data provided a clear illustration that some supervisors are consistent in communicating and acknowledging officers’ potential, it is difficult to interpret the 39% of officers who claim their potential is recognized “moderately.” As the term “moderate” means somewhat, it can be assumed that an officer’s potential is not consistently recognized by his or supervisors regularly; therefore, one can conclude that officers with this experience can be closely linked with officers who experience the recognition “a little” or “not at all.”

The data also revealed that approximately 20% of the surveyed officers would “agree” or “strongly agree” to defend or justify the decisions of their supervisor in his or her absence. Another 44% of the officers surveyed indicated “neutral,” which can be translated to officers that are on the fence, impartial, or undecided regarding their willingness to defend or justify the decision of their assign supervisor in his or her absence.

The 2 survey questions posed and the data retrieved serve to illustrate the reciprocal relationship that, according to the literature reviewed, must be established within organizations. The data show 80% of the survey population would potentially decline and reject an opportunity to defend their supervisor in his or her absence. This lack of desire to defend may be attributed to the supervisor’s behavior in that he or she has failed to establish or consistently
maintain a quality LMX that include: recognizing the potential of officers, being confident in officers, and acknowledging officers’ decision-making skills. As less than 30% of officers expressed experiencing recognition of their potential, the remaining 70% may struggle with the idea of reciprocating behavior to benefit the supervisor and, in retrospect, themselves as well as the organization.

Going back to the original research question—Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisor(s) has confidence in the officer’s professional ability—the specific answer follows. Yes, according to the officers surveyed, some officers perceived that their supervisors were confident in the officers’ professional ability. However, the majority of officers surveyed revealed that they perceived that their supervisors were not confident in officers’ professional ability because of the supervisor’s inability, unwillingness, or failure to acknowledge verbally the professional potential of each officer.

**Support.** The third research question posed sought to determine if sworn officers perceived that their supervisor(s) were supportive. According to the Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Chart, the responses to the following survey questions assist in answering the research question posed, thus confirming or rejecting the previously stated hypothesis:

Survey Question 4: Regardless of how much formal authority he or she has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?

Survey Question 5: Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at
his or her expense?

Using NCSS, a descriptive analysis was conducted on the recorded responses of the participants serving as sworn officers in the LACSD.

Survey Question 4: Regardless of how much formal authority he or she has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?

Based on the data retrieved, many of the officers surveyed disclosed the likelihood of their supervisors using his or her power to help officers solve problems in their work. According to the data, 3% of the officers surveyed confirmed that there was no chance their supervisor would use his or her power to help officers solve problems in their work; 29% officers surveyed disclosed that there was a “small” chance; 42% officers surveyed disclosed there was a “moderate” chance; 18% officers surveyed disclosed there was “high” chance; and 8% of officers surveyed disclosed that there is a “very high” chance their supervisor would use his or power to help officers solve problems in their work. These recorded responses and percentages are illustrated in Appendix O, Figure O7.

Survey Question 5: Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at his or her expense?

Based on the data retrieved, many of the officers surveyed disclosed the perceived likelihood of their supervisors bailing them out at the supervisor’s expense. According to the data, 5% of the officers surveyed disclosed that there
was no chance their supervisor will bail them out at his or her own expense; 37% of the officers surveyed disclosed that there was a “small” chance; 32% disclosed that there was a “moderate” chance; 21% disclosed there was a “high” chance; and 5% disclosed that there was a “very high” chance of that their supervisor will bail them out at his or her own expense. These recorded responses and percentages are illustrated in Appendix O, Figure O8.

**Hypothesis.** The principal investigator hypothesized that sworn officers perceive their supervisors as supportive. Based on the data retrieve, the hypothesis was confirmed.

