5-2002

Measuring Morale in a Municipal Law Enforcement Agency: A Multidimensional Approach

Thomas J. Roth
University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service

Measuring Morale in a Municipal Law Enforcement Agency: A Mutidimensional Approach

by: Thomas J. Roth
Advisor: Professor Bruce Clary
May, 2002

The Muskie School Of Public Service

Graduate Program in Public Policy and Management

This Capstone Project, entitled

Measuring Morale in a Municipal Law Enforcement Agency: A Multidimensional Approach

Thomas J. Roth

is approved and accepted as part of the requirements for the

MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY AND MANAGEMENT DEGREE

MEASURING MORALE

IN A

MUNICIPAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

~

A Multidimensional Approach

Capstone Project By:

Thomas J. Roth
Master's Degree Candidate
Muskie School of Public Service
University of Southern Maine

Presented:

May 3, 2000

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following Muskie School of Public Service faculty for their assistance with this Capstone project; Professor Bruce Clary, for supervising my work, guiding me through the Capstone process and providing critique that enabled me to produce this finished product. Dean Bart Wechsler, for overseeing my Capstone and Professor Josie LaPlante, for providing invaluable assistance with the statistical interpretation of the data.

INTRODUCTION

Administrators of both private and public sector firms are charged with the effective management of their respective agencies. Effective management includes not only striving to fulfil the goals of the organization toward the external client, it also includes proper management of employees, a vital resource to any organization. Likewise, police administrators are bound by duty to not only uphold the laws within their jurisdiction, they are also responsible for maintaining a desirable work environment for their employees. To achieve such an environment, police administrators constantly strive to improve the performance of their agencies through participating in employee evaluation systems, workplace improvement plans and a host of other programs aimed at improving performance through employee involvement and development.

Because a police agency's effectiveness is largely based on the combined total of the knowledge, skills and abilities of all of its individual officers, employee satisfaction, also termed *morale,* is a crucial component of a desirable work environment in an effective police force. But how can an administrator measure the morale of their agency?

Most police commanders, much like their civilian management counterparts, are isolated from the rank and file members of their force. This can occur either by physical barriers or social barriers. Typically, police administrators are physically segregated from the rest of the police population in an agency. This is done so that the administrator can perform their tasks without interruption. Similarly, traditional social barriers exist based on a rigid chain-of-command system that isolates top-ranking officers (administrators) from patrol officers, detectives and non-administrative personnel. While this rank structure has merits in the quasi-military field of law

enforcement, it effectively isolates the top command from having a first-hand understanding of problems facing subordinate employees. Since high morale is a crucial component of effective policing, gauging and understanding departmental morale is a crucial responsibility of the police administrator. Just as high employee morale in private sector firms leads to higher levels of customer satisfaction and customer retention, increased morale in public sector organizations likewise increases customer satisfaction and increases employee retention (Hawk and Sheridan, 1999).

Typically, in the law enforcement field, the only measurable factor used to determine an officer's effectiveness, morale and "worth" was through the analysis of arrest statistics (Swanson, et.al, 1993). While productivity gauges such as this are commonplace and are also seen in private firms where "output" is measured, is the number of summonses issued or arrests made an accurate measure of employee morale? To equate these outputs with morale confuses the basic notion of an administrative system. Summonses are outputs yet morale is an input. In light of all the other variables that we know or suspect affect employee morale, perhaps it is time for law enforcement administrators to expand the list of tools that they use to assess their employees with.

Although there is a voluminous amount of literature on understanding and measuring worker morale from the 1920's through the present, survey tools aimed at measuring the morale of law enforcement officers are scarce. Most past studies examine workers in factory or office settings where output is easily measured and controlled changes can easily be accomplished. This research project aims to fill that void and design a tool for law enforcement administrators to easily, accurately and rapidly assess morale within their respective agencies, as well as analyze

that data and make suggestions for improvement.

This Capstone project represents a three-pronged approach to measuring morale within police agencies. The first prong of the paper, the ***Construction Phase***, is the design of a multidimensional morale assessment tool. This tool includes an employee morale survey, an employee productivity index and the design of focus groups to further examine issues raised in the survey. The second prong, the ***Application Phase***, is the calculation of a productivity index, the administration of the survey and the administration of focus groups and the recording of issues discussed. In this phase, a statistical analysis of the correlation between morale and the indicators selected for the survey will be completed and those results will be discussed. The final leg of this project, the ***Action Plan Phase***, will consolidate the data obtained and offer practical management strategies for improving the organization that was examined.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The analysis of organizations dates back to the early part of this century. Historically, scholars have attempted to examine what motivated workers in order to make them more productive employees. In the early 1900's, Frederick Taylor began by systematically examining the functions of workers and suggesting methods for managers to improve the performance of their workers. Taylor cited pay as one of the primary motivators for work performed. Max Weber examined the role that a structured hierarchy (as seen in a police agency) played in ensuring the efficient operation of an organization and the proper treatment of employees (Rainey, 1997). The Hawthorne Studies (1920) examined the social and psychological factors in workplace management in an attempt to gauge what motivated employees and ultimately how to manipulate these factors for greater output and satisfaction. These early theorists laid the

groundwork for all further examination into what motivates employees and how managers can examine, identify and improve these motivating factors.

More modern examinations of the workplace have focused on similar issues from a variety of standpoints. W.E. Deming's work on Total Quality Management (TQM) took a statistical look at the final work product through all phases of production (Rainey, 1997). Deming utilized these statistical measures of performance as a method to assess the quality of work and plan for continuous improvement. Originally designed for private sector firms, TQM programs started to be seen at an increasing rate in public sector applications. Although this movement has ebbed in recent times, public sector organizations still make assertive attempts to understand and analyze the performance of their employees.

While an exhaustive amount of research on workplace morale and employee satisfaction exists spanning the past eight decades, a modern, computerized academic search of the topic as it pertains to the police field turned up little information. While one could arguably utilize the volumes of work that the armed forces performed to measure and understand morale in military units, today's police forces, while still organized along a military chain-of-command, are functioning more like small businesses interested in participating in "customer service" and "Total Quality Management." Because of this, a search of assessing morale or employee satisfaction of employees in private and public sector employment would most likely turn up the most current research on the topic.

Prior to attempting to study morale, the term must be defined. The term "morale," once commonly used to describe the attitudes of workers, is also known as job satisfaction or employee satisfaction. In both studies by Fosam et al. (1998) and by Koustelios and Bagiatis

(1997), morale is termed "employee satisfaction," which is measured by examining several elements of organizational culture. In Fosam et al. (1998), they begin by describing the current trend toward satisfying internal customers (employees) and measuring these levels of satisfaction. They write that the same effort is being made across private and public sector agencies to measure employee satisfaction. Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) cite the use of "employee satisfaction" as the current accepted terminology for employee morale. In Benge and Hickey (1984), their working definition of morale includes the term "employee satisfaction." For this study, the term morale has been selected to follow the traditional quasi-military terminology for employee attitude and satisfaction. From a conceptual standpoint, Benge and Hickey's definition of morale as the "...net result of job satisfaction of the employees in a specified group" will be used. A self-assessment morale survey will be used to obtain that net satisfaction level.

In Fosam et al. (1998), a set of suggested dimensions of morale are described and the results of an employee satisfaction index are discussed. Fosam et al. (1998) describes the topics and mathematical calculations used to create a questionnaire that was distributed to a police department in England. Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) describe a similar employee satisfaction inventory by identifying parallel dimensions of morale and reports on the findings of the survey administered to both private and public sector employees.

