

Servant Leadership and Law Enforcement Officers

by

Brett Layn Evans

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
May 1, 2021

Servant Leadership, Supervision, Law Enforcement

Copyright 2021 by Brett L Evans

Approved by

Dr. Mitchell Brown, Chair, Associate Professor Department of Political Science
Dr. Cynthia Bowling, Associate Professor Department of Political Science
Dr. Jonathan Fisk, Assistant Professor Department of Political Science
Dr. John Morris, Professor Department of Political Science

Abstract

The primary purpose of this quantitative study was to determine to what extent servant leadership exists among law enforcement supervisors of varying positions. Secondly the research was to help ascertain if there was a relationship between servant leadership and both education and job satisfaction. The study was designed to explore a void in the written literature in which servant leadership is explored as a viable option for law enforcement supervisors. Specifically explored was the existence of servant leadership characteristics identified by Barbuto and Wheeler (2011) through the use of their Servant Leadership Questionnaire. A survey questionnaire was developed on Qualtrics and distributed via an email containing the link to the electronic survey. The test questions concerned the prevalence of the servant leadership characteristics among the law enforcement agents and to what extent these characteristics varied across the levels (ranks) of supervision. Questions were used to solicit responses that would allow the research to indicate if there were any relationships with officers who exhibit servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction. These questions would also provide data to correlate education levels with the servant leadership characteristics.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost I would like to thank God for His grace and mercy. Without His power over my life this dissertation research would not have been possible. Secondly, I want to thank my wife, Tammy, for her continued support and encouragement. She remained a steady source of encouragement, support and knowledge that was invaluable to me during this process. I want to thank my children (Presli, Ansli, Andrew, Meckli, Anthony, Layni, Aiden) for their patience and understanding through the many hours of my absence.

I am extremely grateful to Auburn University for the opportunity they gave me to pursue the doctorate degree. To my committee members I am thankful for your support, knowledge, patience and understanding. I am especially thankful for my committee chair, Dr. Mitchell Brown, as she inspired me to finish and persevere through the process. I am indebted to her and I know that without her support I would not be writing this acknowledgement.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgments.....	3
List of Tables	7
List of Abbreviations	8
Chapter 1 Introduction	9
Statement of the problem	9
Significance of the problem	14
Hypothesis.....	17
Chapter 2 Literature Review	21
Leadership (general).....	21
Why is leadership important.....	23
Leadership in policing.....	25
Servant Leadership.....	29
Support of servant leadership.....	32
Hypothesis and research expectations.....	38
Chapter 3 Methodology	41
Introduction.....	41
Research design.....	41
Population and sample.....	42
Data collection instrument.....	43
Data collection.....	45

Data analysis.....	46
Chapter 4 Research Findings.....	47
Research findings.....	47
Descriptive analysis.....	48
Bivariate analysis.....	50
Multivariate analysis.....	53
Discussion of findings.....	55
Table 4.1.....	62
Table 4.2.....	63
Table 4.3.....	64
Table 4.4.....	65
Table 4.5.....	66
Table 4.6.....	67
Table 4.7.....	68
Table 4.8.....	69
Table 4.9.....	70
Chapter 5 Conclusion, Implications, Weaknesses, Future Research.....	71
Review.....	71
Demographics.....	72
Bivariate analysis.....	72
Multivariate analysis.....	73
Implications.....	75
Weaknesses and future research.....	80

Conclusion.....	83
References.....	85
Appendix A (SLQ Survey, Barbuto & Wheeler, 2011).....	97
Appendix B (research survey questionnaire).....	99
Appendix C (code book).....	111

List of Tables

Table 4.1 (Respondents demographics).....	
Table 4.2 (Respondents positions and jurisdictions)	
Table 4.3 (Respondents Servant Leadership Characteristics).....	
Table 4.4 (Bivariate analysis of relationship between SL characteristics and demographics).....	
Table 4.5 (Bivariate analysis of relationship between SL characteristics and position)	
Table 4.6 (Bivariate analysis of relationship between job satisfaction and SL, Dem, and position)	
Table 4.7 (Bivariate analysis of relationship between job satisfaction and SL characteristics).....	
Table 4.8 Multivariate analysis of SL characteristics and law enforcement	

List of Abbreviations

SL	Servant Leadership
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
NA	National Academy
CEO	Chief Executive Officer

Servant Leadership and Law Enforcement Supervisors

Chapter One: Introduction

Over the course of the last thirty years, law enforcement has evolved within an ever-changing world environment. The field of law enforcement is no longer just about enforcing laws, but now includes community policing and a spirit of involvement. Law enforcement has struggled to become a more professional field with better qualified officers. Agencies strive to hire candidates with higher educations, better training, and a more ethical character. They likewise encourage current officers to become better educated and to focus on training in order to better professionalize their agencies.

In my law enforcement career, I worked for the same agency for over thirty-two years. I began my career as a rookie patrol officer just like most. I was promoted into the narcotics unit where I worked investigations for several years. Later I was promoted through the ranks of sergeant, lieutenant, and captain. Then, after nearly seventeen years of service I was appointed chief. During my tenure this police department would eventually serve the tenth largest city in the state. I witnessed the evolution law enforcement was beginning to make towards a more involved and community oriented position. I began to play a larger part in this transformation as my role within the agency changed. Each of my positions provided the unique opportunity to see the impact that differing leadership styles had when it came to interactions with the officers. Some of these interactions were positive, and others were not.

One such experience in leadership was when I was first assigned to a patrol shift and I worked for two supervisors. Each supervisor had very different approaches to leadership, yet each was impactful. One supervisor made a positive impression on this young officer by

ensuring that everyone had the opportunity to eat during the shift, only himself eating after all others had done so. During the night shift, the other supervisor pulled up to my patrol car which had suffered a flat tire. This supervisor remained inside his car only offering to shine a light on the area I was working. During another experience, I was the Criminal Investigations lieutenant when our unit was out all night working a homicide. The following morning, the chief walked by and asked me a trivial question. I replied in the negative, informing him that I had been out all night with a homicide and there was still much to do. He hardly responded before walking away. Looking back on the encounter, it occurs to me that a servant leader would have been out with his unit during the night, helping and providing in whatever way possible. At this point, a servant leader would have asked if there was anything we needed and then work to provide it.

It was through impactful experiences like this one that I developed the aspiration to be part of a bigger change—to encourage a work environment of caring and empathy rather than the existing disconnected, militaristic, march to order atmosphere currently prevalent in law enforcement. I recognized that law enforcement leadership needed to become more educated, empathetic, and employee-oriented if it was to reduce conflicts with the public and the governing bodies. Officers would need to better relate to the community they served to have any hope of gaining their support. Experiences in law enforcement both with supervisors and as a supervisor myself brought about a desire to make a difference in my agency. I saw servant leadership as the avenue to facilitate the necessary changes.

A new generation of recruits has brought about still more change, as departments are scrambling to understand how to attract them and by what means are they motivated. How do we obtain them and keep them engaged? How do we encourage them to work in the given conditions? If agencies are to survive the trending decrease in support, they will have to enact

drastic measures of reform. This reform must include an approach that involves training officers to be more empathetic to the public, more ethical through the use of education and training, and capitalizing on wisdom and experience.

Many law enforcement supervisors have a militaristic mindset when it comes to the daily operations of the agency. They expect the officers they supervise to obey them without question at all times. I started my law enforcement career working for a chief that was a former Marine. Perhaps because of this, his leadership style was autocratic. Being autocratic meant that there was never any solicited input, no listening to alternatives or differing opinions. Subordinates followed his orders out of fear rather than respect. He led during the mid-1980s, a time in which law enforcement had not yet turned toward any form of community-oriented policing.

Admittedly, there are times of crisis in which officers must know to immediately follow orders for the safety of everyone involved, however this is not the case for the majority of the shift. The next chief I served under was self-absorbed and embraced a laissez-faire leadership style. If a situation or problem did not directly affect him then he paid it no attention. He put his personal vendettas and friendships above all else. The department was stagnant and becoming divided as he turned a blind eye to the needs of the officers and the community. A certain lieutenant under his leadership also displayed little empathy for the public or for the officers assigned to him. His inability to listen to anyone's issues resulted in officers calling in sick rather than requesting time off for family events. He maintained this ineffective leadership style as he rose through the ranks until his retirement. Both the chief and the lieutenant refused to embrace the officers' struggle as legitimate. Instead, they ignored the situation and allowed it to worsen. Their disinterest in fostering relationships within the agency and community produced effects that continued to impact the agency for years to come.

This chief and lieutenant were in polarized opposition with the assistant chief and mayor. The assistant chief was transactional in his leadership style. He led in terms of reward and punishment, which was fairly common at the time. However, he and the mayor both saw the need for change, quality control, and public outreach with programs to foster relationships. These programs were designed to better serve the community and to boost officer morale, motivation, and education. Upon the implementation of the new programs, I began to become intrigued and involved. Many of the programs they developed were initiated in areas under my purview, as I was now the Criminal Investigations Division commander and oversaw many facets of the department and directly interacted with others. I attended the community meetings in which we would listen to the concerns of the neighborhood and business owners to see how we could better serve them. We were able to set new goals and develop strategies for positive community change, and to see what the citizens perceived as stumbling blocks in reaching these goals. Though the programs helped to bring positive change to the department, the opposition of the chief and lieutenant to the assistant chief and mayor led to departmental division. When I became chief, my first goal was to heal the agency and to bring the department into unison. I knew the desires of the mayor and the public for an agency that could be empathetic and motivated for a change for the better.

The mayor taught me an important lesson while standing on the steps at the city hall after his conversation with two senior black ladies. He asked me a simple question: "If you see a turtle on top of a fence post, what is the one fact that you know about that turtle?" When I replied that I did not know, he said to me, "You know for a fact that somebody put it there; it could not get there on its own." He then pointed to the ladies that were departing and said, "Do you know who they are?" When I again replied that I did not, he told me, "That is who put me here." His

obvious reference to the public voters—the people he represented—has never left me, and it became my personal slogan for structuring servant leadership. As the new chief, I decided to pursue this leadership style and to implement it within the department as a whole.

Together, the growing police department and the ever-changing community formed the perfect implementation ground for my ideas. At the time I was not familiar with the formal designation of servant leadership. I knew that I wanted to pull the positive aspects of several leadership styles and develop one that could make the biggest impact. I believed that I wanted to set the example and that I wanted others to follow suit. I knew that I wanted the leadership style to be natural and inspiring. I began to read leadership books from various authors such as John Maxwell, Niccolò Machiavelli, Dale Carnegie, and even Sun Tzu. I was unable to find the single leadership style that I desired. Eventually I found servant leadership, and later Robert K. Greenleaf.

As I became more interested in the practical aspects of Greenleaf's servant leadership I began to compare it to my practical contemporary experience. This comparison helped to better understand the leadership style and to better implement it for myself and within the department as a whole. As I searched for applicable material and prior research to read concerning servant leadership and law enforcement I found that there was in fact very little material, especially empirical peer reviewed writings, concerning this. Therefore as I made my journey through higher education I began to formulate questions on how to best implement servant leadership as a viable leadership style for law enforcement. These questions eventually led to the development of this research.

Servant leadership is intrinsically different than other forms of leadership in one basic facet: the leader is motivated by the act of serving, not leading. The servant leadership mindset

places the leader on an equal plane with each person they lead and thus, no one person is more or less necessary than the other. The concept of servant leadership was formally initiated by Robert Greenleaf (1970, 1977), who was committed to developing a leadership style with an empathetic mindset. Servant leadership emphasizes the development and involvement of the people which, in turn, promotes and facilitates the growth of the organization.

Greenleaf (1970) believed that the basic concept of servant leadership was for people to desire to serve first and that leadership would follow. He also built on the idea that organizations could be servant leaders, not just individuals. As servant leadership has grown in popularity, the question is raised as to which organizations are or can be better equipped to serve in this fashion. The medical and educational fields have already built on this concept for years, and the literature indicates that their acceptance of it has had positive results. A less popular view is that servant leadership is useful, if not necessary, in the law enforcement profession—a profession that is actually built on service. However, the literature on this is quite lacking, and it is difficult to find empirical data on servant leadership in any aspect of law enforcement.

Significance of the problem

The issue of law enforcement professionalism and purpose of service is constantly in question. Historical and contemporary conflicts between the police and communities are all too frequent. The question of why these conflicts exist begs for a solution to bring about and instill a cultural change within departments. I believe that leadership, specifically servant leadership, can be instrumental in this cultural change. Leadership can be the difference between a deadly force situation such as those in Louisville and Minneapolis and those that are resolved or avoided. The servant leadership culture would be better in working with communities when these incidents do

occur. I have always believed in and promoted having strong community relationships long before a crisis, not trying to make those relationships in the midst of one.

Several of the problems facing police supervisors and managers include the issues of morale, retention and integrity. Police executives are coming under unprecedented pressure to re-align departments and become more attune to the desires of the community. An especially difficult, but necessary adaptation, is to bring law enforcement officers and citizens into harmony by understanding the needs of the people served. Servant leadership and the constructs behind it can be well suited to help facilitate better work environments developed by the supervisors and the agency as a whole and these work environments can lead to better retention of officers, higher recruiting rates, and increased professionalism. The ability to keep the officers who align with the values of the agency and community can result in fewer officer shortages. Being fully staffed helps to take the pressure off the administration thereby allowing them to discontinue to employ questionable officers or officers with disciplinary histories.

Another observation in my experience pertained to the predisposition of the first level supervisors to exhibit servant leadership characteristics as they attempt to make the environment from which they came better. These supervisors are not far enough removed yet to have forgotten where they came from and sincerely desire to lift morale and bolster unity. They are more concerned with the well-being of the officers than they are with the overall health of the department's relationship with the public. This knowledge helped form a part of the research questions posed in this dissertation.

From this I expect to find that the characteristics and exhibited behaviors of servant leadership will be more prevalent among the first line supervisors and will decrease as the rank ascends. This expectation is built on the understanding that the servant leadership mindset is

more easily attained when the focus is on the well-being of the individual officers as opposed to the agency as a whole.

Most leadership styles place the importance on the leader. The leader's plans and goals for the organization are sought through the work of the employees. Two of the most recognized and researched leadership styles are transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership can be described as a process by which the leader and the follower both have their needs met by way of an exchange (Bass, 1985). The exchange takes place after the leader identifies the desire of the worker and then meets the need of the worker in order for the goals of the leader to be met. Transformational leadership occurs when leaders build and develop their employees. A version of this leadership model was also developed by Bass (1985) who wrote that leaders should use the interests of the employees to obtain the goal of the organization. Leaders assign tasks and motivate employees to accomplish the tasks by empowering them, encouraging them, and allowing them to share in the rewards.

Law enforcement is a service-oriented profession and should therefore be inclined to be led by servant-oriented leaders. The servant leadership approach suggests that the police organization, the employees, and the community will be better served if the qualities of servant leadership are instilled within the supervisory ranks at every level, beginning with the department's chief executive officer (chief or sheriff). If CEOs practice servant leadership and exhibit the supporting characteristics, then these characteristics will be better developed throughout the supervisory structure. In turn, the relationships, trust level, job satisfaction, and commitment of all members of the police force will improve, thereby enhancing the level of service provided to the community.