**Interpretation.** The data retrieved from sworn officers employed by the LACSD illustrate that only approximately 25% of the survey population perceived that supervisors would bail them out and or use his or her power to assist officers in solving work-related problems. However, a larger percentage (more than one third of the survey population) of officers perceived that there was no chance or a very small chance that officers would receive the aforementioned support from their supervisors. The responses illustrate the inability, unwillingness, or perhaps failure of supervisors to acknowledge or establish continual LMX with officers that foster trust, respect, and mutual support. Although this study reveals that 25% of officers are, in fact, experiencing supportive relationships with their supervisors, it also reveals the needs of other officers.

**Effective working relationships.** The fourth research question posed sought to determine if sworn officers perceive their working relationship with their supervisor as effective. According to the Research Question and LMX 7
Comparison Chart, the responses to the following survey question assisted in answering the research question posed, thus confirming or rejecting the previously stated hypothesis:

Survey Question 7: How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?

Using NCSS a descriptive analysis was conducted on the recorded responses of the participants serving as sworn officers in the LACSD.

Survey Question 7: How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?

Based on the data retrieved, many of the officers surveyed disclosed how they would characterize their working relationship with their supervisors. According to the data, 3% of officers surveyed characterized their working relationship with their supervisor as “extremely ineffective”; 21% of the officers surveyed characterized their working relationship with their supervisor as “worse than average”; 58% of the officers surveyed characterized the relationship as “average”; 13% of officers surveyed characterized the relationship as “better than average”; and 5% characterized the relationship as “extremely effective.” These recorded responses and percentages are illustrated in Appendix O, Figure O9.

**Hypothesis.** The principal investigator hypothesized that sworn officers perceive the working relationship with their supervisors as effective. Based on the data retrieved, the hypothesis was confirmed.

**Interpretation.** Based on the data retrieved from the surveyed officers, very few (less than 20%) officers perceived the working relationships with their
supervisor as effective. The hypothesis is confirmed based on nearly 20% of officers deeming their relationship with their supervisor as “extremely effective” or “better than average.” However this data specifically provides a glimpse of the potential number of supervisors who are currently failing to establish high quality LMX with officers they are assigned to supervise, motivate, and support. The fact that nearly 25% of the population perceived the working relationship with supervisors as “extremely ineffective” or “worse than average” was also a clear indicator, based on the literature reviewed, that officers are not experiencing quality LMX.

**Quality relationships.** The five research questions posed sought to determine if quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within the LEA, from an officer’s perspective. According to the Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Figures, the responses to the following survey questions assisted in answering the research question posed, thus confirming or rejecting the previously stated hypothesis:

Survey Questions 1–7: Based on the cumulative responses of all seven survey questions.

Based on the data retrieved, the following was illustrated: 5% of officers surveys perceived “very high” quality LMX; 21% officers surveyed perceived “high” quality LMX; 24% perceived “moderate” quality LMX; 42% perceived “low” quality LMX; and 8% perceived “very low” quality LMX. Refer to Appendix O, Figure O10.

**Hypothesis.** The principal investigator hypothesized that high quality
relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within law enforcement agencies, from an officer’s perspective. Based on the data retrieve, the hypothesis was confirmed.

**Interpretation.** In contrast to the preceding research questions posed that determined the perception of officers regarding specific LMX components (i.e., support, effective working relationships, awareness of professional needs, and confidence), the data retrieved from each LMX 7 Questionnaire in its entirety provided the overall perception of each officer surveyed. After determining the cumulative scores from each LMX 7 Questionnaire, the scores were compared in Table 1 to determine the quality of LMX each officer’s experiences.

Based on the data retrieved, approximately 26% of officers surveyed disclosed that their supervisors have successfully established “high” or “very high” quality LMX, hence the hypothesis was confirmed. Conversely, half (50%) of the surveyed population disclosed that their supervisors established “low” or “very low” quality LMX. Reflecting on the information presented in the literature reviewed in conjunction with the quantified data, this study highlighted the probable and detrimental organizational and employee performance problems associated with low quality LMX. Essentially, the data revealed that poor performance and poor behavior associated with low LMX of officers were inevitable.