The rationale for measuring morale within an organization and attempting to improve it is fundamental. Numerous studies have indicated that satisfied employees are more productive employees. Fosam et al. (1998) support this theory by stating, "Organizations with satisfied employees have satisfied customers." This effect may also be reciprocal, with satisfied customers leading to satisfied employees. Fosam et al. (1998), goes on to assert that since

measuring employee satisfaction is a crucial part of ensuring customer satisfaction, that it is particularly relevant when the employees have direct contact with their customers. Perhaps no where is this situation more prevalent than in the police service. Benge and Hickey (1984) cite several past studies on how employee morale correlates with productivity. They also quote several top business executives from companies like Sears and IBM who utilize morale surveys to suggest changes that will enhance productivity.

Job burnout, a common plague among police professionals, is another problem to consider and is an important reason to examine morale. Utilizing a 25-question survey entitled the "Maslach Burnout Inventory," Golembiewski (1996) studied more than 40,000 respondents worldwide and more than 40% of them fell into the most advanced stage of job burnout. Cole (1999) cited that using Maslach's research, job burnout was reaching epidemic proportions in North America, as well. Cole (1999) cites organizational structure and culture as the problem, not the individual employee.

For this study, morale will be determined by surveying employees about several elements of their organization. Namely, how they feel toward their job, their co-workers, their supervisors, their pay rates and their perceived promotional opportunities. Now that we have defined morale for tour purposes and have examined the importance of achieving and maintaining high levels of employee morale, we must be able to measure it and obtain base line data for the organization, before any change or improvement can be made. Phase One, the Construction of the Morale Measurement Devices, begins here.

PHASE ONE:

The Construction Phase

SELECTION of UNITS of ANALYSIS

The X Police Department has 65 sworn and non-sworn members. The survey will be administered to all members of the patrol squad (41 members), and the record review will include all squad members. Because the population is so small, there is no need to draw a sample from the population set. Because of the relatively small number of members, the cost in terms of time and effort to adequately survey and conduct focus groups should not be too great. Similarly, since all patrol members are included in the research, this may tend to increase accuracy. The results of the study will compare data from the various homogenous subgroups (all members of a particular squad), also termed stratification.

METHODOLOGY

Triangulation and Cross-Validation

Triangulation is defined as the use of multiple methods and can strengthen the validity of findings if results produced by the different methods are congruent (Rossi et al., 1999). This study includes several methods to examine morale (survey, focus group, record review, participant observer). Included in these methods are both obtrusive (scientific examination of surveys, indices) and unobtrusive (participant observation) measures. Utilizing unobtrusive measures is a way to examine behavior in a non-reactive way, that is, being able to learn something about someone without them knowing that you are examining them. Webb (1966) pioneered this approach in social research by studying what people left behind. In this sense, I, as a participant of the organization, will be able to observe the reactions of employees and utilize

my observations to substantiate any other data. By utilizing different measures, both obtrusive and unobtrusive, the researcher can utilize triangulation to ensure a truer understanding of employee morale. Similarly, utilizing various methods (survey, focus group, record review, participant observation) to examine the topic of morale helps to ensure that a thorough understanding of morale is obtained through cross-validation.

Police agencies are composed of a series of groups (squads, divisions, ranks) that are made up of a series of individuals (patrol officers, detectives, supervisors). Much like military units, these close-working groups often share similar tasks and work in concert to produce a desired product or service. Since these groups are so tightly knit, it would make sense that in order to thoroughly understand morale within a particular agency, the morale of each group be examined. Similarly, since administering just one type of research tool (survey, focus group, interview) can potentially fail to pick up important information or data pertaining to morale, this study will utilize a variety of research methods. This will ensure that a thorough examination of employee morale has been accomplished through the cross-validation of data received. The following methods were used to measure morale: (results will be reported later in the **Data Analysis Section.)**

Record Review:

Individual officer statistics (number of arrests made, summonses issued, and self-initiated contacts) were examined to determine a **productivity index.** These numbers were then combined to calculate a **mean group productivity index** for each shift.

Survey Content:

Current studies on employee morale and job satisfaction often utilize an Employee

Satisfaction Inventory (ESI) to measure morale. An ESI examines multiple dimensions of job satisfaction. Results from individual morale can be correlated with the group average along squad, division or rank lines.

This study adopted Benge and Hickey's (1984) definition and concept of surveying employee morale in specified groups by examining the morale on the shift level. Officers from the day, evening and night shift would be surveyed. Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997), in their employee satisfaction survey, examine workers in a similar way by surveying different occupational groups within a single organization. Fosam et al. (1998) surveyed all members of the South Yorkshire Police Force, including civilian employees. Their analysis examined the results of an Employee Satisfaction Index based on the various subgroups that the participants belonged to. Clearly, these two sources, although unrelated in their chosen field of study, agree that a comparison of morale levels within subgroups is important. For this reason, this study examined how morale levels correlate with organizational assignment.

Finally, as the survey instrument is designed, it is necessary to determine what indicators of morale need to be measured. In Fosam et al.(1998), three areas of measurement are used to examine individual morale. Their survey examines job satisfaction, individual morale and the individual's attitudes about their co-workers.

Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) take a similar multidimensional look at the driving forces behind morale and identify six factors of job satisfaction. These are working conditions, pay, feelings toward their supervisor, the job itself, the organization as a whole and the opportunities for promotion. Ting (1996) similarly cites pay rate and promotion opportunity as major individual characteristics and organizational factors that affect employee satisfaction

Benge and Hickey (1984) provide an overview of the survey dimensions of Sears and IBM. Each of these firms examines employee morale in both contrasting but somewhat similar fashion, and similarities exist between Benge and Hickey (1984) and the other sources. In the Sears Organization Survey, management examines the employee's attitudes on their supervisors, the job itself, pay and potential for promotion (seen in the Koustelios and Bagiatis index). The IBM employee survey also examined pay, supervision, and the job itself, and also the individuals feeling s about their own morale (seen in the Fosam et al. study).

The aforementioned studies all examined the various dimensions of employee morale and came up with similar results in many instances. Utilizing a combination of the work from all three sources should provide a thorough and complete view of the multidimensional aspect of measuring employee morale. While the sources represent a combination of private and public sector study, the current trends in managing police agencies tend toward utilizing studies from both fields. Clearly the Fosam et al. (1998) article is most applicable to the police field and is one of the few studies located which deals with measuring morale. However, one should not dismiss the other sources because of their origin. The Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) article simultaneously supports the other sources and offers both overlapping and alternative dimensions of analysis. Finally, the Benge and Hickey (1984) text provides both sound definitions and real-world examples of the practice of utilizing employee morale surveys from top companies.

Employee Morale Survey:

The morale survey is a self-assessment questionnaire (see ***Appendix A*** for the sample survey) and was administered to all patrol officers within the patrol division. Aurelio (1996)

cites the employee opinion survey as the best means of measuring, monitoring and managing employee satisfaction. Although distributed in written form, similar to a mail survey, the administration of the survey was monitored and therefore more closely resembled a personal survey. Personal surveys have several advantages over mail or other types of surveys (Babbie, 1998). Personal surveys have a high response rate, allow for control of the interview situation and allow the researcher to readily obtain detailed information. Although typically the cost of such a personal survey is high, the only cost the department will incur is the time spent in administering the survey.

Response Rate: The surveys were administered to each member of a squad while at roll call (which I conduct). The participants were briefed on the purpose of the research and the design of the study. Participants were asked that the surveys be returned to me prior to the end of the shift. As a supervisor, this may have "induced" the participants to complete the survey in a timely manner through the "reward" of being in good favor with the patrol supervisor. Although I had anticipated a near 100% response rate, because of rotating shifts and vacation/sick time usage, the response rate was **85-percent**, with 35 out of 41 officers returning surveys.