Research Question

Servant leadership, therefore, ought to be important to effective policing more generally. However, there is a dearth of research on the extent to which police forces are characterized by servant leadership, particularly amongst the supervisory ranks. To help shed light on that, this research explores to what extent do law enforcement supervisors, especially those in executive level positions, exhibit the characteristics of servant leadership? Contained within this question are two significant test questions:

1. How prevalent are the characteristics of servant leadership in law enforcement supervisors?
2. Does the prevalence of servant leadership characteristics differ among the levels of supervisors?

In this research, I first ascertain whether and to what extent police supervisors employ the characteristics of servant leadership within their supervisory and leadership roles. Secondly, I examine the prevalence of servant leadership through the various levels of rank (or supervisory position) in law enforcement in order to determine if the characteristics become more or less a part of their leadership style as they ascend. Third, I determine the extent to which the servant leadership characteristics are related to the officers' job satisfaction. And lastly, I will research the relationship of education level and exhibited servant leadership characteristics.

I expected to find that a first line supervisor (i.e. a sergeant) generally portrays these characteristics significantly more frequently than that of a higher ranking supervisor because he or she cares more about the individual well-being of officers than for the overall health of the organization. Conversely, I expected to find that higher level supervisors (i.e. captains, majors, and chiefs) are less likely to display these characteristics, as these supervisors tend to lead with

the mindset of what is best for the agency as a whole. Therefore, the individual needs of officers become of lesser importance.

In the following chapters, the research question is analyzed by delving into the existing literature concerning this topic and associated topics of leadership. The literature concerning leadership, servant leadership, and various associated topics is ubiquitous, but it became increasingly clear during my research that the literature for servant leadership specifically related to law enforcement was quite sparse. The literature review discusses leadership and its importance, and then deals more specifically with leadership within law enforcement and servant leadership.

I used a survey to conduct my research, which involved more than 1,200 recent graduates of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy. This population was chosen because its members are mostly supervisors of various ranks and lengths of service. They are also from differently-sized agencies. The survey was conducted through the use of Qualtrics, which is located on the server at Auburn University. Through Qualtrics, I created the survey and emailed links to potential respondents.

The findings of my research provide a basis for understanding the extent to which servant leadership is employed and developed within the law enforcement community, and to what extent these characteristics are exhibited at the various ranks. This research also demonstrates the relationship between the prevalence of servant leadership characteristics and the job satisfaction levels of officers who exhibit these characteristics.

This research provides a level of understanding concerning servant leadership and law enforcement, but further research will be needed in order to fully understand the impact that servant leadership characteristics could have on both agency development and the job

satisfaction of individual officers. The current research findings provide a connection between servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction.

This research dissertation is organized into five chapters to provide a logical flow of information. The preceding chapter was used to provide an introduction to the area of servant leadership and law enforcement, as well as establish the purpose and organization of the research. Chapter 2 provides a review of the existing literature that was used to undergird the theories and hypothesis guiding this work. Within Chapter 2, the summary of the literature review is presented and discussed. Areas concerning leadership of various styles, including servant leadership, are covered, as is literature in support of servant leadership and its importance as a whole. The literature review then turns more specifically toward leadership in policing, servant leadership, and the relevance of servant leadership within service-oriented professions.

Chapter 3 provides details on the survey research conducted for the dissertation research. Survey research was selected because it provided the best access to potential respondents nationwide, while also focusing on a specific selection of individuals best suited to the topic. Using Qualtrics, a program provided on the Auburn University computer servers, a survey questionnaire was developed. This survey questionnaire used questions provided by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) from their Servant Leadership Questionnaire, along with demographic questions necessary for the research. Qualtrics was then utilized to email 1,200 potential respondents an invitation request to participate in the study, as well as to provide a generated link to connect them to the survey location. The collected data was then analyzed using correlations and bivariate/multivariate analysis on Stata/IC by StataCorp, LLC.

Chapter 4 contains the information provided by the data analysis, as well as the associated tables developed for visual reference and clarity. The data analysis began with the

associated demographics of the respondents, including rank, agency type, and agency size. Secondly, the analysis of the respondents' servant leadership scores from the questionnaire was conducted, which provided data relevant to the study. Lastly, bivariate and multivariate analysis of the responses was conducted in order to establish the existence of any relative correlations between the variables.

The last chapter, Chapter 5, includes a discussion of the conclusions and their relevance. The chapter also presents the limitations and weaknesses of the study and explores options for future studies. The theories and hypothesis that were researched were developed from a culmination of reading the existing literature and decades of practical experience in the profession of law enforcement.

This research helps to strengthen the idea that servant leadership characteristics are genuinely associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, which in turn creates better work environments and increased retention.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

As with any research, it is imperative to have a basic understanding of the existing literature in order to best understand the history of leadership studies as well as the current coverage of the topic from a research perspective. Within the following section, I have outlined existing leadership research within several specific areas. These areas cover the topics of leadership that mostly pertain to the study of servant leadership in law enforcement. I begin the literature review with the topic of leadership in general in which the overarching concept of leadership is discussed. Within this review is the literature concerning the importance of leadership and why it is relevant to this research. Leadership concepts and applications are far-reaching and diverse, and so the literature review then focuses more narrowly on leadership in policing. Following that is a review of servant leadership and servant leadership within service-oriented professions. The literature specific to servant leadership and law enforcement is sparse, and therefore other service professions such as education, nursing, and the management of non-profit organizations are included. The lack of existing research literature concerning the specific area of servant leadership within the law enforcement profession is apparent.

Leadership in general

Leadership is a well-researched and discussed topic among professionals, scholars, and government officials alike. Within these discussions, there is much discussion concerning the importance of leadership and which attributes make one leader better or more efficient than another. Included within this discussion is the overall aspects of leadership styles and governance, and the leader's ability to affect change within an organization. Recent literature includes a wide array of topics which attempt to examine how leadership and individual leaders

affect various aspects of an organization. These aspects often include such topics as efficiency, effectiveness, commitment to the organization, development, quality, and satisfaction. Each of these aspects concern individual employees directly, demonstrating that the most important duty of leadership is to the individuals that make up the organization.

Leadership is defined by Hirtz, et al. as “the process that managers use to influence subordinates to work toward organizational goals” (Hirtz, Murray, Riordin, 2007). In agreement with this definition, much of the literature indicates that leadership is not just about the position, but is more about how effective a person is in obtaining the organizational goals and increasing performance (Waal and Sivro, 2012; Searle and Barbuto, 2011; Peterson, Galvin and Lange, 2012). These goals may be to increase productivity, to cultivate a better public relationship, or to effect change within the company or entity. Whatever the goal, it is the responsibility of the leadership to achieve the goal.

The effects of leadership, the types of leadership styles, and the general purpose of leadership has been researched abundantly by numerous authors, yet leadership is not so easily defined, recognized, or measured. Some authors, such as Rowe (2006), state that leadership might be “more usefully understood as a process of individual and organizational engagement with time, culture and change” suggesting that leadership is not as much defined as it understood as a developmental process.

Researchers use assorted methods for obtaining data on leadership in order to obtain a better understanding of what makes an effective leader. Some researchers work to identify leadership development initiatives (Amagoh, 2009; Daayaram, 2010) and discover how to better obtain and formalize leadership strategies. Many others focus on the leader’s ability to enhance or affect the performance of the organization. Andrews and Boyne (2010) studied the capacity of

leadership and organizational performance while others concentrated on which leadership styles were better suited to effect change or increase performance (Erwin, 2009; Huang, Hsu and Chiau, 2011). The study performed by Hirtz et al. (2007) was designed to understand the effects of leadership on quality performance from a manufacturing environment. This study centralized on the leadership styles of transformational, transactional, and non-transactional styles, as well as passive and laissez-faire, and whether these leadership styles had any correlation with the final quality. They concluded that there was a positive relationship between a “successful implementation of quality management” and the transformational leadership style, and their study supported “the position that passive styles of leadership negatively impact efforts to implement quality control” (Hirtz, Murray, and Riordan, 2007 pg. 27).

Why leadership is important

In a study conducted by Francis Amagoh (2009), it was stated that “the key elements that contribute to a successful leadership experience include changing mindsets, a global focus, personnel development and improved business and leadership skills” (990). From a manager’s perspective on organizational performance, it could be said that an effective and efficient organization should outperform those that fail in these areas. Therefore, it is important for organizational managers to obtain and inspire the best leaders for their organizations and to supply them with both the means and the ability to succeed. In respect to this, Amagoh further wrote that “a learning organization facilitates change, empowers organizational members, encourages collaboration, and sharing of information, creates opportunities for learning, and promotes leadership” (990). Additional support for the premise that effective leadership has a positive effect on organizational performance has been found in other literature. Andrews and

Boyne (2010) found “evidence from a variety of sources provides support for the premise that effective leadership is associated with high performance” (444).

Leadership has also been tied to the objective of performance when associated with an organization’s ability to increase the capacity or quantity of the work performed. The performance of an organization is usually associated with how effectively the final product is delivered. Both the effectiveness and the capacity of the work can be positively affected by the leadership. In one study concentrating on organizational capacity and performance, Rhys and Boyne (2010) wrote that “high performing governments have better capacity and capacity is enhanced through leadership” (450)

Measuring or quantifying leadership are difficult tasks because in both cases, the data must be obtained from the abstract. However, Kivipold and Vadi (2010) found that measuring the effectiveness of leadership is of vital importance to any organization. “The measurement of organizational leadership capability is an important issue for improving performance in the long term” (Kivipold and Vadi, 2010, 118). Therefore, no matter the difficulty level, organizations should strive to measure, rate and improve their leadership in various forms.

Leadership is often associated with change within an organization, as many leaders develop new methods within existing organizations in order to effect change. Vigoda-Gadot and Beerli (2011) wrote that “it may be argued that the quality of the relationships between the public employees and their supervisors contributes strongly to individuals’ willingness to engage in innovative and creative behaviors and behaviors toward other individuals that support the organization” (591). Change is not usually taken lightly, nor is it accomplished in a short time frame. On the contrary, change may take a long time to occur if the changes are to be permanent. In seeking long-term change through leadership, one problem noted by Erwin (2011) was that

“the last and perhaps most important challenge is maintaining the commitment, energy, and patience to endure the considerable anxiety and pain necessary to achieve sustainable performance” (39).

Leadership in Policing

“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” (Schafer, 2008). With so many factors influencing policing in today’s society, police executives, as well as city and county managers, must look to the leadership of their departments to avoid becoming part of a negative statistic. Leadership or its absence can be credited for a large percentage of breach of duty issues facing law enforcement. Schafer (2010) wrote that “police leaders and leadership remain understudied within existing criminal justice scholarship” (644).

Although few studies have concentrated on police leadership specifically, several leadership styles have historically been attributed to law enforcement and its leaders. Typically, law enforcement is visualized as a para-military style structure with rank, order, and discipline, but this is not necessarily the case any longer. Jermier and Berkes (1979) studied the typical para-military model and questioned its validity concerning law enforcement. Their results were “diametrically opposed” to the “leader as commander” image and found that “leader participativeness and task variability were highly significant predictors of both subordinate job satisfaction and organizational commitment”(16). Yet in this modern era, police executives and supervisors are still slow to change from this mindset. From another perspective, however, the

“military model of leadership in law enforcement” may not always stand with such negative connotations. Cowper (2000) found that “it [the military model] can only benefit America’s police departments, and ultimately the citizens we serve, if we look at the military model as it truly is: a highly professional and organizationally mature profession” (243-244).

Police executives have typically subscribed to the autocratic and bureaucratic leadership mindsets until recently. The autocratic supervisor relying on a single leader control and bureaucratic supervisors merely following the established rules of the department and “chain of command”. Now, more police supervisors and executives follow modern styles of leadership such as transformational and transactional leadership. The changes have occurred through the years from a variety of forces extending from cultural, political, and educational influences within society. Several researchers exploring the relationships of leaders with subordinates have written about the relationships between emotional intelligence, intelligence, and managerial competence with the overall performance attributed to the leader (Hawkins and Dulewicz, 2007). Hawkins and Dulewicz found “support for the proposition that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and performance as a leader in policing” (pg. 57). Additionally, in 2009 they stated that “The results reported identify the most prevalent styles of leadership within the service” and “positive relationships are reported between leadership style and performance as a leader and follower commitment” (Hawkins and Dulewicz, 2009, pg. 251).

Some of the recent literature, as well as literature from decades ago, focuses on leadership and its responsibility concerning police behavior and misconduct. In the work mentioned earlier by Jermier and Berkes (1979), the researchers specifically associated a “police problem” with the leadership style they studied. “The American police are the primary, most visible agents of social control within the criminal justice system. An increasingly important

subject of controversy within the past two decades has been their routine use of coercion in regulating community behavior in a democratic society” (pg. 1). Although the researchers’ work covered the time period between the late 1950s and the late 1970s, their view of an overbearing and militaristic police force has not diminished in present times.

Authors have studied positive elements of what makes an effective leader much more prevalently than they study effects of a leader’s negative traits. One study seems to be in opposition to the other studies with respect to traits and behaviors. Schafer (2009) surveyed over one thousand police supervisors in evaluating traits and habits exhibited by effective leaders and their efficiency. “Efficacy was most strongly linked with integrity, work ethic, communication, and care for personnel; ineffective leaders were characterized as failing to express these traits” (644). A Netherlands survey study of over one thousand police officers attempted to correlate the effects of three leadership characteristics to integrity violations committed by police officers. The authors compared the responses in order to correlate the violations to any one, or combination of several, variables including “role modeling, strictness and openness of leaders” as influencing police behaviors (Huberts, Kaptein, and Lasthuizen, 2007, p 598). The paper’s authors found that the “regression analysis shows that setting a good example had a significant impact on all 20 types of behavior used as example of integrity violations. The analysis also reveal that strictness and openness are related to 15 out of the 20 integrity violations” (Huberts, Kaptein, and Lasthuizen, 2007, p 598). Additionally, they wrote that “the first leadership characteristic of role modeling appears to have a significant influence on all types of misconduct, with a relatively strong effect on internal corruption (favoritism), types of ill-treatment (discrimination, harassment, gossiping, bullying) and falsely calling in sick” (599). From a manager’s perspective, avoiding just these negative behaviors and influences would be

instrumental in turning the direction of an organization. The authors stated that, “As the organizational scandals of late have shown, fraud, corruption, and other integrity violations can have disastrous consequences for the reputation and performance of organizations in the private as well as the public sector” (600).

Multidimensional approaches to training and leader development are mentioned in several of the writings already discussed. Schafer (2010) specifically wrote on the subject in his implications section. Schafer stated that “respondents seemed to support a multi-dimensional approach to leadership development” and that “approaches that mirror a field training model might provide a more robust experience” (657). In his earlier work (2009) he stated “respondents indicate leadership skills are best developed through a combination of education, experience, and mentorship” (Schafer, 2009, p 238).