**Summary**

The data retrieved utilizing the LMX 7 Questionnaire produced an abundance of information, as it illustrated the perception sworn officers have
regarding the quality of LMX established by their supervisors. Based on the data retrieved, each survey response was quantified and categorized according to the Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Figures. Although the data retrieved were helpful in confirming each of the stated hypotheses, it should be noted that confirming each hypothesis only required the affirmative response of one officer at minimum. Aside from at least one officer affirming his or her experience of high quality LMX, the data also revealed the numerous officers experiencing low quality LMX. Based on the interpretation of the data, there were very few officers experiencing moderate to high quality LMX; however, a greater number of officers confirmed their experience of low quality LMX.

Based on the data, low quality LMX could be associated with a supervisor’s unwillingness, inability, or failure to initiate, establish, or consistently maintain high quality LMX by way of communicating effectively, supporting officers, recognizing officer’s potential, and being aware of the officers’ professional needs. As a result of many supervisors failing to establish or consistently maintain high quality LMX, the psychological and professional needs of officers have not been satisfied, according to the data retrieved. Once supervisors of LEAs fail or neglect to establish or maintain high quality and mutually beneficial professional relationships (between supervisor and officer), they are inadvertently provoking officers to reciprocate an uninspiring professional relationship by performing minimally. In referencing the literature review, these unmet needs will inevitably result in behaviors associated with job dissatisfaction, burnout, and low LMX, while proving to be detrimental to overall
success of LEAs.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

The previous 4 chapters introduced, defined, and explored LMX within LEAs. They also identified and confirmed the probable positive and negative behaviors associated with very low, low, moderate, high, and very high LMX. In exploring LMX within LEAs, the data retrieved by surveying randomly selected sworn officers assisted in illustrating the work experiences, challenges, and motivational factors officers incur that may result in poor performance, job dissatisfaction, burnout, and other issues that may constitute the productivity and integrity of the organization.

Based on the data retrieved in comparison with the literature reviewed, this study has identified two factors. First, based on the perception of the officers surveyed, some of the agency (LACSD) supervisors examined have successfully established high and very high LMX with some officers. Second, based on the perception of the officers surveyed, some of the agency supervisors examined are deficient in establishing or maintaining consistent LMX with officers. Although this study revealed that some leadership practices are appropriately applied to establish high and very high LMX, the data retrieved from sworn officers also highlight the moderate to very low levels of LMX. These lower levels of LMX with LEAs reveal the officers’ and the organizations’ needs. It revealed their need for consistently applied leadership, LMX, trust, respect, diligence, motivation, confidence, support, and much more. Not only does the data reveal the needs of officers based on their own perceptions, but it also reveals the negative behavior associated with this deficiency, which, according to the literature review,
threatens the integrity, productivity, and safety of the organization as well as the officers employed.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Based on the information and perceptions conveyed by the statistical results from this study, it is clear that LEAs must actively seek to transform the perceptions of sworn officers. Considering the data retrieved from this study resulted in five suggested recommendations. First, it is recommended that the law enforcement agency examined extend this study with the purpose of collecting additional demographic data to provide a more descriptive illustration of the perception of sworn officers. It is recommended that the agency examined conduct research by surveying supervisors, permitting an ethnographic study to take place within the agency, developing educational curriculum, and implementing mandatory training programs.

**Collecting additional demographic data.** It is recommended that the law enforcement agency examined take additional measures to clarify the perceptions of the officers surveyed by extending this study in way that elicits more demographic information with the use of lengthy demographic questionnaire. Added items on the demographic questionnaire will serve to create a more descriptive illustration of the perception of sworn officers. For example, if officers are asked to provide the amount of service years within the specific agency, number years employed within the law enforcement field, age, and beginning and current payroll title, this information would assist in identifying patterns within the population. With regard to age and the information presented
in the literature review regarding generation gaps, the researcher is able illustrate the common characteristics associated with a particular age group of officers. Similarly, examining demographic information that instructs officers to identify their beginning and current payroll title may also illustrate the level to which the officer has excelled and been promoted or it may illustrated how the officer has failed to progress and excel within the organization. Such descriptive factors may assist in determining whether the officer is performing minimally or experiencing burnout.