Non-sampling Error: Because this study is examining the personal topic of employee morale, non-sampling error may have played a role in the results. For example, when learning that employee morale is being studied, officers may have interpreted this increased interest in their feelings as a positive improvement in the workplace. This, in turn, may have caused their individual morale to improve. In this sense, the measurement (survey) may have acted as a change agent, which is termed reactive measurement.

Similarly, the participants may have felt that since a survey was being conducted, a

watchful eye would be observing their attitudes and performance. This may have caused participants to modify their answers because they were being examined more closely. This is an example of the "guinea pig effect." The fact that the researcher is a supervisor may have exacerbated these effects. To achieve limited non-sampling error, it is important that the respondents were briefed in the value of the candor of their answers and anonymity and confidentiality issues were also discussed. It must be noted that despite a thorough briefing, feelings among the respondents may not be easy to modify.

Survey Design: Although reams of literature are present on designing employee morale surveys in public and private sector firms, little work, if any exists, that deals with survey design geared toward the law enforcement field. One such study by Fosam et. al (1998) examining morale within the South Yorkshire Police Force cites the examination of job satisfaction, individual morale and individual's attitudes toward co-workers as crucial to understanding the morale of both the employee and his or her squad. Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) take a similar multidimensional approach and suggest that the aforementioned areas need to be examined, as well as attitudes toward supervisors, pay and opportunities for promotion as gauges for employee morale. Benge and Hickey (1984) cite several of the suggested morale indicators that both Koustelios/Bagiatis and Fosam et. al mention. By combining these three sources, the following dimensions of morale were examined on the Employee Morale Survey: Pay, Individual Morale, Individual Attitudes toward Co-Workers, Individual Attitude toward Supervisors, and Opportunities for Promotion.

The survey questions each addressed one of the above morale dimensions. The questions were chosen from employee satisfaction surveys cited in Benge and Hickey (1984) and include

the organizational dimensions that Fosam et. al (1998) and Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) cite as being necessary for a thorough understanding of employee satisfaction. An index was created so that each section of questions pertaining to morale produced a score. For example, the section addressing Individual Morale had 10 questions. Each response ranged from lowest morale (0) to highest morale (1). By answering all ten questions, the possible high score would be 10 points out of 10 points. The section on Pay Rate grouped the officers in pay rates ranging from lowest paid (1 point) to highest paid (5 points), thus 5 would be the highest response for that section. Other sections utilized Likert-type questions and a scale was constructed to assign a score to the strength or weakness of the respondent's opinion. Each other section on morale was scored with a similar scale. Babbie (1998) cites that scales are generally superior to indexes because scales take into account the intensity with which different items reflect the variable being measured. In this study, a Likert-type scale is utilized when examining questions that elicit a respondents "feeling" or "attitude" while index scores are utilized to rank-order ordinal data.

Interactional Analysis:

Once the Employee Satisfaction Inventories (ESI) was completed, the researcher then met with each group (patrol squad/shift) and used the results of the ESI as a topic for discussion. The researcher acted as a mediator for the focus group and attempted to elicit participants to come to a consensus as to the state of morale for that particular group. The focus groups elaborated on issues that both lower and raise morale which may be utilized later in planning organizational changes.

Wolfe et al. (1991) examines the methodology of focus groups and provide a wealth of examples and suggestions for properly deploying this research tool. To begin with, Wolfe et al.

(1991) discusses the advantages and disadvantages of such groups. They cite the primary advantage of focus groups as "providing the opportunity to observe a substantial amount of interaction on a particular topic in a restricted period of time." Because each participant may have a range of ideas on why their morale is the way it was measured, the focus group allows the participants to air their concerns and opinions while simultaneously allowing the researcher to obtain more detailed information than the written survey with closed-ended questions.

Wolfe et al. (1991) also cite the ability of the researcher to control the design and implementation of the group as a distinct advantage. Conversely, Wolfe et al. (1991) assert that controlling the group restricts the range of discussion, however, I would disagree with this contention in the context of this study. By being a supervisor and conducting the focus group, some candor may have been limited, but the ability to guide the group and keep it on track aids in ensuring precious time is spent "focusing" on details that need to be clarified. Babbie (1998) reports that focus group methodology provides high face validity.

Planning the Focus Group: Wolfe et al. (1991) suggests that it is more economical to run larger groups since it will take fewer groups to obtain the same information from the same number of participants. Unfortunately, because of the rotating shifts and varied days on and off of police officers, the actual focus groups consisted of several smaller groups. Focus groups were conducted with the officers from similar shifts while they were working. Because of staffing concerns, the meetings took place during "quiet" periods, usually late in the evening or early in the morning or at roll call when the whole squad met.

Wolfe et al. (1991) cites sample bias in selecting focus group participants as a paramount concern and they suggest much thought go into the construction of the group. To avoid such

sampling bias, this study included all squad members in the focus group procedure (a population focus group).

Data Collection and Analysis: Wolfe et al. (1991) suggest four guidelines for conducting effective focus groups. First, they suggest that the groups should cover a maximum range of appropriate topics. The focus groups concentrated primarily on the key topic, morale. Participants were, however, allowed to discuss issues roughly related to morale. Second, Wolfe et al. (1991) suggest that groups should yield data that are as specific as possible. This is where my role as the group's facilitator came in. I was charged with keeping the groups on task and must ask that members narrow their responses to the theme of what level of morale they agree upon is prevalent within their squad or department. Third, they assert that focus groups should promote interaction between the participants. This concept was thoroughly explained prior to the start of the group meetings. Finally, Wolfe et al. (1991) suggest that the focus groups should "recognize the personal backgrounds of the other participants when they formulate responses to the topics being discussed." As a participant observer, I have a thorough understanding of the participant's backgrounds, as would be expected in an organization such as a police force where employees commonly work at such an intimate level.

Topics: Wolfe et al. (1991) suggests that to begin a focus group, the topic(s) be introduced in a general fashion and allow for ensuing comment. Others assert that predetermined questions should not be used. To ensure a free-flow of discussion, the topic was broad. Upon meeting, our focus groups were given the topic of employee morale and were asked to comment on what issues make for high or low morale within our organization. Discussion was allowed to continue freely, but time constraints and professional responsibilities dictated that the groups not meet for

an extended amount of time.

Reporting Results: Wolfe et al. (1991) point out that focus groups, unlike other scientific research methods, do not have rigid guidelines and procedures for reporting results. They go on to cite that choices for the reporting of data collected from focus groups will have already been made during the course of the research itself. Since the focus of my research is to understand morale within my agency, key comments concerning areas of the job and the department that they feel contribute to either high or low morale were documented to be used later in making suggestions toward organizational change. (See Focus Group Results, page 30).

Participant Observations:

Participant observation occurs when the researcher actually joins in (or belongs to) the study and examines the phenomenon from the inside (Babbie, 1998). As the administrator of this research, and as a member of the organization, participant observations were useful throughout the study. Participant observations can aid in clarifying issues raised by the focus group, designing the Employee Satisfaction Inventory and can better explain and interpret the results of the completed research project (Babbie, 1998).

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The ethical design of a research project has many facets. Professional codes exist for many of the social sciences, but little if any information exists pertaining to surveying in the law enforcement field. To ensure that this research design project is performed ethically, this study will adopt the tenets of ethical social research from "The Practice of Social Research" (Babbie, 1998). Babbie cites the following prevailing ethical agreements for social research, voluntary participation, no harm to participants, anonymity and confidentiality, deception and analysis and

reporting. Each of these concerns will be addressed in the following paragraphs.