As part of this study I hypothesized that higher education would be correlated with a higher presence of servant leadership characteristics, so for preparation of that I have included literature review of the topic. However most of the readings included here deal more with professionalism and ethics as they relate to officers’ education levels.

“There has been a long-standing debate over whether a college education for police officers is desirable or even necessary” (Roberg and Bonn, 2004, p 469). Certainly, an argument can be made in support of education as a means for professionalizing service organizations, and law enforcement organizations are no exception. Due in part to the advent of more sophisticated technologies and the complexity of today’s society, the drastic change that law enforcement has undergone over the years is difficult to ignore. Roberg and Bonn’s (2004) research found that “enough evidence (both empirical and experiential) has been established to support a strong argument for a college-degree requirement for entry-level police officers” (481). Undoubtedly,

the benefits of a college-educated police force cannot be overstated. Positive strides could be made both in the realm of ethics and in understanding cultural diversity. Recent headlines and news over controversies involving law enforcement from Ferguson, Missouri to South Carolina have brought about demands for reforms and federal regulation over the actions of law enforcement officers. However, the trending need for more training and education in this public service has been recognized and studied, and changes were recommended decades ago. Sadly, most or all of the recommendations were ignored by the majority of departments and their overseeing governments. Costs and implementation procedures could be the overreaching cause of this breakdown.

Servant Leadership

Many of the aspects of servant leadership were first recognized in a literary work by Robert K. Greenleaf in 1977. Although he did some initial writing in 1970, it was the publication of his book “Servant Leadership” in 1977 that actually drew notice. This work began a leadership movement that would take decades to construct and allow researchers to define and operationalize. Several authors (Vinod and Sudhakar, van Dierendonck, Spears, Barbuto and Wheeler) have listed versions of the traits, factors, or characteristics of servant leadership varying in numbers from five to eleven. Each author attempted to further define the traits that are exhibited by a servant leader.

Greenleaf characterized the traits of a servant leader in his original work in 1970 and in his following work in 1977. Others have tried to narrow or expand their own version of the necessary traits, including Spears (1995), whose categorical list includes listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to growth

of people, and building community.

Greenleaf wrote that “the servant-leader is servant first” and that, “It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first” (23). According to Washington (2007), Greenleaf was committed to developing a formal leadership with an empathetic mindset. Greenleaf developed the idea of servant leadership after studying a story about a spiritual pilgrimage. In Nobel Laureate Herman Hesse’s “Journey to the East,” a group of fictitious characters set out on a pilgrimage for “the order.” The group is accompanied by a servant who departs from the group before they accomplish their quest. The members of the group begin to fall apart from each other, and their once-homogenous group is no longer organized and unified. The dissension among the members eventually leads to the abandonment of the pilgrimage. Later in the story, the narrator character learns that the “servant” who disappeared was in fact the high leader of the “order.”

Greenleaf (1977) states that servant leaders differ intrinsically from other leaders in that they are motivated by the act of serving, not leading. This servant mentality places them on an equal plane with each person they lead and thus no one person is any more necessary or better than the other. Words spoken by Jesus and recorded in the Bible (The Holy Bible ESV 2001, 1394) document a perfect example of this attitude in Mathew 20, verses 26 through 28:

But whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave, even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life as ransom for many.

Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) define a servant leader as “a servant of his/her followers” who “emphasizes personal development and empowerment of followers.”

Additionally, they refer to the servant leader as “a facilitator for followers to achieve a shared

vision.”

Ehrhart (2004) developed a survey questionnaire when researching the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior at the unit-level. His research showed that “between-unit differences in levels of servant-leadership were strongly related to procedural justice climate. In other words, when leaders recognize and respond to their responsibility to work for the good of their subordinates and other stakeholders, the unit they lead will, as a whole, feel that they are treated fairly” (81).

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) comprised a servant leadership questionnaire checklist that assists leaders in evaluating themselves on the necessary qualifications for servant leadership. The survey is comprised of eleven yes/no questions. They then refined those characteristics into five factors—altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. This study “supports the premise that servant leaders create serving relationships with their followers” (319).

Liden et al. (2008) developed a multidimensional measure for servant leadership by identifying nine dimensions, which were then developed into a resulting seven-factor model. In developing the multidimensional measure of servant leadership, they concluded that “in validating this new measure, servant leadership was revealed to be a significant predictor of subordinate organizational commitment, community citizenship behavior, and in-role performance.”

The 2008 work of Sendjaya, Sarros and Santora sought to develop and validate another multidimensional measure of servant leadership, which they named the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale. Their work developed a six-dimension measure which included voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental

spirituality, and transforming influence (407-408). Sendjaya et al. posited that other measures fail to include spirituality and morality-ethics and stated that “these omissions are puzzling, as without its spiritual and moral-ethical emphasis, there is nothing unique or new about servant leadership that has not been addressed in existing leadership studies.” Dirk van Dierendonck and Inge Nuijten followed several years later in 2011 with a new multidimensional measure. They developed “a valid and reliable instrument to measure the essential elements of servant leadership” (249) with an eight-dimensional measure of thirty items with the eight dimensions being “standing back, forgiveness, courage, empowerment, accountability, authenticity, humility, and stewardship.”

Also in 2011, Reed, Vidaver-Cohen, and Colwell introduced their Executive Servant Leadership Scale by identifying “55 items to measure key dimensions of servant leadership, modifying these items to target top executive behavior specifically” (423). The resulting study revealed “five first-order factors reflecting essential servant leadership attributes identified by Greenleaf” (424) which include interpersonal support, building community, altruism, egalitarianism, and moral integrity (425).

Support of Servant Leadership

Servant leadership, rooted in an internal desire to serve the needs of others, is a relatively new leadership topic among researchers and practitioners, yet the concept is age-old. Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) wrote that the servant leader concept dates back two thousand years to the days of Jesus Christ. This foundation is where Greenleaf (1977) began when he introduced a model based upon his perception of how Jesus led as a person who placed others’ needs first. Leaders of this type place the interests of those they lead ahead of their own interests and seek to

help facilitate the growth and development of the people in order for them to succeed and develop into servant leaders themselves. They facilitate information sharing, cooperative decision making, and use delegation (Greenleaf, 1977) to foster an environment that stimulates this growth. While still in its infancy in public administration, the servant leader model is increasing in popularity and application. Spears (2002) wrote:

“The servant-leader concept continues to grow in its influence and impact. In fact, we have witnessed an unparalleled explosion of interest in and practice of servant-leadership during the past decade. In many ways, it can be said that the times are only now beginning to catch up with Robert Greenleaf’s visionary call to servant-leadership” (Spears 2002, 1).

The early 1900s brought about a management revolution as the machine technology and the industrial age spawned and then exploded. Many workers were in plants and factories whose main goal was production. As competition among these facilities increased, so did the need and desire of the management to increase the productivity of the workers. In 1911, Frederick Taylor brought a scientific application to management with his study on workers and production. Taylor’s “scientific management” was the result of years of intricate study in how people operated in environments such as assembly lines and production factories. Taylor believed everything could be reduced into the most simple and yet highly efficient actions, therefore producing the greatest output with the lowest effort. This management outlook saw the human being as simply another piece of equipment which could operate at peak efficiency when tuned (Shafritz and Hyde 2007).

The Hawthorne Experiments, which began in 1927 by Elton Mayo, brought another view

into play concerning assembly workers. These experiments were designed to show that workers would increase productivity, work harder, and be extremely efficient if they believed that their work was being monitored (Fry and Raadschelders 2008). Contrary to these expectations, the experiments indicated that the workers were not affected by this variable. Instead, the workers' productivity was related to several human components such as relationships with co-workers, rewards, and peer pressure. Later studies and examinations of the Hawthorne study revealed that the study itself was flawed, but it did bring to light the humanistic side of workers and how they can be positively and negatively affected by management (Fry and Raadschelders, 2008).

New leadership styles would later be developed from the idea that people are not machines and do not respond as such. The term "manager" carries with it an understanding of control, and the act of managing includes both animate and inanimate subjects. The term "leader" connotes participation and cooperation, and only animate things can be led. When researchers began to study leadership versus management as the best way to increase productivity and job satisfaction, it opened an avenue to a plethora of leadership titles. Among the most studied were transactional and transformational leadership, with servant leadership beginning to be developed and researched by academicians and practitioners alike. These three leadership styles, although different, have several aspects in common.

Servant leadership has become recognized as a leadership style of its own, set apart from even transformational leadership as quantitative and qualitative researchers have found support for the notion that servant leadership is in fact different. Parolini, Patterson, and Winston (2009) sought to "relate the first empirical investigation distinguishing between the two leaders [transformational and servant]" (274) whereby they found "empirical evidence to support that five key discriminate items distinguish between the two leaders" (288). Schneider and George

(2011) also found a difference in the influence that the two leadership styles had on volunteers. They wrote, “Our research has shown that while transformational leadership and servant leadership are related constructs, servant leadership may be uniquely suited to the management challenges of volunteer organizations” (74). Additionally, Liden et al. (2014) found “that the process by which servant leadership impacts followers is through a serving culture which differs from other approaches to leadership” (1445).

Servant leadership has become a desirable form of leadership, and the literature is beginning to support this notion. In recent years there has been an uptick in the amount of literature discussing servant leadership and its benefits. Authors such as Stone (2002), Barbuto (2011), Spears (2004), Sendjaya (2010), and Liden (2014) continue to work in this arena, developing new and supportive research for the benefits of servant leadership. Others, such as Eicher-Catt (2005), disagree with the majority of the literature and take the stance in opposition to the seemingly endless positive attributes of the leadership style. Eicher-Catt wrote, “S-L [servant leadership] does not begin to highlight the creative potential inherent within organizational discourse that aims to capture genuine ethical stance. In other words, S-L does not articulate a leadership ethic that might be spontaneously produced through ongoing communicative deliberations with others” (23).

Liden et al. (2014) wrote in support of their seven-dimensional construct, which indicated that there is “a positive relationship between followers’ perceptions of their formal leader’s servant leadership behaviors and their reports of the degree to which everyone employed within their store focuses on serving others” (1445). Hunter et al. (2013) made several strongly supportive conclusions for their research. They wrote, “Arguably the most important contribution of our study is the empirical evidence it provides about the benefits of servant

leadership” and “support for beneficial effects of servant leadership on follower helping behavior, withdrawal, and sales behavior “ (328).

Among the various benefits researchers have accounted for concerning servant leadership, organizational commitment has been recognized. Walumba, Hartnell and Oke indicated this in their 2010 study: “We found that servant leadership influences OCB (organizational commitment behavior) through different mechanisms” and “our finding indicated that servant leadership was positively associated with OCB” (526). They further attested that their “findings suggest that servant leadership is instrumental in developing positive climates that can then be used to enhance employee citizenship behavior in organizations” (527). In a study of three successful Catholic parishes, Ebener and O’Connell (2010) recognized that “servant leaders encourage people to go above and beyond their own immediate interests by performing organizational citizenship behaviors” (315) and that “researchers know very little about how servant leader’s behaviors work and how they might interact with organizational citizenship behaviors” (315). Their study found that “if leaders place themselves in humble service to their organization, recognize the gifts and talents of others, and call them forth through empowering actions, then the people will respond with organizational citizenship behaviors by helping each other, taking initiative, participating in various activities, and taking responsibility to continuously develop themselves as potential leaders of their organizations” (332).

Hoveida, Salari, and Asemi (2011) had similar findings in a university employee study in which the results showed “that there is a significant relationship among the characteristics of SL (servant leadership) and OC (organizational commitment)” (507). Testing the viability of servant leadership within a high-performing organization allowed researchers to see whether or not this leadership style could, in fact, work in such a competitive environment. Melchar and Bosco

(2010) conducted survey research within three high-performing for-profit organizations with the survey instrument developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006). This research led them to assert that the “success these servant leaders have achieved in a for-profit, demanding environment suggests this leadership style is viable for adoption by other firms” (74). In discussion, the authors relayed how servant leadership can be effective and sustaining, as their results “support the contention that the modeling of servant leadership by strategic level managers can create an organizational culture in which servant leaders develop among lower-level managers. Servant leadership can provide a successful alternative to other leadership styles such as autocratic, performance-maintenance, transactional, or transformational” (84). Confirming the success of servant leadership within the high-performance organization, they wrote, “Clearly, servant leaders can be successful in a competitive, for-profit, service organization” (85).

Servant leadership has seen a documented success in other professional fields, such as those of medicine and education (Waal and Sirvo, 2012; Garber et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2007) as well as in non-profit organizations (Schneider and George, 2011). In the Garber et al. study in 2009, researchers looked at the relationship between collaborative efforts of doctors and nurses and their self-perception of servant leadership characteristics. The researchers wrote that it “is interesting to note that the self-perceptions of residents as to whether they consider themselves as servant leaders and how they view organizational leadership are both very positive”.

Waal and Servo (2012) refuted the claim that there is a link between servant leadership and organizational performance, citing a lack of empirical evidence to substantiate the claim. “SL (servant leadership) seems to have more influence on the HPO (high performance organization) factors when the formal leader is behaving as a servant leader, than when the direct leader is behaving as a servant leader.” Although they found “no direct link between the SL

factors and organizational performance,” they did accept that “SL can be used to specifically improve the quality of formal leaders by teaching them to be more attuned to employees. This will help the organization create better managers, which in turn will help create an HPO as these managers will be better able to improve on the HPO factors” (Waal and Servo, 2012).

In the work of Taylor et al. in 2007, they did find that “principals identified as servant leaders were rated significantly higher by their teachers” in five leadership areas.

“From the overall results it may be concluded that servant leaders, as identified using the SASLP, are perceived by their teachers as more effective leaders in the areas of challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modelling the way and encouraging the heart. Additionally, it may be concluded that the style of servant leadership occurs across a myriad of personal and professional characteristics” (Taylor et al., 2007).

Taylor et al. (2007) went on to conclude that “if servant leadership is relevant and an effective means of leadership, as indicated by the results of this research, educational leadership programmes (sic) should be adapted to include the study and practical application of the principles and practices of servant leadership.”

Hypothesis and Research Expectations

I initially developed my hypothesis and research expectations from my years of law enforcement supervision. Having performed supervision in every level, including chief (CEO), I had the unique opportunity to experience and interact with law enforcement supervision over the course of several years. I also realized that the leadership style that I had formed personally was actually recognized by the name of servant leadership. Studying leadership in general solidified

my interest in leadership, but it also strengthened my understanding of other leadership styles and how leaders develop those styles. This study required the study of the people being led as well in order to understand the relationship and dynamics of leadership style. It helped me to better understand the overall effectiveness of the leadership style in actual use rather than in theory.

From my own experience and my initial readings, I then began the literature review necessary for this research. The literature review helped to undergird my understanding of leadership and leadership development. The literature was especially helpful in guiding the hypothesis development, as it became clear that while servant leadership had many positive attributes overall, the desirable attributes of servant leadership were especially manifested in the professions generally referred to as service professions. The literature review did not culminate in a sufficient amount of research directly related to servant leadership effectiveness in law enforcement, but the available literature that was reviewed was encouraging.