It is also advised that the demographic questionnaire require officers to identify their specific department and the supervisor who has shaped his or her perceptions. This information will assist in pinpointing the supervisors who may need assistance in establishing or improving the high leader-member exchange relationship.

**Surveying supervisors.** As mentioned previously, the LMX 7 Questionnaire is designed to survey both subordinates and supervisors. As a result, it is recommended that agency examined allow researchers to administer the LMX 7 Questionnaire to all supervisors employed by the agency. The data retrieved from this questionnaire would assist in determining supervisors’ perceptions, as they lead officers throughout daily task completion. This data can be compared to the survey data retrieved from sworn officers to illustrate whether the perceptions of officers and supervisors are shared or conflicting.

**Ethnographical study.** Permitting researchers to conduct an ethnographic study within the agency examined is sure to produce valuable
qualitative data and insight regarding the responsibilities, task, time constraints, and levels of interaction between supervisors and sworn officers. It should be noted that this study’s researcher is currently employed as a peace officer in Los Angeles, California. It is because of this experience that it is suggested that researchers be allowed to submerge themselves within the environment of the law enforcement agency examined. An ethnographic study will provide the necessary background information needed when researchers attempt to translate or interpret the quantitative data, as each LEA operation varies.

Implementing an ethnographic study to this research topic would also confirm whether the demographic questionnaire asks the most appropriate questions. Perhaps there are additional issues that impact LMX within the agency that have been neglected in this study. If the issues are observed during the ethnographic study, questions surrounding these issues would be presented on the demographic questionnaire.

Curriculum development. Based on the quantitative data retrieved from the surveys administered to sworn officers and supervisors along with qualitative data retrieved from an ethnography study, it is suggested that the law enforcement agency examined explore the benefits of developing and instituting an educational leadership training curriculum. The foundation of the curriculum should be based on the specific individual, departmental, and organizational needs identified by the data. It should encompass the various intrinsic and extrinsic needs of officers, appropriate leadership styles, learning styles, and motivational strategies to be applied in an effort to maximize the performance of
individuals, groups, departments, as well as the overall law enforcement agency.

Essentially, the curriculum would serve as guide to educate and assist organizations in properly training supervisors to build genuine, healthy, reciprocal, and professional relationships with sworn officer. The curriculum should educate each supervisor based on his or her individualized areas of weakness identified throughout the quantitative and qualitative data. It should be noted that the curriculum should emphasize knowledge of people instead of knowledge of law enforcement policies and procedures.

**Mandatory supervisor training.** It is also recommended that an educational training for LEAs be instituted to educate supervisors on leadership theories and appropriate leadership styles. This mandatory training should be designed according to the agency-specific developed curriculum. The suggested educational training should include small groups of supervisors, with additional individual support to assist supervisors in specifically addressing personal areas of concern or identified deficiencies. As the literature revealed the limitations in providing in-service training within LEAs, it is also suggested that the leadership educational training curriculum and intervention be facilitated by a qualified third-party representative.

In considering the fiscal budget restraints imposed on LEAs, these restraints will tend to limit additional study. The suggested research to evaluate the specific applied leadership practices along with the implementation of continual educational leadership training will be costly. However, this cost, in the long-term, will prove to be minimal, as the organizational expenses as a result
absenteeism, worker’s compensation claims, and paying officers overtime to meet minimum staffing requirements should decrease. Essentially, this study recommends that LEAs invest in the future of their organizations by acknowledging and properly addressing all factors associated with establishing and maintaining high LMX.
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APPENDIX A

LMX 7 Questionnaire

Instructions: This questionnaire contains items that ask you to describe your relationship with your supervisor. For each of the items, indicate the degree to which you think the item is true for you by circling one of the responses that appear below the item.

How do you know where you stand with your supervisor… [and] do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?

Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Fairly often Very often
1 2 3 4 5

How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs?

Not a bit A little A fair amount Quite a bit A great deal
1 2 3 4 5

How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?

Not at all A little Moderately Mostly Fully
1 2 3 4 5

Regardless of how much formal authority he or she has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?

None Small Moderate High Very high
1 2 3 4 5

Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at his or her expense?

None Small Moderate High Very high
1 2 3 4 5

I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so?

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree
1 2 3 4 5
How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely ineffective</th>
<th>Worse than average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Better than average</th>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities

Participant:

Principal Investigator: Shanell M. Law

A REVIEW OF LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGES WITHIN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES: CREATING AWARENESS AND INITIATING BEHAVIORAL CHANGE

I, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Shanell M. Law under the direction of Dr. J.L. Fortson, Dr. Leon Nixon, and Dr. Ronald Stephens.

The overall purpose of this research is to bring awareness to Law Enforcement Agencies regarding perceived supervisory relationships from the sworn officer’s perspectives.

My participation will involve the following: the confidential completion and submission of an LMX 7 Questionnaire that will be utilized to measure and generalize the perceptions of subordinates with regard to leadership within Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA).

My participation in the study will be requested during the following timeframe: August 15, 2011 - August 15, 2012. The study shall be conducted at my assigned work location. However, I am aware that I have the option of requesting to be administered the questionnaire at an alternative location.

I understand that the possible benefits to myself or society from this research are to bring awareness to LEA regarding perceived supervisory relationships from the sworn officer’s perspectives.

I understand that there are certain risks and discomforts that might be associated with this research. These risks include: retaliation of supervisors or feeling threatened by a supervisor throughout the process of evaluating his/her leadership skills.

I understand that I will have up to 30 minutes to complete the survey packet provided by the research facilitator.

I understand that my estimated expected recovery time after the experiment will be immediately following the submission of the questionnaire in a sealed envelope.

I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.
I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

I understand that the investigator(s) will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws. My responses will be immediately placed in a portable locked file box, then securely transferred to a locked file cabinet in the care of the principal investigator. Under California law, there are exceptions to confidentiality, including suspicion that a child, elder, or dependent adult is being abused, or if an individual discloses an intent to harm him/herself or others. I understand there is a possibility that my medical record, including identifying information, may be inspected and/or photocopied by officials of the Food and Drug Administration or other federal or state government agencies during the ordinary course of carrying out their functions. If I participate in a sponsored research project, a representative of the sponsor may inspect my research records.

I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact Dr. Ronald Stephens at ronaldstephens@-schoolsafety.us if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Dr. Yuying Tsong, Interim Chair Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (IRB), Pepperdine University, at yuying.tsong@pepperdine.edu.

I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

I understand that in the event of physical injury resulting from the research procedures in which I am to participate, no form of compensation is available. Medical treatment may be provided at my own expense or at the expense of my health care insurer which may or may not provide coverage. If I have questions, I should contact my insurer.

I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.
Parent or legal guardian’s signature on participant’s behalf if participant is less than 18 years of age or not legally competent.

______________________________
Participant’s Signature

______________________________
Date

______________________________
Date

______________________________
Witness

______________________________
Date

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person’s consent.

______________________________
Principal Investigator

______________________________
Date
APPENDIX D

Demographic Questionnaire

Instructions: For each of the following questions, select one response. Do NOT enter any identifying information on this questionnaire.

Are you at least 21 years of age?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Have you completed your probationary period with your currently assigned law enforcement agency?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you have any prior military experience?

☐ Yes ☐ No

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

☐ GED Completion ☐ High School
☐ Associates Degree ☐ Undergraduate
☐ Graduate ☐ Doctorate
☐ None of the Above

Are you currently serving or acting in a supervisory role within your assigned agency?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Have you read and signed the informed consent form? If yes, please insert the consent form in the embossed envelope provided and seal it.