Voluntary Participation:

While most social research is performed on individual citizens with their personal cooperation, research in the law enforcement field is inherently different. Because of the quasi-military nature of police organizations, participation in a department-wide project is often mandated from the top administration down to the rank and file. Unfortunately, because participation is mandated, sample numbers may be high, but accuracy based on and individual members desire to participate may be low. To ensure that both ethical considerations are met and accurate results are obtained, participation in this research survey or focus group should be strictly voluntary. To ensure that the administrators of the participant agency are supportive of the study and that it in no way violates a labor law or contract, a Memo of Agreement must first be obtained from the agency head detailing the type of research and authorizing the study.

Participant Harm:

Obviously no physical harm would come to participants involved in a written survey or focus group. However, many members of an organization may feel embarrassed by the questions which may impair their candor in a survey or discussion group. In order to avoid that, a statement of confidentiality will accompany each survey and will be announced at the beginning of each focus group.

Anonymity and Confidentiality:

Prior to designing the survey, I met with representatives of each squad to discuss their involvement in my research. A common concern was the dissemination of individual-level data to management. Their feelings were so strong that they indicated participation would be scant if

their responses could be ultimately traced to the individual. To ensure anonymity by individual, each Employee Satisfaction Inventory distributed to employees will have no identifying numbers or marks to allow the researcher to identify the participant. In order to examine the attitudes of groups of employees by squad, surveys were color-coded to aid in identifying only which squad a participant belongs to, not the individual officer. This was also explained prior to distributing the surveys.

Deception:

To aid in achieving the full participation of individuals and to keep members informed of the reasons for the research study, all participants should be briefed on why the agency is interested in assessing internal morale. Participants should also be informed of how the results of the study will be tabulated and utilized. This will be done during the Focus Group meetings.

Analysis and Reporting:

Conducting a research study of this magnitude would be extremely costly if an outside survey agency was employed. Using an employee to administer the research and correlate the findings in an obvious cost-saving measure. It is imperative that the researcher be instructed to report all data, regardless of the outcome.

While the above areas of ethical consideration are by no means a comprehensive listing of the subject, they should serve to guide the researcher and provide the frame of mind of that is necessary when performing social science research.

PHASE TWO:

The Application Phase

Beginning in May of 1999 and concluding in August 1999, members of the X Police department were examined using the productivity index, multidimensional morale survey and through focus group meetings.

Productivity Index Results: A productivity index was created using data obtained through the department's Court Officer and by analyzing calls for service on the departmental computer system. Individual officer statistics (number of arrests made, summonses issued, and self-initiated contacts) were examined from twelve months prior to the study to the present (May 1998 through April 1999). For each officer, an index was created by totaling the number of arrests, summonses and self-initiated contacts they made and dividing by the number of months that the index reflected (12) to determine a **productivity index.** These numbers were then combined to calculate a **mean group productivity index** (See Table 1.) for each squad (Squad A, B and C). Data was grouped by squad and will be compared to individual officer survey data, due to the ethical constraint of not having access to individual level survey data.

Table 1. **Mean Squad Productivity Indices.**

	SQUAD A	SQUAD B	SQUAD C
PRODUCTIVITY INDEX	10.36	7.46	15.26

Morale Survey Results:

The morale survey was administered to members of the three patrol squads beginning in

May of 1999 and concluding in August of 1999. These officers range in age from 24 years old to 43 years old. Tenure with the department ranges from less than one year to 18 year veterans. Members of Squad A work Day Shift (0600 to 1600), Squad B work evening Shift (1530 to 0130) and members of Squad C work Night Shift (2030 to 0630). Each squad rotates through all shifts once in a one year period, so these are not permanent assignments in regard to shift worked, however the squad to which an officers belongs is a permanent assignment. The results of the surveys are represented in Appendix C. Out of 41 possible respondents, 35 completed surveys (an 85.37% response rate). A breakdown of the survey response rate is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. **Survey Response Rate by Squad.**

	SQUAD A	SQUAD B	SQUAD C
SQUAD SIZE	14	13	14
# of RESPONSES	14	9	12
RESPONSE RATE	100%	69.23%	85.11%
Total Response Rate:			**85. 37%**

Factors such as scheduling difficulties, officers out on extended sick leave and those on vacation accounted for a response rate of less than 100-percent.

Survey Variables:

A self-assessment survey was administered to all participants. The survey examined the following variables (items in parentheses indicate variable name): the respondent's own morale (MORALE), the respondents attitude toward their co-worker's morale (ATTCOWRK), the respondent's feelings about their supervisors (ATTSUPR), the respondent's self-assessed

potential for promotion (PROMPOT) and the pay-range group that the respondent belonged to (PAYGRP). The survey data set appears in Appendix B. A more detailed explanation of the survey questions follows.

The survey addressed the variables in the following manner:

MORALE: A ten-question section that utilized matrix questions and Likert scale questions geared toward having the respondent self-assess their own level of morale. An open-ended general comment section was used to elicit topics for focus group discussions.

ATTCOWRK: A five-question section that used Likert scale questions to assess the respondent's attitude toward the morale level of their squad members. An open-ended general comment section was used to elicit topics for focus group discussions.

ATTSUPR: A five-question section that assessed the respondent's feelings about their supervisors. An open-ended general comment section was used to elicit topics for focus group discussions.

PROMPOT: An eight-question section that utilizes closed-ended and Likert scale questions to allow the respondent to self-assess their "promotability" potential. An open-ended general comment section was used to elicit topics for focus group discussions.

PAYGRP: A single ordinal measurement question that allowed the respondent to rank themselves among one of five pay groups.

Comparison of Means:

The means for each of the five variables were recorded by population and then compared by squad. The following table includes those means and other statistical information:

Table 3. **Means for Overall Population.**

	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT	PAYGRP
N of cases	35	35	35	35	35
Minimum	3.500	2.250	2.250	0.000	1.000
Maximum	9.750	9.500	9.250	3.000	5.000
Range	6.250	7.250	7.000	3.000	4.000
Median	8.000	7.250	6.500	1.000	3.000
Mean	7.500	6.814	6.279	1.571	2.829
Standard Dev	1.833	2.213	1.817	0.948	1.317

It is noteworthy that in all variables but one (Opportunity for Promotion), that the median is higher than the mean, which indicates the presence of negative skewing in the overall data set. The Computed Pearson's skewness statistic = **-.81**. This tells us that the mean is smaller than the median because it has been pulled downward by extremely low scores. Because of the skewness and because the three squads differ so greatly in productivity (see Table 1), it is more appropriate to examine each squad separately.

Table 3. **Low Productivity Group Data. (Squad B).**

Mean Productivity index = 7.460.

	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT	PAYGRP
N of cases	9	9	9	9	9
Minimum	3.500	2.250	2.250	0.000	2.000
Maximum	9.250	6.750	7.500	3.000	5.000
Range	5.750	4.500	5.250	3.000	3.000
Median	5.000	3.750	4.250	1.000	4.000
Mean	5.167	3.861	4.306	1.222	4.111
Standard Dev	1.811	1.596	1.514	0.972	1.054

This group shows the lowest average morale score of the three groups. Attitudes toward coworkers and supervisors are also the lowest among the three squads. There is a low potential for promotion but interestingly a high average rate of pay. The data suggest that members of this squad may be unhappy workers with many years on the department. It is also interesting to note that one person is responsible for all of the minimums in this squad and the scores are low

relative to all other respondents within the entire department. This may be indicative of a serious workplace problem such as depression. This one person's attitude could also be affecting the entire squad by brining the morale and attitude of others down, as well. Job satisfaction, or morale, is strongly affected by organizational factors such as the attitudes of coworkers (Ting, 1996). If one officer is depressed, his or her depression can be contagious to other employees.