As the hypothesis was developed from my experience and the insight from the literature review I began to narrow the focus of this study. Therefore I generated the following hypotheses.

Based off of the servant leadership literature, we know that servant leaders tend to exhibit greater empathy and caring. However, as officers rise through the ranks their responsibilities are focused more on the office and organization and less on personal relationships with other officers. As such, one of two things are likely to happen. Either, officers who start with servant leader tendencies lose them as they rise through the ranks, or officers who exhibit less empathy and caring are more likely to be promoted. Thus we should expect to see that higher ranked officers will exhibit fewer characteristics related to servant leadership.

H1: There is a significant relationship between supervisors who exhibit servant leadership characteristics (DV) and their level/position (IV) within the agency.

1A: servant leadership characteristics (DV) will be displayed less frequently within the higher level/ranks (IV).

Job satisfaction is a difficult topic in law enforcement. Being among the lowest paid professionals, Police officers are also among the least respected and often times the most overworked. All these factors can have a negative effect on an officer's job satisfaction which can lead to overall low morale in the agency. Servant leadership characteristics tend to be intrinsic traits which lead a person to feel purpose as they carry out their daily responsibilities of leading others. This self-fulfillment leads to job satisfaction.

H2: There is a significant relationship between supervisors who exhibit SL attributes (DV) and employee job satisfaction (IV).

As law enforcement evolves to meet the everchanging needs of society, professionals are realizing the need to further educate police officers. As officers gain more of an understanding of differing cultures and viewpoints, they begin to internalize the traits of servant leadership. Current literature suggests that officers need training in the area of servant leadership to be better equipped in dealing with the varying needs of the community.

H3- Servant leadership characteristics (DV) will be exhibited more frequently by supervisors with higher education levels (IV).

Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methodology of this study. The study design, the population, and the sample are described. The instrument that was used to collect the data is described, as is the reliability and validity of the instrument. With this research I will discuss the generalizability as well as the possible limitations to the study.

Research Design

Survey research is used for this study because it is the most effective way to gather the data from individual respondents directly over a large geographical region. It is the best method to use when the researcher desires to gain a representative picture of the characteristics of a large group (Brown and Hale, 2014). A survey obtains information from a sample of people by means of self-report, meaning that participants respond to a series of questions. In this study, the researcher emailed a survey link for the survey instrument to recent graduates (2017, 2018, 2019) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy.

A descriptive survey is used because there is a predefined category of responses that the respondent must choose from, thus providing statistically inferable data. This allows the researcher to measure the significance of the results. This design was chosen to meet the objectives of this study, and specifically to indicate what relationship rank has on servant leadership characteristics.

Population and Sample

The survey link was emailed to potential respondents through the use of Qualtrics and the servers maintained by Auburn University. I conducted the survey in two waves to two different groups of recipients. The first wave survey did not contain the questions of rank or job satisfaction. The second wave of recipients received the same survey, but with the addition of those two questions which were necessary for the additional data. The analysis of the data was conducted using both waves of survey respondents.

Participants selected were recent graduates of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy classes, sessions 273-278. This population was chosen because it consisted of sworn officers in supervisory positions. Utilizing this group of respondents allowed for the data to be collected from a variety of law enforcement agencies across the United States. These officers were of varying ranks, times in grades, ages, genders, races, and education levels.

Purposive sampling was used in order to reach a targeted sample. The targeted sample was used to reach a group with the specific characteristic of being a law enforcement supervisor. Wave one of the survey was sent to 660 potential participants, and wave two was sent to 613. Survey wave one was sent on October 7th of 2019, with a reminder emailed on October 14th, 2019. The second wave was conducted on December 10th of 2019 with the reminder emailed on January 13th, 2020. Of the combined 1,273 requests for participation, there were 259 responses that were sufficiently complete and therefore considered for analysis. This return provided a 26% response rate.

As part of the survey questionnaire, respondents were asked to provide data concerning their demographic information, as well as their agency jurisdiction types and agency sizes. They

were also asked to provide their current ranks or positions within their respective agencies. The data analysis program STATA was used for all data analysis calculations.

The respondents' demographic analysis showed that the majority of respondents were white (83%) males (91%) with a median age of 49 and an age range of 35 to 61. Educationally, only 2% remained at the high school/GED level, whereas 13% had some college but no degree, 47% possessed an associate's degree, 38% possessed a bachelor's degree, and 1% held a graduate degree of any kind.

A significant limitation of this study and the conclusions we can draw from it is a function of this sampling approach. While I did not realize in advance how homogenous the people who attend the FBI academy are, the demographics above support this fact. It is the case that most police officers in the country are white males, and thus it follows that most of the people who attend the FBI academy are therefore also white males. If it is the case that servant leadership characteristics are more or less prevalent depending upon race and gender, this is hard to tease out of these data because of how homogenous the sample is.

Data Collection Instrument

Permission was requested and received from Dr. John (Jay) Barbuto to use his Servant Leadership Questionnaire for this research. The survey is based on a Likert Scale with respondents given a scale of 0-4 of rate of frequency with the middle point being "sometimes." This questionnaire was selected because it is a validated survey that best tests several of the characteristics associated with servant leadership.

The five characteristics used were taken from the complete eleven dimensions identified by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) because they were "conceptually and empirically distinct." The

characteristics eliminated were found to be non-specific to servant leadership because they were common in other leadership styles. The full list of eleven characteristics consisted of calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building. Of those complete eleven characteristics, the five specifically measured by this survey were altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship.

For clarification, Barbuto and Wheeler (2011) defined these servant leadership characteristics within the context of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire. The definitions as provided by the authors are included below:

“Altruistic calling describes a leader’s deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in others’ lives.

Emotional healing describes a leader’s commitment to and skill in fostering spiritual recovery from hardship or trauma.

Wisdom can be understood as a combination of awareness of surroundings and anticipated consequences, similarly described by classic philosophers.

Persuasive mapping describes the extent that leaders use sound reasoning and mental frameworks.

Organizational stewardship describes the extent that leaders prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society through community development, programs, and outreach.” (Barbuto, J. and Wheeler, D, 2006)

Reliability and Validity

The survey instrument designed and tested by Barbuto and Wheeler (2011) was significantly tested and validated. The authors reported that the “self version of the subscales demonstrated reliabilities ranging from .68 to .87” and that “no opportunities for improving the reliability coefficient alphas for any of the subscales existed.” Furthermore, Barbuto and Wheeler wrote that “results indicated that self-reported servant leadership subscales correlated positively with each of the three positive outcome variables.”

Data Collection

The survey was produced and distributed via email with the use of Auburn University’s computer system. Specifically, this survey was conducted with the use of the program Qualtrics. Since each class has approximately 200 to 250 members from the United States, it required the use of six consecutive graduate class rosters to provide a sufficient sample size. The survey link was emailed to 1,273 potential respondents, which culminated in 259 responses used for the data analysis. All of the submitted responses were collected through the Qualtrics system located at Auburn University.

The completed responses were then downloaded from Qualtrics into an Excel spreadsheet to structure the data into a useable format required by the data analysis program Stata. Excel was used to codify the responses into a numerical format, and the data then uploaded to Stata for further analysis.

Data Analysis

Bivariate and multivariate analysis were used to measure the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variables. Bivariate analysis is used to find relationships between sets of two variables within data set. These tests included chi-squares and extensions, analysis of variance, t-tests, and pairwise correlations depending upon the level of measurement of the variables. Ordinary Least Squares regression is used to address non-spuriousness among the variables to analyze more than two variables simultaneously. Multicollinearity was a problem in some of the models, and as such I ran parallel models substituting some variables that were collinear.

A limitation in the data collection and study was apparent due to the homogenous sample that was used. Since the sample chosen was police supervisors from the United States the data was collected from mostly white males. As observed personally and through data from the United States Census Bureau (Census.gov) Law enforcement in general is comprised mostly of white males and therefore there should be an expectation that the survey sample would have mirrored this distribution.

Chapter 4 Research Findings

The previous chapters have outlined the background of servant leadership and leadership in general, as well as provided a review of the existing literature concerning the related topics. The literature specific to servant leadership in regard to law enforcement was very limited when I was conducting my research. Consequently, I used literature and studies pertaining to servant leadership within other forms of service-oriented professions to help undergird the framework of servant leadership and law enforcement. Because law enforcement is similarly service-oriented, the professional areas of education, medicine, and the management of non-profit organizations provided literature comparable in nature to that of leadership in law enforcement.

The literature review supported my expectations in two areas. Firstly, I expected servant leadership to be a leadership style well suited for the area of law enforcement. Through education and training as well as my experience as a law enforcement supervisor, I am fully aware of the difficulties and problems that face supervisors in modern day policing. Studies in servant leadership show promise in addressing issues related to morale, short staffing and community relationship breakdowns.

Secondly, I expected the literature to indicate that servant leadership has positive effects on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Overall, there were few studies found in opposition to the positive effects that servant leadership can potentially bring to a law enforcement organization.

The purpose of this study was to determine what relationship rank has with respect to servant leadership characteristics. The study also looked for relationships between job satisfaction and the education levels of supervisors who exhibit servant leadership characteristics. The servant leadership characteristics provided by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006)

of Altruistic Calling, Emotional Healing, Wisdom, Persuasive Mapping, and Organizational Stewardship were used to indicate the overall strength of the servant leadership tendencies in the respondents. A survey and tabulation key, The Servant Leadership Questionnaire, was obtained from Jay Barbuto (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2011) and adapted for this survey. The adaptations were made to obtain biographical and agency information, as well as respondents' overall job satisfaction levels.

Chapter 4 is used to describe and understand the data that was collected from the survey research. The collected data was analyzed as described in the methodology from Chapter 3. This chapter includes descriptive analysis, which utilizes the demographic data to provide an understanding of the respondents. A bivariate and multivariate analysis is provided in order to determine relationships among the variables. These relationships are used to test the hypothesis, leading to the discussion of the findings at the end of the chapter.

Descriptive Analysis

As part of the survey questionnaire, respondents were asked to provide data concerning their demographic information as well as agency jurisdiction type and agency size. They were also asked to provide their current rank or position within their respective agency in the Wave 2 responses. The data analysis program STATA was used for all data analysis calculations.

The respondent's demographic analysis in Table 4.1 shows that the majority of respondents are white (83%) males (91%) with a median age of 49 and an age range of 35 to 61. Only 2% of respondents remained at the high school/GED level, whereas 13% had some college experience but no degree, 47% held an associate's degree, 38% held a bachelor's degree, and 1% held a graduate degree.

Insert Table 4.1 about here

The majority of the respondents were of the rank of Lieutenant (30%, wave two only) and Captain (29%, wave two only), with the ranks of Major/Colonel/Deputy Chief coming in third with 19% (wave two only). Municipalities comprise the largest percentage nationwide of government entities (United States Census), and therefore most (59%) of respondents are from municipal law enforcement agencies, with 24% of respondents working in county jurisdiction. The remaining 17% are state and federal agencies. These numbers were to be expected, as municipal and county agencies represent the greatest portion of law enforcement agencies within the United States.

The analysis of the respondents' demographics correlates with my expectations based on my experience in law enforcement. The majority of those in law enforcement are white males, and few of them have college degrees on any level. However, since these respondents were supervisors, it was expected that the education levels reported would be higher on average.

Insert table 4.2 about here

Table 4.3 represents the mean, median, and range of the scores provided to the pertinent questions regarding the five servant leadership characteristics measured by the survey. The data statistics related here are the combined data of respondent groups one and two. The individual leadership characteristics each had a possible score of 20, and the overall had a possible score of 100.

The five servant leadership characteristics used in this survey, as provided and defined by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), were analyzed for mean, median, and range.

The characteristic of Altruistic Calling “describes the leader’s deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in others’ lives.” In this characteristic, the mean was 15.0996, the median was 15, and the range was 9-20.

Emotional Healing had a mean of 13.00, a median of 13, and a range of 3-20. Emotional Healing “describes a leader’s commitment to and skill in fostering spiritual recovery from hardship or trauma.”

The characteristic of Wisdom had a mean of 15.7298, a median of 15, and a range of 10-20. Wisdom “can be understood as a combination of awareness of surroundings and anticipated consequences, similarly described by classic philosophers.”

Persuasive Mapping had a mean of 14.1486, a median of 14, and a range of 6-20. Persuasive Mapping describes “the extent that leaders use sound reasoning and mental frameworks.”

Organizational Stewardship had a mean of 16.6951, a median of 17, and a range of 10-20 and is described as “the extent that leaders prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society through community development, programs, and outreach.”

The overall combination of all five servant leadership characteristics had a mean of 74.111, a median of 74, and a range of 52-95.

Insert Table 4.3 about here

Bivariate Analysis

In the bivariate analysis of the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and the demographics, the characteristic of Wisdom indicated statistical significance. This

characteristic was significant in the demographic of race, as seen in Table 4.4. The results of an ANOVA was $F = 1.74$ with a p -value of less than 0.10.

Insert Table 4.4 about here

Table 4.5 represents the bivariate analysis of the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and the respondent's rank (position held), agency type (jurisdiction), and number of officers (agency size). The data analysis indicated that there were no relationships of any significance throughout the servant leadership characteristics with the exception of organizational stewardship and "agency type" ($\chi^2 = 40.183$ at $p < 0.10$ significance level).

A mean score was calculated for the survey results for each jurisdiction type, and their results were compared. The resulting means were as follows: the city mean was 16.81, the county mean was 16.47, the state mean was 16.90, and the federal mean was 16.33. All of the means were separated by less than 0.60 points.

Based on these results, dummy variables for each jurisdiction type were created, and then a regression was run with the leadership characteristic organizational stewardship. The regression results showed that there was no statistical significance present with any jurisdiction type.

Insert Table 4.5 about here

As part of the research, I conducted a bivariate analysis of the relationship between "job satisfaction" and respondents' demographics. Correlations were conducted for the independent demographic variables of "education", "year of birth", "number of officers" (agency size), and "current rank" with the dependent variable of "job satisfaction". The data showed a significant negative relationship with "year of birth" and "job satisfaction" of $r = -0.180$ at the $p < 0.05$ level and a significant relationship with "current rank" of $r = 0.191$, also at the $p < 0.05$ level.

The variable “education” had a correlation of $r = 0.048$, and “number of officers” had a correlation of $r = 0.005$, with neither variable having a significant relationship with “job satisfaction”.

Insert Table 4.6 about here

The bivariate analysis was conducted with the demographical information, and the independent variable “job satisfaction” and the variable “year of birth” had a negative relationship. As seen in Table 4.5, the significant negative relationship with “year of birth” and “job satisfaction” indicates that as the ages of respondents increased, so did the level of reported job satisfaction. Conversely, then, the younger respondents reported a decreased level of job satisfaction.

Table 4.5 also shows the significant relationship with the variables of rank and job satisfaction. The data analysis indicates that job satisfaction increases as the level of the respondents’ ranks increase. Therefore, the sergeants did not report the same level of job satisfaction as did the higher-ranking officers.