☐ Yes ☐ No
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APPENDIX F

Letter of Introduction

March 16, 2011

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
Men's Central Jail
441 Bauchet Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

To Whom It May Concern:

As a doctoral student at Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology, I have studied and reviewed the various theoretical perspectives concerning organizational leadership within law enforcement agencies. Collaboration with the Graduate and Professional Schools’ (GPS) Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Pepperdine University has resulted in my ability to develop and propose a study that will honor your participation and protect the integrity of your organization as well as the human subject research participants in a continuous effort to examine leadership.

The proposed study entitled, A Review of Leader-Member Exchanges within Law Enforcement Agencies: Creating Awareness and Initiating Behavioral Change serves to determine the general perception sworn officers have regarding the Leader-Member Exchanges (LMX) initiated by their supervisor(s). While the primary purpose of this study is to create awareness, it may also serve as a resource in implementing procedures that, if needed, will lead to the enhancement of leadership practices employed throughout law enforcement agencies throughout the county of Los Angeles and then throughout the state of California.

The carefully constructed methodological aspect of this study will measure LMX, the quality of the social exchange between leaders and sworn officers which are characterized by mutual trust, respect and obligation. The LMX 7 questionnaire, deemed a reliable and valid instrument by prominent researchers and theorists such as George Graen and Mary Uhl-Bien (1995), Peter Northouse (2007), Derrin Erdogan and Robert Liden (2002), will be the seven-item survey utilized to solicit confidential quantitative data that will be analyzed by me to create implementation procedures to enhance leadership practices throughout law enforcement agencies.

The participation of your agency is vital for the completion of my research requirement at Pepperdine University, but most importantly it will initiate change and provoke further research that will benefit the industry. With that said, I am requesting that Joellee Smith, a sworn deputy representing your division, be permitted to facilitate the LMX 7 Questionnaire to 50 officers. It should be noted that Deputy Smith has agreed to facilitate this study and she has successfully completed the IRB mandated training on the privacy and protection of human subject research participants.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Shanell Law
Doctoral Candidate
Organizational Leadership
Pepperdine University
shanell.law@pepperdine.edu
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Research Approval Signature Form

I, _________________________________, have reviewed the informative summary and supplemental documents pertaining to the research project entitled: A Review of Leader-Member Exchanges within Law Enforcement Agencies: Creating Awareness and Initiating Behavioral Change. Based on the information provided, I have authorized Deputy Juleen Smith(#528315) to facilitate the confidential survey to 50 randomly selected deputies within the Men’s Central Jail work location.

Signature  __________________________

Title  __________________________

Date  __________________________
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Research Approval Signature Form

I, [Name], have reviewed the informative summary and supplemental documents pertaining to the research project entitled: A Review of Leader-Member Exchanges within Law Enforcement Agencies: Creating Awareness and Initiating Behavioral Change. Based on the information provided, I have authorized Deputy Juleen R. Smith (#528315) to facilitate the confidential survey to 50 randomly selected deputies within the Men’s Central Jail work location.

Signature: [Signature]  Title: [Title]

Date: [Date]
APPENDIX I

Randomizer List

Research Randomizer
Results:
50 Sets of 1 Unique Numbers Per Set
Range: From 1 to 617—Unsorted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>520</th>
<th>Set 32</th>
<th>145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set 2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Set 33</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 3</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Set 34</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 4</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>Set 35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 5</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Set 36</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Set 37</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 7</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>Set 38</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Set 39</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 9</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Set 40</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 10</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Set 41</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 11</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>Set 42</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Set 43</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 13</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>Set 44</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 14</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>Set 45</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 15</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>Set 46</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 16</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Set 47</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 17</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>Set 48</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 18</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>Set 49</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 19</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>Set 50</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Facilitator Recruitment Script

1. Hello my name is officer/deputy________________________. How is your
day/night going so far?

**Participant Response**

2. I come to you today because you were randomly selected to participate in
a study led by Shanell Law, a doctoral student at Pepperdine University.
Our department has approved and provided Ms. Law with the opportunity
to survey officers/deputies at this work location. I have volunteered to
assist her as a facilitator in administering surveys. I must inform you that
your participation is voluntary and the __________________________
(agency name) nor I will I have access to your responses. Your responses
on two short questionnaires, totaling 13 questions, will be submitted
confidentially and reviewed only by the researcher, Ms. Law.