Table 4. **Medium Productivity Group Data. (Squad A).**

Mean Productivity Index = 10.360.

	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT	PAYGRP
N of cases	14	14	14	14	14
Minimum	6.250	4.250	4.750	0.000	1.000
Maximum	9.750	9.000	8.250	3.000	5.000
Range	3.500	4.750	3.500	3.000	4.000
Median	8.000	7.125	6.000	2.000	3.000
Mean	7.911	7.214	6.125	1.786	2.643
Standard Dev	0.959	1.212	1.163	0.893	1.151

Morale and attitudes are much better within this group, although not as high as in the "High Productivity" Squad. Employees see some possibility of promotion and are primarily within the midrange of pay groups.

Table 5. **High Productivity Group Data. (Squad C).**

Mean Productivity Index = 15.260.

	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT	PAYGRP
N of cases	12	12	12	12	12
Minimum	8.000	6.250	6.750	0.000	1.000
Maximum	9.750	9.500	9.250	3.000	4.000
Range	1.750	3.250	2.500	3.000	3.000
Median	8.625	8.750	7.750	1.000	2.000
Mean	8.771	8.563	7.937	1.583	2.083
Standard Dev	0.695	0.936	0.847	0.996	0.996

This groups shows the highest morale and best attitude scores. On average, potential for promotion is lower than the "Medium Productivity" Squad and more similar to the "Low Productivity" Squad. Interestingly, the pay rate is lowest of the three groups. This is perhaps due

to this being a young squad with no promotion opportunities on the horizon, but with a still-high level of excitement about being on the force.

Recap of the Data Results:

There are some clear patterns here that suggest the three squads are quite different from each other, but similar within, in that the squads seem to have a homogeneous makeup (highly productive officers are almost all one the same shift and the least productive officers are on the shift with the lowest productivity), yet the different squads, A, B and C vary in their overall levels of morale and productivity from low to medium to high. At first glance, this may reflect a dynamic wherein morale and attitude are contagious within the squads, but the numbers on probability of promotion and pay-group don't really reflect that view. An examination of the raw data through correlation analysis shows significant clustering by pay-group within the three squads.

Correlation Analysis:

A statistical analysis (Systat) of the entire population produces the following results:

Table 6. **Overall Group Correlation Analysis.**

	MNPPROD	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT
MNPPROD	1.000				
MORALE	0.695	1.000			
ATTCOWRK	0.764	0.701	1.000		
ATTSUPR	0.771	0.821	0.671	1.000	
PROMPOT	0.097	0.207	0.283	0.046	1.000
PAYGRP	-0.551	-0.426	-0.518	-0.327	0.034
NUSQUAD	0.987	0.745	0.809	0.781	0.130

	PAYGRP	NUSQUAD
PAYGRP	1.000	
NUSQUAD	-0.586	1.000

Mean productivity and NUSQUAD (Squad Number: Squad 1= Low Productivity Squad, Squad 2 = Medium Productivity Squad, Squad 3 = High Productivity Squad) are correlated at a

substantially high level (almost +1.0) because by using the mean productivity of the squad in place of the individual officer's productivity ratings you essentially are looking at the same thing when you correlate Squad Number with other variables or correlate Mean Productivity with other variables. Because the mean productivity rating is ratio level data (there are meaningful distances between ratings, even though they are averages for the squads) and Squad Number is ordinal (rank 1,2,3), Mean Productivity correlates better with some of the variables. It should be noted that initially the squads each received a productivity score based on the mean productivity index of the members of each particular squad (see page 8 for Productivity Index definition). These interval level indices were reduced to an ordinal level score (Low Productivity Squad, Medium Productivity Squad, High productivity Squad).

If the officers were randomly assigned to the squads, and as a consequence there was not the clustering of pay grades that are evident in this data, one would not expect to see the correlations that exist with Mean Productivity (and also with Squad Number). Since each of the three squads shows distinctive traits (due to the grouping of similar personnel), the correlations and predictive regression models perform well.

As hypothesized, Mean Productivity is correlated at a high level with Morale(+.695), Attitudes Towards Coworkers (+.764) and Attitudes Towards Supervisors (+.771). Mean Productivity is negatively correlated with Pay-Group at a moderate-strong level (-.551), which shows a tendency for squads with more high pay range officers to earn lower productivity ratings. The negative correlation (-.586) between Pay-group and Squad Number confirms the sense that the low productivity squad is characterized by personnel at high pay levels while the high productivity squad consists of lower-paid officers. It is interesting to note that all of the

independent variables except Promotion Potential are associated with Squad Number, which again demonstrates that the composition of the squads is far more homogeneous than expected. Here are correlations done separately for each group. To fully examine correlations within the data, "within group" correlations must be performed.

Squad Correlations:

Table 8. **Low Productivity Squad Correlation Results:**

	MNPPROD	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT
MNPPROD	.				
MORALE	.	1.000			
ATTCOWRK	.	0.074	1.000		
ATTSUPR	.	0.771	-0.255	1.000	
PROMPOT	.	0.314	0.586	0.097	1.000
PAYGRP	.	0.251	-0.268	0.465	-0.515
NUSQUAD	.	.	.	.	.

Table 9. **Medium Productivity Squad Correlation Results:**

	MNPPROD	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT
MNPPROD	.				
MORALE	.	1.000			
ATTCOWRK	.	0.220	1.000		
ATTSUPR	.	0.662	0.436	1.000	
PROMPOT	.	-0.451	0.312	-0.324	1.000
PAYGRP	.	-0.153	0.307	0.022	0.369
NUSQUAD	.	.	.	.	.

Table 10. **High Productivity Squad Correlation Results:**

	MNPPROD	MORALE	ATTCOWRK	ATTSUPR	PROMPOT
MNPPROD	.				
MORALE	.	1.000			
ATTCOWRK	.	0.094	1.000		
ATTSUPR	.	0.099	0.256	1.000	
PROMPOT	.	0.539	-0.213	-0.007	1.000
PAYGRP	.	0.359	-0.250	0.465	0.496
NUSQUAD	.	.	.	.	.

The "within group" correlations vary noticeably from the initial overall correlation matrix

and from each other. The morale and attitude towards supervisor correlation in the low productivity group indicates there exists a relationship between the supervisor and the squad, with some people responding well to the supervisor and having high morale as a consequence, while the reverse is true for those with low morale. Although not as strong, the same pattern is in evidence in the medium productivity squad. In contrast, there is a complete lack of correlation between morale and attitude toward the supervisor in the high productivity group.

In the low productivity group, higher pay group personnel tend to have better attitude towards supervisor scores (r=+.5). Interestingly, this does not carry over to the medium productivity group, where the correlation between pay group and attitude towards supervisor is not statistically significant (.022).

In the high productivity group, pay group is associated with attitude towards supervisor, at about the same level as the low productivity group.

When we look back to the overall group correlation, it turns out that taken as one group, officers show a mild negative association between pay group and attitude towards supervisors.

In examining levels of association, morale and pay group in the high productivity group, shows a weak association (+0.4). The association in the low productivity group is similar, but barely significant. In contrast, the association is negative, but not significant in the medium productivity group.