Table 4.7 lists the correlations between job satisfaction and the five servant leadership characteristics. In this analysis, there exists a significant relationship between job satisfaction and all five of the servant leadership characteristics plus the overall. There was a significant relationship with Altruistic Calling, Emotional Healing, and Wisdom at the $p < 0.10$ level, while Persuasive Mapping and Organizational Stewardship had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.01$ level. Overall had a relationship at the $p < 0.01$ level as well.

The information collected from the bivariate analysis indicates several important points regarding the respondents and their job satisfaction, as well as findings concerning job

satisfaction and the servant leadership characteristics. The correlations indicate that the higher job satisfaction levels were reported by the older, higher-ranking officers.

In any type of research the aspect of correlation and causation must be understood. In this research it can be shown that there are certain relationships among variables which help to better understand the question and then reject or accept the hypothesis. However, the relationships are correlations and not causations. Servant leadership is correlated with job satisfaction, but it would not be necessarily true that the servant leadership characteristics causes the job satisfaction level to be higher. The intrinsic values associated with the servant leadership characteristics may lead to higher job satisfaction levels, as well as job satisfaction may help promote servant leadership characteristics.

Ordinary Least Squares analysis was used because the dependent variable has a scale measurement. With the data analysis, a test for multicollinearity was conducted using auxiliary regression, and it was found to be present in the multivariate models between variable “years of experience” and “year of birth”. Therefore, the “year of birth” variable was deleted from the models.

Multivariate Analysis

A multivariate analysis of servant leadership characteristics was conducted with the demographic’s variables as the independent variables. In this test, the variable “years of experience” had a significant positive correlation at the $p < 0.10$ level with both the traits Altruistic Calling and Wisdom. There was no significant correlation among the other characteristics, nor was it significant overall. The variable “current rank” had significant positive correlations with Altruistic Calling and Organizational Stewardship at the $p < 0.05$ level, and

with Persuasive Mapping at the $p < 0.10$ level. There was no significant relationship overall. The variable “number of officers” had no significant relationship with any of the servant leadership characteristics.

The variable “white” had a significant negative relationship at the $p < 0.05$ with Altruistic Calling, Persuasive Mapping, and Organizational Stewardship, indicating that non-whites scored higher in these areas. There was also a significant positive correlation at the $p < 0.10$ level with the variable Wisdom. The overall resulted in a negative significant correlation at the $p < 0.05$ level. The “gender” variable had no significant correlations. This may be due to the low percentage of female respondents. The variable “education” had only one significant correlation with the characteristic Persuasive Mapping at the $p < 0.10$ level.

Insert Table 4.8 about here

Table 4.9 represents the multivariate analysis of the dependent variable “job satisfaction” with the demographic variables and the servant leadership characteristic variables. In this analysis, the servant leadership variables were placed in independently of each other and then together to create six (6) different models. This allowed the researcher to see which servant leadership characteristics had significant relationships independently of the others, and then to see how the servant leadership characteristics worked together.

Model 1 included the servant leadership variable Altruistic Calling, Model 2 included the servant leadership variable Emotional Healing, Model 3 included the servant leadership variable Wisdom, Model 4 included the servant leadership variable Persuasive Mapping, Model 5 included the variable Organizational Stewardship, and Model 6 included all five of the servant leadership characteristics.

With the independent variable “years of experience,” there were no relationships of any significance across the models. Variable “current rank” had significant relationships at the $p < 0.10$ level in Model 2 and Model 4. Variable “number of officers” had significant negative relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level in Model 1 and Model 6. The variable “white” had significant relationships across all six models with Model 3 having the significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level, and each of the other remaining models had significant relationships at the $p < 0.10$ level. There were no significant relationships across the models in either variable “gender” or “education.”

In Model 1 the servant leadership characteristic “Altruistic Calling” had no significant relationship. In Model 2 the servant leadership characteristic “Emotional Healing” had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.10$ level. In Model 3 the servant leadership characteristic of “Wisdom” had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.10$ level. Model 4 included the servant leadership characteristic “Persuasive Mapping” which had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level. Model 5 included the servant leadership characteristic “Organizational Stewardship” had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level. Overall Model 6 showed a significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Insert Table 4.9 about here

Discussion of Findings

In order to have the definitions of the servant leadership characteristics available and reiterated they are repeated here for reference:

“Altruistic calling describes a leader’s deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in others’ lives.

Emotional healing describes a leader's commitment to and skill in fostering spiritual recovery from hardship or trauma.

Wisdom can be understood as a combination of awareness of surroundings and anticipated consequences, similarly described by classic philosophers.

Persuasive mapping describes the extent that leaders use sound reasoning and mental frameworks.

Organizational stewardship describes the extent that leaders prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society through community development, programs, and outreach." (Barbuto, J. and Wheeler, D, 2006)

As discussed in earlier sections of this chapter, the demographics show that the majority of the law enforcement supervisors were white males. Therefore, the "race" variable in the demographic analysis did not contribute much to the direction and purpose of this study. However, the bivariate analysis of servant leadership characteristics with the demographics (Table 4.4) did result in one positive correlation of significance. The significant correlation was that of the characteristic "Wisdom" with "race" with $F= 1.74$ at the $p < 0.10$ level. The meaning of this correlation is unclear to me at this time, and therefore more research is necessary to explore this further.

The information provided from the data represented in Table 4.6 indicates that the variables "year of birth" and "current rank" are both correlated to job satisfaction. However, "year of birth" had a negative correlation demonstrating that as the age of the respondent increased, so did the reported job satisfaction level. When the relationship of the "current rank" variable with "job satisfaction" is read in conjunction with the "year of birth" variable and "job

satisfaction,” then I can infer that the correlation is similarly directional and that the higher levels of job satisfaction are reported by the officers in the higher ranks. The relationships depicted here met my expectation, as it has also been my experience that officers who progress in supervision tend to remain in law enforcement longer and that their levels of job satisfaction tend to be higher than officers with less experience.

The bivariate analysis of servant leadership characteristics with “rank,” “agency type,” and “number of officers” resulted in one significant correlation. The correlation of “Organizational Stewardship” and “agency type” provided a X^2 score of 40.183 with a probability level of $p < 0.10$. A regression was run on the individual agency types with the leadership characteristic of “Organizational Stewardship,” and no correlations of significance were noted. I believe that the original correlation could have been the result of the movement of law enforcement officers from one jurisdiction type to another. Many officers begin their law enforcement careers in a local police department or sheriff’s office, only to move into state or federal law enforcement agencies later in their career. This could account for the initial correlation, as so many supervisors have worked in multiple agencies throughout their careers. Certainly, more research would be necessary in this area for definitive answers.

In the multivariate tests, there was a correlation with the variable “years of experience” with two of the servant leadership characteristics: Altruistic Calling and Wisdom. These two characteristics, by definition, would lend themselves to be more prevalent in supervisors with more years of experience. It has been my experience and is commonly noted that people in general mature as they age and gain experience within their field. The experience which law enforcement supervisors gain throughout the years should lead to an increase in both the desire to “make a positive difference in others’ lives” (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) and in wisdom. The

ability to “anticipate consequences” (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) is generally enhanced through experience.

The multivariate test showed a correlation of “rank” with the servant leadership characteristics of Altruistic Calling, Organizational Stewardship, and Persuasive Mapping. I would expect to find these qualities in a supervisor as a part of his or her main purpose within the agency. Supervisors are expected to lead, guide, and train those under their watch who have less experience. The ability to help others by making an influence on them, training them to make sound and fact-based decisions, and fostering a loyalty to the organization within them is essential. These servant leadership characteristics should be prevalent in law enforcement supervisors.

The relationship that the variable “education” has with Persuasive Mapping indicates to me that the attainment of an education has developed the “sound reasoning” abilities as discussed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006). Completion of an education beyond the minimum levels indicates a person’s ability to navigate through the sometimes rigorous requirements necessary to complete a degree program. These reasoning abilities are traits that successfully allow supervisors to make decisions and work through the complex issues they face every day.

In order to better test and understand the individual servant leadership characteristics’ relationships with “job satisfaction,” each characteristic was placed into a model individually as described earlier. All six models had a negative relationship with the variable “white,” indicating that the non-white respondents had stronger scores within each model. Since the number of non-white respondents was relatively low (17%), the reliability of these results is questionable and is therefore not discussed further. The low percentage of non-white participants is a weakness of this study, and additional research would be necessary to substantiate any of the correlations

indicated in Table 4.9. The next paragraphs discuss the relationships found between each of the six models with “job satisfaction” as the independent variable.

Model 1 included Altruistic Calling as the servant leadership characteristic. In this model, there was a negative relationship with the variable “number of officers,” indicating that job satisfaction levels decreased as the number of officers, or agency size, increased. As a researcher, I would conclude that supervisors from smaller agencies have increased levels of job satisfaction. My experience in law enforcement leads me to propose that as the size of an agency increases, there is a decrease in the personal involvement with the functions of the agency. Supervisors become less familiar with their officers, and the level of personal interaction between them disappears. This loss of connection on the individual level could certainly lead to a lesser degree of job satisfaction.

Model 2 included the servant leadership characteristic Emotional Healing. The multivariate analysis resulted in relationships with the dependent variable “job satisfaction” to “current rank” and Emotional Healing.

The first question guiding this study as related in Hypothesis 1 was the relationship between supervisors who exhibit servant leadership characteristics and their rank or position level within the agency. The initial bivariate analysis resulted in no significant correlations across the servant leadership characteristics with the variable “rank” (Table 4.5). Additionally, a multivariate analysis resulted in a significant positive relationship between “rank” and the characteristics of Altruistic Calling, Persuasive Mapping, and Organizational Stewardship. Emotional Healing and Wisdom did not have significant relationships with “rank.” Interestingly the Overall resulted in no significant relationship with “rank,” even though three of the five characteristics showed a significant positive relationship. Hypothesis 1 stated that “there is a

significant relationship between supervisors who exhibit servant leadership characteristics (DV) and their level/position (IV) within the agency.” The results discussed and pictured in Tables 4.5 and 4.8 indicate that Hypothesis 1 is not supported and therefore is rejected.

The second correlation conducted concerning job satisfaction specifically addressed the servant leadership characteristics. A correlation was run with the individual servant leadership characteristics with “job satisfaction” as the dependent variable. In this correlation, a significant correlation was found to exist with each of the five servant leadership characteristics and “overall,” which included all of the characteristics (Table 4.7). Altruistic Calling, Emotional Healing, and Wisdom each had a probability of $p < 0.10$, while Persuasive Mapping, Organizational Stewardship, and “overall” were each positively correlated with “job satisfaction” at the $p < 0.01$ level.

The multivariate analysis of the dependent variable “job satisfaction” confirmed these findings when each servant leadership characteristic was placed within its own model. In order to isolate each servant leadership characteristic from the others (models 1-5), a separate multivariate analysis was conducted for each. Model 6 represented all five servant leadership characteristics together, and then all six models were used in a multivariate analysis with “job satisfaction.”

Understandably, the correlation and multivariate findings were significant in the study, as they confirmed the second hypothesis. The second hypothesis was related to the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and the variable “job satisfaction.” Hypothesis 2 stated that “there is a significant relationship between supervisors who exhibit servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction.” Hypothesis 2 is strongly supported by the research data in that there was a significant relationship between each of the individual servant leadership

characteristics and job satisfaction, with the exception of Altruistic Calling. Furthermore, the overall relationship between all of the characteristics and job satisfaction was statistically significant, with a positive relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Hypothesis 3 was specifically used to address the question of education level as it pertains to servant leadership and servant leadership characteristics. Table 4.4 illustrates the bivariate analysis in which the variable “education” and the servant leadership characteristics were tested. The findings of the analysis showed that there was no statistically significant correlations with any of the five servant leadership characteristics.

In understanding and analyzing this result, I can theorize that since the population chosen consisted of supervisors in which 86% had no less than an associate’s degree and 39% had a bachelor’s degree or higher, there was not a significant enough number of respondents without a degree. This lack of dissimilar respondents did not allow for accurate analysis and should be explored in further research.

Table 4.1 Respondent demographics

	Respondent group one	Respondent group two	Overall
Gender			
Male	90% (97)	91% (132)	91% (229)
Female	10% (9)	9% (13)	9% (22)
	n=108	n=145	n=251
Year of Birth			
Range	1959-1985	1959-1985	1959-1985
Median	1972	1971	1971
Mean	1971.82	1971.71	1971.76
Education Level			
HS or GED	2% (2)	1% (2)	2% (4)
Some college but No degree	12% (12)	13% (18)	13% (30)
Associate Degree	50% (51)	44% (61)	47% (112)
Bachelor degree	36% (35)	40% (55)	38% (90)
Graduate Degree	1% (1)	1% (2)	1% (3)
	n=101	n=138	n=239
Race			
White	87% (93)	81% (118)	83% (211)
Black or African- American	3% (3)	6% (9)	5% (12)
Hispanic/Latino	6% (6)	6% (9)	6% (15)
Asian/Pacific Islander	2% (2)	2% (3)	2% (5)
Native American	1% (1)	1% (2)	1% (3)
Prefer not to respond	1% (1)	3% (4)	2% (5)
Multi-Racial	1% (1)	1% (1)	1% (2)
	n=107	n=146	n=253

Table 4.2 Respondent's rank and jurisdiction type

		Respondent group one	Respondent group two	Overall
Rank				
	None		3% (4)	
	Corporal		0% (0)	
	Sergeant		6% (9)	
	Lieutenant		30% (45)	
	Captain		29% (43)	
	Major/Colonel/Deputy Chief		19% (29)	
	Chief/Sheriff		13% (19)	
			n=149	
Jurisdiction Type				
	Municipal	56% (60)	61% (91)	59% (151)
	County	28% (30)	22% (33)	24% (63)
	State	10% (11)	13% (19)	12% (30)
	Federal	5% (5)	3% (4)	3% (9)
	Military	2% (2)	2% (3)	2% (5)
		n=108	n=150	n=258

Table 4.3 Servant leadership characteristics

		Respondent group one	Respondent group two	Combined
Altruistic Calling				
	Mean	15.3491	14.9172	15.0996
	Median	15	15	15
	Range	10-20	9-20	9-20
Emotional Healing				
	Mean	13.23	12.8252	13.00
	Median	13	13	13
	Range	7-20	3-20	3-20
Wisdom				
	Mean	16.0093	15.5143	15.7298
	Median	15	15	15
	Range	11-20	10-20	10-20
Persuasive Mapping				
	Mean	14.4904	13.9034	14.1486
	Median	14	14	14
	Range	9-20	6-20	6-20
Organizational Stewardship				
	Mean	16.5922	16.7692	16.6951
	Median	17	17	17
	Range	11-20	10-20	10-20
Overall				
	Mean	74.870	75.856	74.111
	Median	74	75	74
	Range	52-95	58-94	52-95

Table 4.4 Bivariate analysis of relationship between servant leadership and demographics