The overall purpose of this research is to bring awareness to Law
Enforcement Agencies regarding perceived supervisory relationships from
the sworn officer’s perspectives. With that said, you will be asked to
answer a few questions regarding you current supervisor. The survey is
formatted on a likert scale which will allow you to rate your supervisor.
Essentially you’ll be circling one of the provided responses that describe
your experience. You will not be asked to write sentences or paragraphs
to provide further details.

3. Would you like to participate?

**Participant Response**

If “No”, go to line rebuttal number 4.

If “Yes”, skip rebuttal number 4. Go to rebuttal number 5
I understand. Thank you for your time. Enjoy the rest of your day/evening.

4. Excellent! I must provide you with a private location to complete your
survey packet, I have reserved __________________________ (survey
packet administering location). In effort of maintaining the safety of the
organization and your colleagues, what time will you be available to meet
with me in __________________________ (survey packet administering
location)?

**Participant Response**

5. Perfect! I’ll see you then.
APPENDIX K

Facilitator Proctor Script

Please employ this script once the officer/deputy arrives at the survey packet administering location.

1. Welcome. Thanks for taking the time to participate in this study. I’m sure you time is limited, so let’s get started. You’ll have up to 30 minutes to read and complete the survey packet. Here’s the packet that you are being asked to complete. It includes two sealable embossed envelopes, one embossed Demographic Questionnaire, one embossed LMX 7 Questionnaire, and two embossed Informed Consent Forms. Prior to receiving the Questionnaires, please review and sign both Informed Consent Forms. Once you have reviewed and signed both copies of the form, please insert one copy into the provided sealable envelope. Be sure to seal the envelope containing the signed consent form. Please notify the facilitator (standing outside the designated area or room) once you have completed this step to proceed in this process. Do you have any questions at this time?

**Participant Response**

If “no”, provide participant with two Informed Consent Forms and one sealable envelope. [EXIT AREA]

If “yes”, Please attempt answer question while referencing facilitator survey material.

2. [ENTER AREA] Next, you will begin reading and responding to the questions presented on the Demographic Questionnaire. Then, the LMX Questionnaire. Do your best to select responses that most describe you and the relationship with your current supervisor. Once you have selected responses for all items on each questionnaire, place both questionnaires in the second envelope provided. Be sure to seal the envelope. Do not write any identifying information on the envelopes nor on the questionnaires. Do you have any questions at this time?

**Participant Response**

If “no”, go to line rebuttal #3.

If “yes”, Please attempt answer question while referencing facilitator survey material.

3. As a reminder, all your responses will only be reviewed by the researcher
Shanell Law. Also please be informed that you have the option to withdraw your participation at anytime during this data collection process. If you decide to withdraw, you must still submit the entire (blank or partially completed) survey packet to the facilitator for proper disposal by the researcher. Please notify the facilitator (standing outside the designated area or room) once you have completed this step to proceed in this process. Do you have any questions at this time?

**Participant Response

If “no”, provide participant with Demographic Questionnaire, LMX 7 Questionnaire one sealable envelope. [EXIT AREA]

If yes”, Please attempt answer question while referencing survey material.
APPENDIX L

Checklist for Administering Survey to Sworn Officers

Note: “Facilitators” please take time to review the checklist prior to administering the questionnaire.