To measure the joint effect of the independent variables on morale, a multiple regression equation was run. When examining the correlation matrix (Table 6, page 24.), it is evident that attitudes toward coworkers, attitudes toward supervisors and the mean productivity of the squad all influence morale. However, when the multiple regression equation is run to see which

variables remain in the model in the presence of other variables in the model (which serve as controls), only attitude toward coworkers and attitude toward supervisor were significant enough to be included in the final model.

These two variables together explain 72% of the differences in morale across officers, with attitude towards supervisor being substantially more important than attitude toward coworkers, as indicated by the respective sizes of the standardized coefficients. Both are associated positively, with better attitudes predicting better relative morale and low attitude ratings predicting lower relative morale (see Table 11).

Table 11. **Regression Results.**

Dep Var: MORALE N: 35 Multiple R: 0.846 **Squared multiple R: 0.716**

Adjusted squared multiple R: 0.698 Standard error of estimate: 1.008

Effect	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coef	Tolerance	t	P(2 Tail)
CONSTANT	1.916	0.646	0.000	.	2.966	0.006
ATTSUPR	0.644	0.128	0.638	0.550	5.022	0.000
ATTCOWRK	0.226	0.105	0.273	0.550	2.146	0.040

Run as separate models, we find that attitude toward supervisor explains 68% of the differences while attitude toward coworkers used alone explains 49%. As in the multiple regression model, both show a positive association with morale (see Tables 12 and 13). Because of a high incidence of multicollinearity (attitude toward coworkers only adds 4% in explained variance), it should be dropped from the model.

Table 12. **Separate Regression Model Examining Effect of Attitude Toward Supervisors.**

Dep Var: MORALE N: 35 Multiple R: 0.821 **Squared multiple R: 0.675**

Adjusted squared multiple R: 0.665 Standard error of estimate: 1.061

Effect	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coef	Tolerance	t	P(2 Tail)
CONSTANT	2.297	0.654	0.000	.	3.511	0.001
ATTSUPR	0.829	0.100	0.821	1.000	8.271	0.000

Table 14. **Separate Regression Model Examining Effect of Attitude of Attitude Toward Coworkers.**

Dep Var: MORALE N: 35 Multiple R: 0.701 **Squared multiple R: 0.491**

Adjusted squared multiple R: 0.476 Standard error of estimate: 1.327

Effect	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coef	Tolerance	t	P(2 Tail)
CONSTANT	3.544	0.736	0.000	.	4.817	0.000
ATTCOWRK	0.581	0.103	0.701	1.000	5.646	0.000

Data Analysis Conclusions:

The results from this part of the data analysis provide a number of important conclusions about what factors affect employee morale within the X Police Department. First, merely examining employee productivity does not provide a thorough, complete picture of individual employees (officers) or groups of employees (squads) in terms of morale. Specifically, the data suggests that examining other factors such as the officer's own morale, the officers attitude toward their co-worker's morale, the officers feelings about their supervisors, the officer's self-assessed potential for promotion and the pay-range group that the officers belong to provides a

more through understanding of employee morale.

Second, the data also aids, through regression analysis, in fine tuning which variables provide the best model for examining employee morale within the X Police Department. As the regression analysis has pointed out, utilizing attitude toward supervisors and attitude toward co-workers variables together explains 72% of the differences in morale across officers. This illustrates the importance of promoting good relationships between the officers and themselves and the officers and supervisors.

Finally, the data support an important observation about measuring morale within police agencies: that despite the traditional use of productivity as a gauge of employees satisfaction, many other forces play a major role in how officers feel about their job, themselves and their co-workers. Morale measurement, if it is to be successful, must constantly be examined to determine if the data being examined is truly indicative of the individual, the squad or the department.

Focus Group Results:

Once all of the surveys were in, Focus Groups were conducted during roll call and during quiet periods when all officers could meet. Because of the way each squad rotates, several focus groups were held to ensure that all members had a voice. To begin with, the purpose of the research, as well as the methodology, was explained to those present.

The following concerns were brought forward by squad members.

Squad A Focus Group Results:

- **Desire for increased communication.** Consensus among group members that they often heard about changes in policy/announcements third hand.
- **Poor communication between divisions.** This group felt that there was little interaction

between patrol/detective division, felt ill-informed on investigations and intelligence.

- **Desired input on equipment purchase/selection.** This group wanted to have a say in selecting and evaluating equipment prior to purchase.
- **Desired more permanent shifts.** A majority of the officers do not want to rotate the shift (day, evening, night) that they work.

Squad B Focus Group Results:

- **Desire to maintain current squad assignment.** Officers on this squad are primarily those with 5 to 10 years on the department and have developed a strong bond.
- **Desire to work with different supervisors:** This group expressed an interest to work with a variety of supervisors, not have one set of supervisors always work with them. They expressed a concern that they could be "stuck" with a boss they didn't like.
- **Desire for self-assignment to special details:** This group expressed the desire to select the special details that they are assigned to. Periodically, one or two officers are assigned to work a plain clothes details or conduct surveillance. They wish to decide who works those details, and even wanted to decide what detail to perform (typically a supervisory decision).
- **Desire for increased communication.** Group members felt that they were "in the dark" about many of the decisions and inner-workings of the department.

Squad C Focus Group Results:

- **Desire for specialized units:** This group requested that the department look into bicycle patrol units, reestablish the defunct Motorcycle and Selective Enforcement Units.
- **Desire to be rotated out of Patrol Division into Traffic Division:** Several officers on this squad expressed an interest in being assigned to the Traffic Division on a rotating

basis, and opening that option up for others.

- **Desire for increased communication.** Group members expressed a concern that they were not kept well informed of the happenings of other divisions (Detective, Juvenile Services, Traffic).
- **Desire for permanent supervisors:** This squad unanimously desires to work with the same supervisor at all times. They felt that they could get to know what a particular supervisor desired for work and could more easily please one boss rather than please eight rotating supervisors.
- **Desire for an "Equipment Review Panel":** Officers requested that the administration appoint a cross-sectional group of officers to choose and evaluate any major equipment purchases/changes, i.e., cruisers, radios, firearms, uniforms.

With the morale survey results indicating where problems exist and where officers seem to be content and the focus groups results which serve to define the concerns/desires of all of the officers on the various squads, the administration needs to examine all of this data and decide how it will address problem areas and maintain those areas which are favorable to the officers. The following Action Plan addresses the concerns and identifies the strong and weak areas of employee satisfaction:

PHASE 3:

The Action Plan

In examining employee morale within the X Police Department, several sources were used to determine areas of concern for management. Using statistical data, survey results and

focus group results, several themes were identified that management should address. The major themes are; Communication, Supervision and Employee Empowerment. These themes, or areas of concern, are highlighted below, along with recommendations for taking action to address these concerns.

Communication:

All three focus groups expressed a concern regarding communication within the department, both from a "top-down" standpoint and among divisions. Clearly being kept informed is important from a safety standpoint (information of wanted, dangerous persons), but it also aids in providing a feeling of belonging. Several other agencies publish a "Departmental Bulletin" highlighting the workings of the various divisions, major policy changes, personnel issues, criminal activity and congratulations for individual or team effort. Such a publication within the X Police Department would serve to keep members informed, both on a departmental and divisional level. Similarly, opening up the rigid "chain-of-command" organization culture of a police agency so that employees may access all levels of administration is an important step in ensuring open lines of communication. Aurelio (1996) asserts that managers should create opportunities for discussion and interaction to aid in motivating employees. Similarly, Martin (1999) cautions managers to personalize communication by avoiding full reliance on impersonal documents.