	Altruistic Calling	Emotional Healing	Wisdom	Persuasive Mapping	Organizational Stewardship	Overall
Gender	F=16.00	F=52.23	F=9.89	F=19.72	F=20.72	F=1.20
Year of Birth	r= -0.034	r= 0.026	r= -0.044	r= -0.057	r= -0.025	r=-0.026
Education	r=1.02	r=1.20	r=0.92	r=1.37	r=0.58	r=0.074
HS or GED	F=2.09	F=5.17	F=0.77	F=1.11	F=0.89	F=0.68
Any College	F=0.98	F=1.19	F=0.95	F=1.04	F=0.83	F=1.31
Graduate	F=0.67	F=0.78	F=0.46	F=2.01	F=0.57	F=0.64
Race	F=1.44	F=1.14	F=1.74*	F=1.39	F=0.79	F=1.16

* p < 0.10
 ** p < 0.05
 *** p < 0.01

Table 4.5 Bivariate analysis of relationship between servant leadership and rank, agency type and number of officers

	Altruistic Calling	Emotional Healing	Wisdom	Persuasive Mapping	Organizational Stewardship
Current Rank	X ² =54.309	X ² =74.4528	X ² =54.012	X ² =79.211	X ² =37.566
Agency Type	X ² =38.785	X ² =45.260	X ² =27.543	X ² =39.146	X ² =40.183*
Number of Officers	r=-0.04	r=-0.008	r=-0.047	r=0.020	r=-0.059

n=249

* p < 0.10

** p < 0.05

*** p < 0.01

Table 4.6 Bivariate analysis of relationship between job satisfaction and demographics

		Job Satisfaction
Correlations		
	Education	r=0.048
	Year of Birth	r=-0.180**
	Number of officers	r=-0.005
	Current Rank	r=0.191**
Anova Tests		
	Gender	F=2.23***
	Race	F=2.10***
*	p < 0.10	
**	p < 0.05	
***	p < 0.01	

Table 4.7 Correlation between job satisfaction and servant leadership characteristics

	Job Satisfaction
Altruistic Calling	r=0.146*
Emotional Healing	r=0.133*
Wisdom	r=0.134*
Persuasive Mapping	r=0.199***
Organizational Stewardship	r=0.204***
Overall	r=0.218***

* p < 0.10
 ** p < 0.05
 *** p < 0.01

Table 4.8 Multivariate Analysis of Servant Leadership Characteristics

	Altruistic	Emotional	Wisdom	Persuasive	Organizational	Overall
Years Experience	0.049* (.031)	-.047 (0.044)	0.042* (0.031)	0.021 (0.037)	0.312 (0.0350)	0.108 (0.129)
Current Rank	0.246** (0.151)	-0.185 (0.225)	0.118 (0.160)	0.288* (0.185)	0.307** (0.172)	0.680 (0.647)
Number Officers	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-6.17e07 (0.000)	-4.38e-06 (0.000)	0.000 (0.001)
White	-0.8325** (0.491)	-0.085 (0.715)	0.711* (0.507)	-1.181** (0.593)	-1.096** (0.567)	-3.847** (2.121)
Gender	-0.289 (0.675)	1.082 (0.990)	0.764 (0.703)	-0.296 (0.838)	-0.785 (0.751)	0.806 (2.963)
Education	0.152 (0.186)	0.270 (0.267)	-0.159 (0.191)	0.307* (0.267)	-0.087 (0.214)	0.753 (0.802)
Constant	13.783*** (1.325)	11.866*** (1.989)	13.846*** (1.429)	12.558*** (1.665)	17.365*** (1.524)	69.361*** (5.962)
n=	141	139	136	141	139	122
Adj R ² =	0.036	-0.010	-0.000	0.031	0.026	0.019

* p < 0.10 using a one-tailed test

** p < 0.05 using a one-tailed test

*** p < 0.01 using a one-tailed test

Table 4.9 Multivariate Analysis of Job Satisfaction

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Years Experience	0.184 (0.201)	0.233 0.192	0.174 (0.196)	0.163 (0.196)	0.123 (0.198)	0.223 (0.202)
Current Rank	1.039 (0.966)	1.512* (0.981)	1.260 (0.994)	1.290* (0.976)	1.004 (0.985)	0.781 1.020
Number Officers	-0.002** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001** (0.001)
White	-4.662* (3.148)	-4.629* (3.153)	-5.721** (3.209)	-4.613* 3.203	-5.344* (3.328)	-4.601* (3.374)
Gender	4.955 (4.289)	2.989 (4.321)	2.152 (4.384)	2.808 (4.394)	3.759 (4.289)	3.599 (4.648)
Education	0.051 (1.182)	0.314 (1.169)	0.183 (1.191)	0.313 (1.198)	0.852 (1.218)	0.725 1.262
Altruistic	0.688 (0.549)	--	--	--	--	--
Emotional	--	0.608* (0.379)	--	--	--	--
Wisdom	--	--	0.831* (0.556)	--	--	--
Persuasive	--	--	--	0.7667** (0.456)	--	--
Organizational	--	--	--	--	0.965** (0.498)	--
Overall	--	--	--	--	--	0.277** (0.146)
Constant	64.079*** (11.310)	64.267*** (9.777)	63.027*** (11.834)	63.316*** 10.470	56.694*** (12.288)	53.156*** (13.796)
n=	141	138	135	140	138	122
Adj R ² =	0.045	0.031	0.025	0.035	0.043	0.060

* p < 0.10 using a one-tailed test
 ** p < 0.05 using a one-tailed test
 *** p < 0.01 using a one-tailed test

Chapter 5: Conclusion, implications, weaknesses, and future research

The purpose of this research was to determine the relationship of servant leadership and law enforcement in several specific areas. I wanted to better understand the dynamics behind the theory of servant leadership and its relationship with supervisors in law enforcement. With that, the research was designed to evaluate the presence of the servant leadership characteristics of Altruistic Calling, Emotional Healing, Wisdom, Persuasive Mapping and Organizational Stewardship among police supervisors and the extent in which these characteristics exist. Also studied were education levels and the extent to which these levels affect the prevalence of the servant leadership characteristics. Lastly, I studied the relationship between the presence of servant leadership characteristics and the supervisors' job satisfaction levels.

For potential respondents to the survey, I selected recent graduates of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy. This academy conducts several classes per year that result in approximately two hundred graduates per class. The classes are comprised of supervisors in law enforcement from various agencies worldwide. I selected only those graduates from agencies within the United States in order to keep respondents more narrowly focused.

In order to conduct the research I utilized a survey, The Servant Leadership Questionnaire, obtained from Jay Barbuto and developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2011). The survey was adapted to obtain the demographic and job satisfaction levels of the participants. Once the survey was developed, Qualtrics was used to collect the data. The survey questions were built into Qualtrics and then an email list was entered for distribution. Qualtrics emailed the prospective participants to request their involvement in the study. All of their responses were tracked and tabulated anonymously to protect the respondents.

Demographics

The resulting data was then analyzed in a series of calculations providing correlations, bivariate analysis, and multivariate analysis through the analysis program Stata/IC by StataCorp, LLC. The results from the analysis was organized into several tables for discussion. Any significant correlations were indicated for ease of identification. The results of the analysis showed that the majority of the respondents were white males with a median age of forty-nine. All but 2% had education levels above high school or GED, with 38% possessing a bachelor's degree.

The majority of the respondents were the rank of Lieutenant (30% wave two only) and Captain (29% wave two only), with the group Major/Colonel/Deputy Chief comprising 19% (wave two only). Of the respondents 59% were currently working in a municipal setting and 24% were in the county jurisdiction setting

Bivariate Analysis

In the bivariate analysis of the servant leadership characteristics and the demographics only one characteristic, Wisdom, indicated a significance with the demographic "race" resulting in an ANOVA of $F = 1.74$ and a p-value of less than 0.10. The bivariate analysis of the relationships between the servant leadership characteristics with rank, agency type, and agency size had no relationships of significance with the exception of Organizational Stewardship and agency type with a $X^2 = 40.183$ at $p < 0.10$ significance level.

A bivariate analysis was conducted of the relationship between job satisfaction and the respondent's demographics. Correlations were conducted for the independent variable of "education", "year of birth", "number of officers", and "current rank". A significant negative relationship was noted between "year of birth" and "job satisfaction", $r = -0.180$ with $p < 0.05$

level, indicating that as the year of birth was lower, the job satisfaction was higher. The demographic of “rank” also had a significant relationship with “job satisfaction” of $r = 0.191$ with $p < 0.05$. The demographics of “education level” and “number of officers” also had correlations, but neither had a significant relationship with job satisfaction.

Multivariate Analysis

In the multivariate analysis the servant leadership characteristics were analyzed with the demographics variables as the independent variables. In this analysis the variable of “years of experience” had a positive correlation at the $p < 0.10$ level the traits of Altruistic Calling and Wisdom. There were no other significant correlations nor was it significant overall. The variable “current rank” had correlations with Altruistic Calling and Organizational Stewardship at the $p < 0.05$ level, and with Persuasive Mapping at the $p < 0.10$ level. The Overall did not have a significant relationship. The variable “number of officers” did not have any relationships of significance.

The variable “white” had significant negative relationships at the $p < 0.05$ level with Altruistic Calling, Persuasive Mapping and Organizational Stewardship. Having a negative relationship indicates that the non-white respondents scored better in these three areas. There was a correlation at the $p < 0.10$ level with Wisdom, and the Overall had a negative relationship at the $p < 0.05$. In recognizing one of the weaknesses in this study being overly homogeneous (low percentage of non-white respondents) the validity of these results is in question. The variable “education” was significantly correlated with Persuasive Mapping at the $p < 0.10$ level.

A multivariate analysis of the dependent variable “job satisfaction” with the demographic variables and the servant leadership characteristic variables was also conducted. In this analysis, the servant leadership variables were placed in independently of each other and then together to

create six (6) different models. This allowed the researcher to see which servant leadership characteristics had significant relationships independently of the others, and then to see how the servant leadership characteristics worked together.

Model 1 included the servant leadership variable Altruistic Calling, Model 2 included the servant leadership variable Emotional Healing, Model 3 included the servant leadership variable Wisdom, Model 4 included the servant leadership variable Persuasive Mapping, Model 5 included the variable Organizational Stewardship, and Model 6 included all five of the servant leadership characteristics.

With the independent variable “years of experience,” there were no relationships of any significance across the models. Variable “current rank” had significant relationships at the $p < 0.10$ level in Model 2 and Model 4. Variable “number of officers” had significant negative relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level in Model 1 and Model 6. The variable “white” had significant relationships across all six models with Model 3 having the significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level, and each of the other remaining models had significant relationships at the $p < 0.10$ level. There were no significant relationships across the models in either variable “gender” or “education.”

In Model 1 the servant leadership characteristic “Altruistic Calling” had no significant relationship. In Model 2 the servant leadership characteristic “Emotional Healing” had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.10$ level. In Model 3 the servant leadership characteristic of “Wisdom” had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.10$ level. Model 4 included the servant leadership characteristic “Persuasive Mapping” which had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level. Model 5 included the servant leadership characteristic “Organizational

Stewardship” which had a significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level. Overall Model 6 showed a significant relationship at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Implications

It became very apparent to me through my career in law enforcement that a significant change in leadership style was necessary. As agencies adapted to the evolving expectations of the communities they served, the officers and their supervisors within the agencies had to adapt as well. As I examined the differences among agencies that were excelling in this area, I related those findings to my own agency and the growth and success we were experiencing. Envisioning the change towards a much more respondent law enforcement agency was necessary for success on several levels.

Ultimately, I saw law enforcement as a service and the people we served as customers. With that, I began asking myself what we could do that would change the direction of the agency and incorporate change that was both beneficial and expected with a climate of community-oriented policing. It should be noted that portions of this research is speculative and based off a combination of the findings from the study and my own observations as a law enforcement officer.

The servant leadership characteristics of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping and organizational stewardship could positively impact police work by helping officers to look outside themselves to the needs of the community they are called to serve. As officers move up the ranks as supervisors, the characteristics will further enable them to look at the needs of the other officers and at the agency as a whole. Furthermore, these characteristics are human characteristics that appear to some extent within all persons regardless of race or gender. The results of this study should be able to be generalized across all races and

genders in spite of the homogenous sample used for this data collection. The limitations of the number of non-white and female representatives within the sample are also limitations of the profession of law enforcement as a whole.

I took note that the officers and supervisors who were effective in community policing were effective because they actually cared. They cared for the people within the community, they cared about the requests the community made of the agency, and they cared about the agency and its effectiveness in relating to the community it served. I also began to realize that this same attribute of caring was effective in leadership among supervisors, including myself. Those that we led did not really care what we knew until they knew how much we cared. This caring attribute had been, and continues to be, sorely missing among law enforcement personnel. As I mentioned in the introduction to the dissertation study, I began to develop this leadership style personally, not realizing that it was termed servant leadership. As I developed as a supervisor I continued to study leadership, specifically servant leadership, and it became apparent that the attributes associated with servant leadership were having a positive effect on those that were entrusted to my care.

One of the hypotheses developed for this study concerned the existence of the servant leadership characteristics among supervisors and the apparent lack or reduction of those characteristics as these supervisors continued to increase in rank. I hypothesized that the servant leadership characteristics would be more prevalent in the lower ranks than within the higher ranks. Contrary to my expectations, my research showed that this correlation did not exist. I believe that some of the weaknesses in this study, such as the homogeneous sample, contributed to these results.

One multivariate test showed a correlation of “rank” with the servant leadership characteristics of Altruistic Calling (desire to make a difference in other people’s lives), Organizational Stewardship (leaders preparing an organization to make a positive contribution), and Persuasive Mapping (leaders using sound reasoning). Although directionally I cannot associate these characteristics to a specific rank level or increase in scores based on rank, I can associate the existence of those three servant leadership characteristics with an agency’s ability to reach people both interdepartmentally and intra-departmentally through other supervisors. As the head of a modern law enforcement agency that focuses on servant leadership, I expect these characteristics from each of my supervisors, and I expect that in turn they will instill them in the people that they lead.

In order to better prepare for the future and to help adapt law enforcement for an ever changing environment, it is the administration’s responsibility to be visionary, flexible and knowledgeable concerning the best paths to take. Creating a path that enables current supervisors and future supervisors to be better prepared seems to be overly practical and yet commonly missed in application. Knowing that there is a correlation between “rank” and three of the five servant leadership characteristics (including Persuasive Mapping) lends credence to support developing these traits within the supervisors, and developing supervisors who possess these traits.

Experience and this research have both demonstrated that servant leadership characteristics can make a distinguishable difference in the approach taken in law enforcement towards solutions for community issues. The implication here being that if we can apply our understanding of servant leadership in law enforcement as an officer and supervisor development tool then we can help create a servant leadership environment within the department. An

environment that concentrates on empathy, understanding, loyalty and better decision making skills.

Agencies which focus on changing the culture of their departments to be more in-tune with their communities would benefit from the presence of decision makers with servant leadership characteristics. These supervisors and officers would be less likely to act impulsively and more likely to promote the agency's wellbeing. Clashes between the public and law enforcement over misuses of power are not only recent occurrences, but have been occurring throughout the history of policing. The riots of the late 1960s found their basis in the same problems that communities like Philadelphia, Minneapolis, and Louisville are currently experiencing. The disconnect between law enforcement and the public is substantial.