### Initiation: Request of Participation

- [ ] Arrange or confirm a location within your agency to administer survey packets
- [ ] Refer to the list produced by randomizer.org website to identify the next potential participant
- [ ] Locate the potential participant current whereabouts or work location; if unavailable go the next person listed
- [ ] Approach the potential participant to request participation in study (See Recruitment Script)

### Administering Survey Packets

- [ ] Ensuring the survey packet administering location is tidy
- [ ] Greet officer upon arrival at the designated location (See Facilitator Proctor Script)
- [ ] Provide participant with a black ink pen, if they do not have one accessible
- [ ] Exit the designated area to provide participant with privacy while completing survey packet

### Collecting Survey Packet

- [ ] Refer to Facilitator Proctor Script, Line #1
- [ ] Once the participant notifies you of completion of Informed Consent Form, enter designated location
- [ ] Ensure the envelope containing the Informed Consent is sealed. If not, instructed the participant to seal the open envelope. Place the sealed envelope in the portable locked file box.
- [ ] Refer to Facilitator Proctor Script, Line #2-3
- [ ] Once the participant notifies you of completion of Questionnaires, enter designated location
- [ ] Ensure the envelope containing the Questionnaires is sealed. If not, instructed the participant to seal the envelope. Place the
sealed envelope in the portable locked file box

Thank You
☐ With a handshake, thank the officer for participating in the study
☐ Again, reference the “Informed Consent” copy for contact information and to address further questions
☐ Escort officer to exit; Thank him/her again for participating

Securing of Data
☐ Place sealed envelopes containing data in the portable locked file box
☐ Using the appropriate key, lock the file box once each sealed envelope is place inside
☐ Keep file box locked and in your possession at all times
☐ Contact the principal investigator weekly to schedule a day and time to securely transfer data
## APPENDIX M

### Research Question and LMX 7 Comparison Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Corresponding Survey Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisor is aware of the officer’s professional needs? | *Question 1*: How do you know where you stand with your supervisor...[and] do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?  
*Question 2*: How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs? |
| Do sworn officers perceive that their supervisor has confidence in their professional ability? | *Question 3*: How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?  
*Question 6*: I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so? |
| Do sworn officers perceive their supervisors as supportive?                        | *Question 4*: Regardless of how much formal authority he or she has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?  
*Question 5*: Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at his or her expense? |
| Do sworn officers perceive the working relationship with their supervisor as effective? | *Question 7*: How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor? |
| Do high quality relationships exist between supervisors and sworn officers within law enforcement agencies, from an officer’s perspective? | *Questions 1-7*: Based on the cumulative responses of all survey questions |
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**APPENDIX O**

**Figures**

*Figure O1. Demographic questionnaire: Inclusion and exclusion requirements.*

This figure illustrates the percentage of survey participants that met the inclusion requirements based on their recorded responses on the Demographic Questionnaire. This figure also illustrates the recorded responses that were excluded from analysis based on the responses recorded on the Demographic Questionnaire.
Figure O2. Highest level of education completed. This figure illustrates the percentages of the levels of education completed by the survey participants. This figure illustrates the recorded responses of each participant which was retrieved from the Demographic Questionnaire.
Figure O3. Communication of satisfaction. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the responses to Survey Question 1: How do you know where you stand with your supervisor…[and] do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?, This was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.
Figure O4. Understanding job problems and needs. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the responses to Survey Question 2: How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs? This was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.
Figure O5. Recognizing the potential of sworn officers. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the responses to Survey Question 3: How well does your supervisor recognize your potential? This was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.
Figure O6. Confidence in supervisors. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the responses to Survey Question 6: I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so? This was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.
Figure O7. Assistance in resolving work-related problems. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the responses to Survey Question 4: Regardless of how much formal authority he or she has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work? This was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.
Figure O8. Likelihood supervisors “bailing out” officers. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the responses to Survey Question 5: Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at his or her expense? This was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.
**Figure O9.** Working relationships: Supervisors and sworn officers. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the responses to Survey Question 7: How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor? This was presented on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.
Figure O10. Levels of leader-member exchange. This figure illustrates the recorded responses (in percentages) of surveyed sworn officers employed by LACSD. The illustrated percentages represent the cumulative responses to Survey Questions 1–7 present on the LMX 7 Questionnaire.