Supervision:

In several instances, worker attitude toward supervisors surfaced. In the data sets, Squad B exhibited the lowest individual and group scores for attitude toward supervisors, indicating an overall dislike for the squad supervisors. When the multiple regression analysis was run, attitude toward supervisors and attitude toward co-worker together explained 72% of the differences in

morale across officers, with attitude toward supervisors being the more important variable. Attitude toward supervisors is also associated positively with better attitudes toward supervisors predicting higher morale and poorer attitudes predicting lower morale. Finally, when the focus groups were held, the squad with the lowest scores regarding attitude toward supervisors, Squad B, expressed a strong interest to work with different supervisors on a rotating basis instead of "getting stuck with a boss they did not like." While nothing in the data or focus groups indicated which supervisor(s) the squad did not like, clearly there is a supervision issue, especially with Squad B. Interestingly, Squad A expressed an interest to work with permanent supervisors.

To address the apparent problem with Squad B in regards to supervision, it is imperative that top management closely examine what the problem is. A private meeting of squad representatives should be set up to determine if there are one or two supervisors that are causing a problem for the squad, or if, overall, they resent authority. Judging from Squad B's other focus group themes, they expressed an interest in being able to self-select duties, a radical departure from typical chain-of-command duty assignment typical of police agencies. If allowing squad members to choose assignments (within reason) serves to raise morale, perhaps a pilot program where the shift determines the special assignments from a pre-approved list of duties could be examined. This proposal ties in with the "Employee Empowerment" theme that follows.

If there is truly a riff between Squad B and the supervisors, a series of "team-building" exercises could be run with the supervisors and Squad B participating together. The City Personnel Director has a list of in-service training classes that includes such a theme.

Employee Empowerment:

Each squad expressed an interest in being provided with some mechanism to have an increased say in the design of their tasks. Squads A and C suggested an "Equipment Selection

Committee" where representatives of the department would evaluate and report on future equipment selections. Squad B, as previously mentioned, expressed a desire to be able to self-select detail assignments. Squad C also exhibited an interest in broadening the scope of assignments available for patrol officers. They asked that the Motorcycle Unit be reestablished and that the Selective Enforcement Unit (responsible for addressing specific criminal activity such as prostitution, drug use and crimes concentrated in certain areas where traditional uniformed patrol tactics do not work) be brought back. These units were phased out several years ago due to lack of interest and a reduction in the patrol division size due to attrition.

All of these suggestions by employees point to an increased desire for employee empowerment and diversification. Interestingly, the Motorcycle Unit and Selective Enforcement Unit are designed to promote community oriented policing techniques, a concept that the X Police Department has pledged to pursue both at present and in the future. If staff size is not affected and all patrol positions are filled, both units would act to serve both the public and the officers of the department. Special assignments in law enforcement oftentimes serve as an incentive and act to raise employee morale (Swanson, et. al 1993). Allowing officers to have more of a say in designing special details and assignments may work toward that end, as well.

FUTURE STEPS

This study was cross-sectional in that it examined attitudes of employees at one point in time. In order to accurately gauge morale within a police agency, periodic "spot checks" of morale can serve to better acquaint the administer with issues, concerns and suggestions before they become problems. It is recommended that individuals or squads that exhibit overall low scores in the self-assessment survey be monitored closely. It is also suggested that employee concerns and suggestions raised during focus group meetings be examined in earnest and if at all

possible, implemented. Clearly, the patrol officers of the X Police Department have concerns regarding their role as public safety officials and for the most part, a desire to improve their working conditions. Allowing them to have input and monitoring their responses should only work to improving the department as it prepares to enter the 21st century.

LITERATURE SOURCES

Aurelio, R., Motivating a De-motivated Staff. Management Review, February 1996, v85, n2 p62 (3).

Babbie, E.R., The Practice of Social Research, 8 ed., Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1998.

Benge, E.J. and Hickey, J., Morale and Motivation: How to Measure and Increase Productivity. Franklin Watts Publishing Co., New York, NY 1984.

Cole, J., An Ounce of Prevention Beats Burnout. HR Focus, June 1999, v76, i6, p1.

Fosam, E.B., Grimsley, M., and Wisher, S.J., Exploring Models for Employee Satisfaction with Particular Reference to a Police Force. Total Quality Management, May 1998, v9, n2-3, p235 (13).

Golembiewski, R.T., Boudreau, R.A., Munzenrider, R.T. and Luo, H., Global Burnout, Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, (in press).

Hawk, E., and Sheridan, G., The Right Staff. Management Review, June 1999, p43 (10).

Koustelios, A.D. and Bagiatis, K., The Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI): Development of a Scale to Measure Satisfaction of Greek Employees. Educational and Psychological Measurement, June 1997, v57, n3, p469 (8).

Martin, J. Building Morale Keeps Employee Spirits High in Tough Times. HR Focus, April, 1999, v76, i4, p9.

Rainey, H.G., Understanding and Managing Public Organizations, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1997.

Rossi, P.H., Freeman, H.E., and Lipsey, M. W., Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 1999.

Stanek, J. The Seven Survey Sins, Personnel Journal, July 1996, v75, n7, p61 (3).

Swanson, C.R., Territo, L and Taylor, R., Police Administration- Structures, Processes and Behavior. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1993.

Ting, Y. Analysis of Job Satisfaction of the federal White-Collar Work Force: Findings from the Survey of federal Employees. American Review of Public Administration, December 1996, v26, n4, p439 (18).

Webb, Eugene, Unobtrusive Measures: Non-reactive Research in the Social Sciences. Rand McNally, Chicago, IL, 1966.

Wolfe, D., et. al, Using Focus Group Methodology to Obtain Child and Family Mental Health Data. In: Conference Proceedings, Third Annual Research Conference, A System of Health Care for Children's Mental Health: Building a Research Base. FMHI Publication 136. Research and Training Center for Children's Mental Health, Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, p139-150.

APPENDIX A

EMPLOYEE MORALE SURVEY

SCORING KEY

Instructions to Participant: Please answer each question on this survey with the response that bests represents your attitude/feeling.

Part 1. General Information.
(Check One)
1. My current rank.
( ) A. Civilian Employee
( ) B. Patrol Officer
( ) C. Detective
( ) D. Sergeant
( ) E. Lieutenant

2. I have worked for Auburn PD for approximately:
( ) A. Under 1 year.
( ) B. 1 to 4 years.
( ) C. 5 to 9 years.
( ) D. 10 to 15 years.
( ) E. 15 or more years.

3. My usual weekly gross salary (before deductions) is approximately:
( ) A. $400-$450. (Score 1)
( ) B. $451-$500. (Score 2)
( ) C. $501-$550. (Score 3)
( ) D. $551-$600. (Score 4)
( ) E. $601 or more. (Score 5)

Part 2. Individual Morale.