The lack of historical data and literature concerning servant leadership and law enforcement is perplexing. Seeing that law enforcement should be a field to which these characteristics are well suited, I find it hard to understand why it has not been more properly applied in hiring, promoting, and training. Neither my research nor anything from the literature review provided any insight as to the base existence of servant leadership characteristics. I wondered whether these characteristics were more innate in nature and developed through one's life experience and biological makeup, or if they could be taught and nurtured through training. My experience leads me to believe that the characteristics are part of a person's character and can therefore be further developed, but not taught. If an officer or supervisor does not already possess some of the defining characteristics of servant leadership, then these characteristics would be difficult or impossible to develop.

The relationship that the variable "education" has with Persuasive Mapping seems to fit in with real world experiences. Supervisors with higher education levels have developed better

reasoning abilities and therefore are more capable of working through complex situations efficiently and effectively. A common complaint recently associated with law enforcement is the concern over officer's decision-making processes and their intended outcome. Officers capable of making decisions can learn to make better decisions with proper training and mentoring. Addressing this concern in a proactive approach could include hiring and promoting officers with higher decision making skills. These decision making skills are again prevalent in officers with the Persuasive Mapping servant leadership attribute, therefore this study helps to provide support to the idea of testing for servant leadership skills in hiring and promoting would help to reduce the concern of the public being served.

The second hypothesis concerned the existence of servant leadership characteristics in those supervisors with a higher level of job satisfaction. This hypothesis was supported in the research, and additional research is necessary to better understand the direction of this relationship. From my data and the way the questions were formulated, I cannot determine whether or not the servant leadership characteristics lead to job satisfaction or if in fact the job satisfaction leads to the existence of the characteristics. From my experience, I tend to believe the former. Either way, there is a positive correlation with the existence of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction. With higher levels of job satisfaction come the attributes of effectiveness, efficiency, caring, and longevity. Much of the leadership literature (Andrews and Boyne, 2010 and Rhys and Boyne, 2010 for example) indicated the importance of these traits for an organization to be successful.

Since this correlation exists in the research, I would like to see it better used in the application of several aspects in law enforcement, including hiring and promoting. A department wishing to move toward community-oriented policing, or policing with a purpose, should

consider implementing a screening of sorts that allows for the assessment of an individual's servant leadership characteristics, especially Organizational Stewardship and Persuasive Mapping. While the existence of these characteristics may not become a mandatory requirement in the hiring process, knowing that a candidate has these characteristics could be beneficial in the future years for retention, promotability, and overall health of the organization.

This correlation of job satisfaction and the servant leadership traits should also be built into an officer/supervisor development plan. Knowing an officers preference for training and assignment is one part of a development track that enables departments to best utilize its personnel through the officer's desires and strengths. Adding professional development in the servant leadership realm could increase the officers ability to perform his or her duties more empathetically, while simultaneously operating more efficiently.

Weaknesses and future research

There were several weaknesses and/or flaws in the research that I conducted, some of which I believe resulted in missed correlations and incomplete results. One such weakness concerned the structure of the question for the hypothesis of servant leadership characteristics existing among the differing levels or ranks. The survey questions posed to the recipients did not allow me to analyze the data in order to determine this. The questions should be structured to allow the information to show correlations at each of the varying ranks. Questions that could indicate the direction of causality would be beneficial as well.

A second weakness in the study was the overly homogenous group that was used to provide the responses. The respondents were selected because they were all supervisors in law enforcement in the United States, but this meant that the group was mostly comprised of white males. Data that could have provided additional insight or correlations was not gathered because

of the lack of non-white and female respondents. Additionally, as the respondents were all supervisors who had been selected for the National Academy, all but 2% of them had some college experience and 85% had either an associate's degree or a bachelor's degree. I believe that this led to the inability to have a correlation between servant leadership characteristics and education level. Further research should utilize a more diverse sample in order to be more inclusive of groups. Knowing that the law enforcement profession is heavily populated with white males the sample group should have been expanded.

Another weakness was exposed in evaluating the data that indicated the correlation between job satisfaction and the servant leadership characteristics. I was unable to determine the direction or causation of this correlation. I was able to conclude that they were correlated, but I was unable to determine if they possessed the characteristics because of the job satisfaction, or if they reported higher job satisfaction because of the servant leadership characteristics. This causality difference could have made an exceptional difference and led to more questions for additional research. Future research should ensure that the questions or the type of data collection allow for a better understand of causality in order to better define the effects of servant leadership

A final weakness in this study was that the researcher was a career law enforcement officer. Being in law enforcement for over thirty years could have led to confirmation bias. Future research may need to be conducted by someone not in the field of law enforcement to alleviate the bias.

This survey was based upon the respondents evaluating themselves in the questionnaire, and I believe that this method could also lead to a weakness in the study. Had the supervisors also been evaluated by the officers or their peers, their level of scoring in the servant leadership

characteristics may have been much different, and in fact lower. Humans have a tendency to be less critical of themselves and believe they are much better or more attuned to the needs of others than they truly are. Future research should collect responses from additional sources, such as subordinates and coworkers, in order to provide a more realistic and balanced evaluation of a person's leadership characteristics. I believe this additional information would have been much more insightful and therefore I am hopeful that this future research will be conducted.

In completing this study I was confronted with additional questions that came to light through the literature review, survey and analysis. Several areas of needed additional research were noted within the chapters and will be addressed here. Two such areas are directly related to what was identified as a weakness in this study. First was the low number of non-white participants. This low percentage of non-white participants led to a weakness in some of the correlations or non-correlational outcomes. Second was the high percentage of participants educated beyond the high school/GED level. This non-homogenous sample did not allow for enough variance in the participants and therefore may have led to negative results in some of the analysis. Additional research in the area of servant leadership among these two groups, or groups that are more dissimilar, is necessary in order to reveal the possibility of useful correlations.

For future research I would also recommend that the attributes being examined, the servant leadership characteristics, either use an external assessment or an assessment in addition to the self-scoring survey. I believe self-scoring led to higher cumulative scores on the scale and may not be a true representation of the leader's actual characteristics. Adding an outside assessment from peers or subordinates could help to balance and normalize the scores and provide a more accurate review of the individual's possession of the characteristics.

I believe it is important to better study the possible correlations between education and servant leadership characteristics as well. Mentioned earlier was the weakness and recommendation of using a more diverse study group, but here I believe that there needs to be additional research concerning the correlation with higher education and servant leadership characteristics. The literature review revealed studies in which higher education was linked to officers with better ethics and abilities including empathy and tolerance for diversity of other cultures.

Lastly I would hope to see future research concerning the servant leadership culture of an agency and any correlations with the number of use of force cases and complaints that it experiences. With the future of the relationships between law enforcement and community uncertain and in danger of total collapse, a servant leadership culture could be the solution.

Conclusion

In the midst of the turmoil gripping the United States, all law enforcement executives are searching for solutions to historical and contemporary problems. Having worked in this executive law enforcement world I can truly believe that I've seen what a servant leadership culture within the agency can provide their communities. Agencies stand on their policies, procedures and vision statements concerning their commitment to safety, integrity and service to community. Unfortunately words not placed into action are merely words. Regardless of these policies and procedures, what an agency actually does or allows its officers to do is it's culture, and culture is not changed with additional regulation. Culture can be changed with an altered mindset, training, and understanding.

The tragic cases like Breonna Taylor and George Floyd do not have to happen. When they do happen the agencies need to have solid relationships with the communities and interests

groups. Strong relationships that are already established before a crisis so that the trust is already there. The possibility exists that the associated agencies to these cases could be so uncaring and uninterested in the needs and concerns of their communities that their culture allowed these deaths. I would propose that instilling a servant leadership mentality and culture within a department would be greatly beneficial.

This study has shown some strengths in the servant leadership characteristics that could be directly related to culture issues that can in turn result in bad relationships, poor decisions, and dangerous consequences. Job satisfaction has been shown to be correlated with servant leadership characteristics. Job satisfaction, or the lack thereof, leads to apathy and discontent. In law enforcement there is no place for an apathetic mindset. I believe that enough empirical and qualitative data exists to show the important potential that a servant leader mentality and culture could bring to law enforcement. So many of the issues facing law enforcement; morale, discontent, apathy, unethical behavior, even malice could all be greatly reduced by agencies instilling servant leadership, and its associated qualities, within all the ranks.

In developing a servant leader led organization, a law enforcement agency could possess the properly equipped personnel who would be better trained and prepared to address today's societal issues. Developing a more meaningful relationships both internally and with the population as a whole could lead to officer longevity. These officers would be more committed to the concerns of their personnel and therefore to the citizens.

References

- Amagoh, Francis. 2009. "Leadership Development and Leadership Effectiveness." *Management Decision* 47 (6): 989–99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740910966695>.
- Andrews, Rhys and Boyne, George A. Capacity, leadership, and organizational performance: Testing the black box model of public management. 2010. *Public Administration Review* Vol. 70, No. 3: 443-454.
- Barbuto, John E. and Wheeler, Daniel. 2006. "Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership". *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 31, Issue 3: 300
- Bass, B.M. 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Caldwell, Cam, Dixon, Rolf, Floyd, Larry, Chaudoin, Joe, Post, Jonathan and Cheokas, Gaynor. 2012. Transformative leadership: achieving unparalleled excellence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109: 174-187.
- Brown, Mitchell and Hale, Kathleen. 2014. *Applied research methods in public and nonprofit organizations*.
- Catt-Eicher, Deborah. The myth of servant-leadership: a feminist perspective. *Woman and Language* Vol. 28, No. 1: 17-25.
- Chatbury, A., Beaty, D. and Kriek, H.S.. 2011. Servant leadership, trust and implications for the "base-of-the-pyramid" segment in South Africa. *South African Journal of Business Management* Vol42, No. 4: 57-61.
- Currie, Graeme and Lockett, Andy. 2007. A critique of transformational leadership: moral, professional and contingent dimensions of leadership within public services organizations. *Human relations*, Vol. 60, No. 2: 341-370.

Dayaram, Kandy. Leadership and vision: evolving strategies. 2010. SCMS Journal of Indian Management. January-March; 20

Ebener, Dan and O'Connell. How might servant leadership work? 2010. Nonprofit Management & Leadership Vol. 20, No. 3:315-335.

Eberlin, Richard and Tatum, B. Charles. 2008. Making just decisions: organizational justice, decision making, and leadership. Management Decision, Vol. 46, No. 2: 310-329.

Eddy, Erik, Lorenzet, Steven and Mastrangelo, Angelo. Personal and professional leadership in a government agency. 2008. Leadership & Organizational Development Journal Vol. 29, No. 5: 412-426.

Eeden, Rene, Cilliers, Frans and Deventer, Vasi van. Leadership styles and associated personality traits: support for the conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. South African Journal of Psychology 38: 253-267.

Eicher-Catt, Deborah. The myth of servant-leadership: a feminist perspective. ??? . woman and Language Vol. 28, No. 1: 17-25.

Ekaterini, Galanou. The impact of leadership styles on four variables of executives. 2010. International Journal of Business and Management Vol. 5, No. 6: 3- .

Erwin, Dennis. Changing organizational performance: examining the change process. 2009. Hospital Topics: Research and Perspectives on Healthcare Vol. 87, No. 3: 28-40.

Fry, Louis and Cohen, Melanie. Spiritual leadership as a paradigm for organizational transformation and recovery from extended work hour cultures. 2009. Journal of Business Ethics 84: 265-278.

Fry, Brian R. and Raadschelders. 2008. Mastering public administration: from Max Weber to Dwight Waldo. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Gadot-Vigoda, Eran and Beerli, Itai. Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in public administration: the power of leadership and the cost of organizational politics. 2011. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* Vol. 22:573-596.

Garber, Jeammie, Madigan, Elizabeth, Click, Elizabeth and Fitzpatrick, Joyce. 2009. Attitudes towards collaboration and servant leadership among nurses, physicians and residents. *Journal of Interprofessional Care* Vol. 23, No. 4: 331-340.

Gardner, William, Coglisier, Claudia, Davis, Kelly and Dickens, Matthew. Authentic leadership: a review of the literature and research agenda. 2011. *The Leadership Quarterly* 22: 1120-1145.

Giberson, Tomas, Resick, Christian, Dicken, Marcus, Mitchelson, Jaqueline, Rnadall, Kenneth and Clark, Malissa. Leadership ad organizational culture: linking CEO characteristics to culture values. 2009. *Journal of Business Psychology* 24: 123-137.

Greenleaf, R.K. 1977. Servant leadership: a journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Graham, J. (1991). Servant-leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2), 105-119.

Gunter, Helen and Fitzgerald, Tanya. The future of leadership research. 2008. *School Leadership and Management* Vol. 28, No. 3: 261-279.

Haakonson, Dorthe, Burton, Richard, Obel, Børge and Lauridsen, Jørgen. How failure to align organizational climate and leadership style affects performance. 2008. *Management Decision* Vol. 46, No. 3: 406-432.

Hawkins, John and Dulewicz, Victor. 2007. The relationship between performance as a leader and emotional intelligence, intellectual and managerial competences. *Journal of General Management*, vol. 33, No. 2: 57-78.

Hawkins, John and Dulewicz, Victor. 2009. Relationship between leadership style, and degree of change experienced, performance and follower commitment in policing. *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 9, No. 3: 251-270.

Hirtz, Paul, Murray, Susan and Riordan, Catherine. 2007. The effects of leadership on quality. *Engineering Management Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 1: 22-27.

Hoveida, Reza, Salari, Somaye and Asemi, Asefeh. 2011. A study on the relationship among servant leadership and the organizational commitment: a case study. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 3, No. 3: 499-509.

Huang, Chen-Mei, Hsu, Ping-Yu and Chiau, Wen-Lung. Perceptions of the impact of chief executive leadership style on organizational performance through successful enterprise resource planning. 2011. *Social Behavior and Personality* 39(7): 865-878.

Huberts, Leo, Kaptein, Muel and Lasthuizen, Karin. 2007. A study of the impact of three leadership styles on integrity violations committed by police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 30, No. 4: 587-607.

Keller, Jonathan and Yang, Yi. Leadership style, decision context, and the poliheuristic theory of decision making: an experimental analysis. 2008. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* Vol. 52, No. 5: 687-712.

Kivipõld, Kurmet and Vadi, Maaja. A measure tool for the evaluation of organizational leadership capability. 2010. *Baltic Journal of Management* Vol. 5. No. 1: 118-136.

Kohn, Alfie. 1993. *Punished by rewards*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company

Kool, Marjolein and van Dierendonck. 2012. Servant leadership and commitment to change, the mediating role of justice and optimism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* Vol 25, No. 3: 422-433

Korkmaz, Mehmet. The effects of leadership styles on organizational health. 2007. *Educational Research Quarterly* Vol. 30.3: 22-54.

Joseph, Errol and Winston, Bruce. 2005. A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal* Vol. 26, No.1: 6-22.