1. How do you like your present job?
( ) A. I don't like it. (Score 0)
( ) B. I'd prefer something else. (Score .25)
( ) C. I accept it, nether liking nor disliking it. (Score .5)
( ) D. I like it. (Score .75)
( ) E. I like it very much. (Score 1.0)

2. What is your ability to do your job?
( ) A. I have much more skills/abilities than my job calls for. (Score 1)
( ) B. I have more skills/abilities than my job calls for. (Score .75)
( ) C. I have the right amount of skills/abilities to do my job. (Score .5)
( ) D. I don't have some skills/abilities to do my job. (Score .25)
( ) E. I don't have the skills/abilities to do my job well. (Score 0)

3. Do you enjoy the environmental conditions (inside or outside) in which you work?
( ) A. I do not like the environmental conditions I work in. (Score 0)
( ) B. I dislike some of the environmental conditions I work in. (Score .25)
( ) C. I neither like nor dislike my working environment. (Score .50)
( ) D. I like the environmental conditions I work in. (Score .75)
( ) E. I dislike the environmental conditions I work in. (Score 1.0)

4. Do you feel challenged in your job?
( ) A. I never feel challenged in my work. (Score 0)
( ) B. I seldom feel challenged in my work. (Score .25)
( ) C. I neither feel challenged nor bored in my work. (Score .50)
( ) D. I sometimes feel challenged in my work. (Score .75)
( ) E. I always feel challenged in my work. (Score 1.0)

5.) Do you have the necessary equipment to do your job effectively?
( ) A. I don't have the necessary equipment do my job effectively. (Score 0)
( ) B. I have some of the necessary equipment do my job effectively. (Score .25)
( ) C. I have more necessary equipment do my job effectively than most officers in similar departments. (Score .50)
( ) D. I have enough necessary equipment do my job effectively. (Score .75)
( ) E. I have all the necessary equipment I need to do my job effectively.(Score 1.0)

6-10. Check the line that <u>best</u> represents your attitude toward the following questions
Score as below:

6. My job is fun and enjoyable.

Strongly Agree (1.0) Agree (.75) Undecided (.5) Disagree (.75) Strongly Disagree(0)

7. My job leaves me with a sense of satisfaction at the end of the day.

Strongly Agree (1.0) Agree (.75) Undecided (.5) Disagree (.75) Strongly Disagree(0)

8. I receive a fair wage for what I do

Strongly Agree (1.0) Agree (.75) Undecided (.5) Disagree (.75) Strongly Disagree(0)

9. I plan to retire from the Auburn Police Department.

_____ Strongly Agree (1.0) _____ Agree (.75) _____ Undecided (.5) _____ Disagree (.75) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

10. I enjoy interacting with the public through my job.

_____ Strongly Agree (1.0) _____ Agree (.75) _____ Undecided (.5) _____ Disagree (.75) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

11. How could the Auburn Police Department initiate change that would improve the way you view your job?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Part 3. Your Co-workers.

1-10. Check the line that best represents your attitude toward the following questions:

1. I get along well with my co-workers.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

2. I work well with other members of my squad.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

3. My squad members seem to enjoy their jobs.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

4. Some members of my squad are difficult to work with.

_____ Strongly Agree(0) _____ Agree(.25) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.75) _____ Strongly Disagree(1)

5. My squad has higher morale than any other squad in the department.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

6. I enjoy working within my squad.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

7. My squad does it's job of policing the city well.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

8. My squad members seem to enjoy working together.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

9. I can rely on my co-workers for my safety and well-being.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

10. I would change squads if given the opportunity.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

11. How could your co-workers improve your squad?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Part 4. Your Supervisors.

1 - 5. For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you Strongly Agree (SA)(1), Agree (A)(.75), Disagree (D)(.25), Strongly Disagree (SD)(0), or are Undecided (U)(.5).

1.) Department supervisors do a good job, for the most part. _____
2.) Department supervisors are skilled in law and procedures. _____
3.) Department supervisors are uniform in what they all require. _____
4.) Department supervisors are enjoyable to work with. _____
5.) Department supervisors allow me to do a better job. _____

6 - 10. For each of the following statements, please check the appropriate box.

6. I get along well with my supervisors.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

7. I trust the supervisors.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

8. The supervisors seem to enjoy their jobs.

_____ Strongly Agree(1) _____ Agree(.75) _____ Undecided(.5) _____ Disagree(.25) _____ Strongly Disagree(0)

9. Some supervisors are difficult to work with.

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Strongly Agree(0) Agree(.25) Undecided(.5)Disagree(.75) Strongly Disagree(1)

10. The supervisors make it easy to do my job well.

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Strongly Agree(1) Agree(.75) Undecided(.5)Disagree(.25) Strongly Disagree(0)

11. How could the supervisors at Auburn PD improve the workplace?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Part 5. Opportunities for Promotion: (10 points possible)

1. I am eligible for promotion, based on my years in service.
( ) Yes (1pt)
( ) No (0 pt)

2. I have been turned down for a promotion that I qualified for in the past.
( ) Yes (0 pt)
( ) No (1 pt)

3. I anticipate being promoted within three years.
( ) Yes (1 pt)
( ) No (0 pt)

4.- 8. For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you Strongly Agree (SA) 1.0, Agree (A) .75, Disagree (D) .25, Strongly Disagree (SD).0, or are Undecided (U) .5.

4.) Promotions occur on a frequent basis at Auburn PD. _____
5.) Promotional exams/procedures are fair. _____
6.) Deserving officers are usually the ones promoted. _____
7.) Promotional procedures should be changed. (negative score) _____
8.) I approve of the current promotional procedure at Auburn PD. _____
9.) The overall promotion process is fair. _____
10.) I am optimistic that I will be promoted at some future point. _____

11.) What comments do you have about the promotional procedure at Auburn PD?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Part 6. General Comment.

Please comment on any aspect of employee morale that was not addressed by this survey. Feel free to write about what you would like to see changed or improved, as well as what you feel is currently in place that aids in enhancing worker morale.

APPENDIX B

SQUAD	MNPROD	MORALE	COWORKER	SUPV	PROMO	PAY
1 A	10.36	7.50	7.00	5.25	2.00	1.00
2 A	10.36	7.75	6.25	5.00	2.00	3.00
3 A	10.36	7.75	7.00	6.00	1.00	2.00
4 A	10.36	7.00	9.00	4.75	3.00	3.00
5 A	10.36	7.00	7.25	5.00	2.00	3.00
6 A	10.36	6.25	6.25	6.25	2.00	2.00
7 A	10.36	6.75	7.25	6.00	3.00	4.00
8 A	10.36	8.50	8.50	7.25	1.00	3.00
9 A	10.36	8.25	7.00	5.25	3.00	3.00
10 A	10.36	8.75	6.75	6.50	2.00	3.00
11 A	10.36	9.75	8.75	8.25	1.00	1.00
12 A	10.36	8.25	4.25	5.25	0.00	1.00
13 A	10.36	9.00	8.00	8.25	2.00	3.00
14 A	10.36	8.25	7.75	6.75	1.00	5.00
15 B	7.46	5.00	4.25	4.25	3.00	2.00
16 B	7.46	3.50	3.75	4.25	0.00	4.00
17 B	7.46	3.50	2.25	2.25	0.00	4.00
18 B	7.46	5.25	5.75	3.00	2.00	3.00
19 B	7.46	3.75	3.25	4.25	1.00	5.00
20 B	7.46	4.75	2.25	5.25	1.00	5.00
21 B	7.46	5.00	4.25	3.25	1.00	4.00
22 B	7.46	9.25	2.25	7.50	1.00	5.00
23 B	7.46	6.50	6.75	4.75	2.00	5.00
24 C	15.26	9.75	8.75	6.75	3.00	1.00
25 C	15.26	8.25	7.25	7.50	3.00	3.00
26 C	15.26	8.00	8.25	7.25	1.00	2.00
27 C	15.26	8.50	9.25	7.00	1.00	2.00
28 C	15.26	9.25	8.75	7.75	1.00	2.00
29 C	15.26	8.00	8.75	8.25	1.00	1.00
30 C	15.26	9.50	9.25	9.25	2.00	4.00
31 C	15.26	9.25	6.25	7.75	2.00	3.00
32 C	15.26	8.75	8.75	8.00	0.00	1.00
33 C	15.26	9.75	9.50	9.00	3.00	3.00
34 C	15.26	8.25	9.25	7.50	1.00	1.00
35 C	15.26	8.00	8.75	9.25	1.00	2.00
36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Survey Data Set