Leroy, Hannes and Palanski, Michael. Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. 2012. *Journal of Business Ethics* 107:255-264.

Liden, Robert, Wayne, Sandy, Liao and Meuser, Jeremy. 2014. Servant leadership and serving culture: influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal* Vol 57, No. 5: 1434-1452.

Liden, Robert, Wayne, Sandy, Zhao, Hao and Henderson, David. 2008. Servant leadership: development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly* 19: 161-177.

Luckcock, Tim. Spiritual intelligence in leadership development. 2008. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* Vol. 36(3): 373-391.

Madlock, Paul. The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. 2008. *Journal of Business Communication* Vol 45. No. 1: 61-78.

Maslow, A. H. 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50: 370-396.

Mayer, David, Bardes, Mary and Piccolo, Ronald. 2008. Do servant-leaders help to satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* Vol. 17, No. 2: 180-197.

Melchar, David and Bosco, Susan. 2010. Achieving high organization performance through servant leadership. *The Journal of Business Inquiry* Vol. 9, No.1: 74-88.

Melville, Wayne, Wallace, John and Bartley, Anthony. Individuals and leadership in an Australian secondary science department: a qualitative study. 2007. *Journal of Science Education & Technology* 16: 463-472.

Meyer, Marshall. Leadership and organizational structure. 1975. *The American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 81, No. 3: 514-542.

Mgbere, Osaro. Exploring the relationship between organizational culture, leadership styles and corporate performance: an overview. 2009. *Journal of Strategic Management Education* 5(3&4): 187-202.

Parolini, Jeanine, Patterson, Katherine and Winston, Bruce. 2009. Distinguishing between transformational and servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* Vol. 30, No. 3: 274-291.

Prieto, Leon. Proactive personality and entrepreneurial leadership: exploring the moderating role of organizational identification and political skill. 2010. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal* Vol. 16. No. 2: 107-121.

Pekerti, A and Sendjaya, S. 2010. Exploring servant leadership across cultures: comparative study in Australia and Indonesia. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* Vol. 21, No. 5: 54-780.

Peterson, Suzanne, Galvin, Benjamin and Lange, Donald. 2012. CEO servant leadership: exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology* Vol. 65: 565-596.

Pollard, William. The leader who serves. 1997. *Strategy & Leadership* Vol. 25, No. 5: 49-51.

Reed, Lora, Vidaver-Cohen, Deborah and Colwell, Scott. 2011. A new scale to measure executive servant leadership: development, analysis, and implications for research. *Journal of Business Ethics* 101: 415-434.

Rowold, Jens. Relationship between leadership behaviors and performance. 2011. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal* Vol. 32, No. 6: 628-647.

Rozuel, Cécile and Kakabadse, Nada. Ethics, spirituality and self: managerial perspective and leadership implications. 2010. *Business Ethics: A European Review* Vol. 19. No. 4: 423-436.

Ruiz, Pablo, Ruiz, Carmen and Martinez, Ricardo. Improving the “leader-follower” relationship: top manager or supervisor? The ethical leadership trickle-down effect on follower job response. 2011. *Journal of Business Ethics* 99:587-608.

Russell, Robert and Stone, A. Gregory. 2002. A review of servant leadership attributes: developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal* Vol. 23, No. 3: 145-157.

Sahertian, Pieter and Soetjipto, Budi Eko. 2011. Improving employee’s organizational commitment, self-efficacy,, ad organizational citizenship behavior through the implementation of task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership behavior. *The Business Review, Cambridge* Vol. 17, No. 2: 48-60.

Sanders, Joseph III, Hopkins and Willie, Geroy, Gary. 2003. From transactional to transcendental: toward an integrated theory of leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* Vol. 9: 21-31.

Schafer, Joseph. 2009. Developing effective leadership in policing: perils, pitfalls, and paths forward. *Policing: An international journal pf Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 32, No. 2: 238-260.

Schafer, Joseph. 2010. Effective leaders and leadership in policing: traits, assessment, development, and expansion. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 33, No. 4: 644-663.

Schneider, Sherry and Winnette, George. 2011. Servant leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* Vol. 32, No. 1: 60-77.

Searle, Travis and Barbuto Jr., John. 2011. Servant leadership, hope, and organizational virtuousness: a framework exploring positive micro and macro behaviors and performance impact. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* Vol. 18, No. 1: 107-117.

Seligman, Lester. The study of political leadership. 1950. *The American Political review* Vol. 44, No. 4: 904-915.

Sendjaya, Sen and Sarros, James. 2002. Servant leadership: its origin, development, an application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* Vol. 9: 57-64.

Sendjaya, Sen, Sarros, James and Santora, Joseph. 2008. Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies* Vol. 45, No. 2: 402-424.

Shafritz, Jay and Hyde, Albert. 2007. *Classics of public administration*. Boston: Thompson Higher Education.

Shapira, Reuven. 2001. Communal decline: the vanishing of high-moral servant leaders and the decay of democratic, high-trust Kibbutz cultures. *Sociology Inquiry* Vol. 71, No.1: 13-38.

Skaržauskienė, Aelita. Managing complexity: systems thinking as a catalyst of the organization performance. 2010. *Measuring Business Excellence* Vol. 14, No. 4: 49-64.

Skinner, B.F. 1935. Two types of conditioned reflex and a pseudo-type. *Journal of General Psychology*, 12:67-77.

Smith, Brien, Montagno, Ray and Kuzmenko, Tatiana. 2004. Transformational and servant leadership: content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* Vol. 10: 80-91.

Sosik, John and Dinger, Sandi. Relationships between leadership style and vision content: the moderating role of need for social approval, self-monitoring, and need for social power. 2007. *The Leadership Quarterly* 18:134-153.

Spears, Larry. 2002. Tracing the past, present and future of servant-leadership. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Tam, David, Chessum, Thomas and Leopold, Jay. The challenge of innovation and the high-performance team. 2012. *Herd* vol. 5, No. 3: 66-73.

Spinelli, Robert. 2006. The applicability of Bass's model of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership in the hospital administrative environment. *Hospital Topics: Research and Perspectives on Healthcare*, Vol. 84, No. 2: 11-18.

Starling, Grover. 2002. *Managing the public sector*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Inc

Stone, G. A., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349-361.

Taylor, Tim, Martin, Barbara, Hutchinson, Sandy and Jinks, Michael. 2007. Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. Vol. 10, No. 4: 401-419.

Tibus, Cheryl. 2010. Leadership beyond the glass ceiling: does ownership matter? *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, Vol 31, No. 8: 743-757.

Trottier, Tracey, Van Wart, Montgomery and Wang, XiaoHu. 2008. Examining the nature and significance of leadership in government organizations. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 68, No. 2: 319-333.

United States Census Bureau. Retrieved on-line at www.census.gov

van Dierendonck, Dirk. 2011. Servant leadership: a review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37, No. 4: 1228-1261.

van Dierendonck, Dirk and Nuijten, Inge. 2011, The servant leadership survey: development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26:249-267.

Deventer, Vasi, van Eden, René, and Cilliers, Frans. Leadership styles and associated personality traits: support for the conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *South African Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 38, No. 2: 253-267.

Vinod, Sangeetha and Sudhakar, B. 2011. Servant leadership: a unique art of leadership! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, Vol. 2, No. 11: 456-467.

Vito, Gennaro, Suresh, Geetha, and Richards, George. 2011. Emphasizing the servant in public service: the opinion of police managers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 34, No. 4: 674-686.

Vito, Gennaro and Higgins, George. 2010. Examining the validity of the leadership challenge inventory: the case for law enforcement. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, Vol. 12, No. 3: 3-5-319.

Vechio, Robert, Justin, Joseph and Pearce, Craig. 2008. The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81: 71-82.

Waal, André and Sirvo, Mirna. 2012. The relation between servant leadership, organizational performance, and the high-performance organization framework. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2: 173-190.

Wulumbwa, Fred, Avolio, Bruce, Gardner, William, Wernsing, Tara and Peterson, Suzanne. 2008. Authentic leadership: development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management* Vol. 34:89-126.

Walumba, Fred, Hartnell, Chad and Oke, Adegoke. 2010. Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: a cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95, No. 3: 517-529.

Walumba, Fred, Lawler, John and Avolio, Bruce. 2007. Leadership, individual differences, and work-related attitudes: a cross-culture investigation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* Vol. 56, No. 2: 212-230.

Webb, Kerry. Motivating peak performance: leadership behaviors that stimulate employee motivation and performance. 2007. *Christian Higher Education* Vol. 6:53-71.

Weinberger, Lisa Ann. Emotional intelligence, leadership style, and perceived leadership effectiveness. 2009. *Advances in Developing Human Resources* Vol.11, No. 6:747-772.

Whetsone, J. Thomas. Personalism and moral leadership: the servant leader with a transforming vision. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 11, No. 4: 385-392.

Williams, Brian. 2008. From the outside looking in: the praxis dilemma of linking psychopolitical validity with community policing. *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 2: 137-147.

Wong, Carol and Laschinger, Heather. Authentic leadership, performance, and job satisfaction: the mediating role of empowerment. 2013. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* Vol. 69, No. 4: 947-959.

Yiing, Lee and Ahmad, Kamarul. The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance. 2009. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal* Vol. 30, No. 1: 53-86.

Zoller, Heather and Fairhurst, Gail. Resistance leadership: the overlooked potential in critical organization and leadership studies. 2007. *Human Relations* Vol. 60, No. 9: 1331-1360

Zhu, Weichun, Riggio, Ronald, Avolio, Bruce and Sosok, John. 2011. The effect of leadership on follower moral identity: does transformational/transactional style make a difference? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 2: 150-163.

Appendices

Appendix A

SLQ Survey (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2011)

Please read each of the following statements and rate the frequency with which each is true:

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
0	1	2	3	4

- ___ 1. I put others' best interests ahead of my own
- ___ 2. I do everything I can to serve others
- ___ 3. I sacrifice my own interests to meet others' needs
- ___ 4. I go above and beyond the call of duty to meet others' needs
- ___ 5. I am someone that others turn to if they have a personal trauma
- ___ 6. I am good at helping others with their emotional issues
- ___ 7. I am talented at helping others to heal emotionally
- ___ 8. I am one that can help mend others' hard feelings
- ___ 9. I am alert to what's happening around me
- ___ 10. I am good at anticipating the consequences of decisions
- ___ 11. I have good awareness of what's going on around me
- ___ 12. I am in tune with what is happening around me
- ___ 13. I am usually good at anticipating what's going to happen in the organization
- ___ 14. I encourage others to offer compelling reasons for choices
- ___ 15. I encourage others to dream "big dreams" about the organization
- ___ 16. I encourage others to share the thinking behind their decisions
- ___ 17. I am good at helping others to share their thoughts
- ___ 18. I am good at gently persuading others without being pushy
- ___ 19. I believe that the organization needs to play a moral role in society
- ___ 20. I believe that our organization needs to function as a community
- ___ 21. I see the organization for its potential to contribute to society
- ___ 22. I encourage others to have a community spirit in the workplace
- ___ 23. I am preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future

Education: H.S. _____ Assoc. _____ B.S./B.A. _____ M.S./M.A. _____ Doctorate _____
 Gender: Male _____ Female _____
 Age: 18-25 _____ 26-30 _____ 31-35 _____ 36-40 _____ 41-50 _____ 51-60 _____
 61+ _____
 Race: African _____ Asian/Indian _____ Caucasian _____ Hispanic _____ Other _____

Servant Leadership Questionnaire Results
 SLQ Individual Scoring Sheet

Altruistic Calling: 1)____, 2)____, 3)____, 4)____, 1)_____ = _____ (Sum)
 Emotional Healing: 5)____, 6)____, 7)____, 8)____, 5) _____ = _____ (Sum)
 Wisdom: 9)____, 10)____, 11)____, 12)____, 13)_____ = _____ (Sum)
 Persuasive Mapping: 14)____, 15)____, 16)____, 17)____, 18)____ = _____ (Sum)
 Organizational Stewardship: 19)____, 20)____, 21)____, 22)____, 23)____ = _____ (Sum)

Servant Leadership Questionnaire Profile

Altruistic Calling	Emotional Healing	Wisdom	Persuasive Map	Org. Steward
25				25
20				20
15				15
10				10
5				5
0				0
Altruistic Calling	Emotional Healing	Wisdom	Persuasive Map	Org. Steward

Appendix B

Dear Participant:

My name is Brett Evans and I am a doctoral student at Auburn University, a retired police chief from Georgia, and a graduate of the FBI National Academy session #199. For my dissertation I am examining servant leadership among law enforcement supervisors. Because you are a supervisor in law enforcement within the United States and a recent graduate of the FBI National Academy, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached survey.

The following questionnaire will require approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. There is no compensation provided for responding, nor are there any known risks. In order to ensure that all information will remain anonymous, please do not include your name or other identifying information. Anonymous data from the project will be provided to my Auburn University advisor, Dr. Mitchell Brown. If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible and complete the questionnaires promptly. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in this research. The data collected will provide useful information regarding servant leadership in law enforcement. Completion of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in this study. If you require additional information or have questions, please contact me at the number listed below.

Sincerely,

Brett Evans PhD Candidate

Department of Political Science Auburn University
evansbl@tigermail.auburn.edu 478-256-2650

Dr. Mitchell Brown Professor Department of Political Science Auburn
University brown11@auburn.edu 334-844-6170

"The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from _____ to _____. Protocol #19-227, Evans"

Q1 I put others' interests ahead of my own

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q2 I do everything I can to serve others

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q3 I sacrifice my own interests to meet others' needs

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q4 I go above and beyond the call of duty to meet others' needs

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q5 I am someone that others turn to if they have a personal trauma

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q6 I am good at helping others with their emotional issues

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q7 I am talented at helping others to heal emotionally

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q8 I am one that can help mend others' hard feelings

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q9 I am alert to what's happening around me

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q10 I am good at anticipating the consequences of decisions

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q11 I have a good awareness of what's going on around me

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q12 I am in tune with what is happening around me

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q13 I am usually good at anticipating what's going to happen in the organization

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q14 I encourage others to offer compelling reasons for choices

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q17 I encourage others to dream "big dreams" about the organization

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q18 I encourage the others to share the thinking behind their decisions

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q19 I am good at helping others to share their thoughts

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q20 I am good at gently persuading others without being pushy

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q21 I believe that the organization needs to play a moral role in society

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q22 I believe that our organization needs to function as a community

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q23 I see the organization for its potential to contribute to society

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q24 I encourage others to have a community spirit in the workplace

- Never (2)
 - Rarely (3)
 - Sometimes (4)
 - Often (5)
 - Always (6)
-

Q25 I am preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future

- Never (1)
 - Rarely (2)
 - Sometimes (3)
 - Often (4)
 - Always (5)
-

Q32 The next set of questions pertain to your demographic characteristics. Please answer to the best of your ability.

Q29 How many years of experience do you have as a law enforcement executive in a supervisory position?

Q35 How satisfied are you with your job?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Click to write Choice 1 ()



Q27 What is your current area of jurisdiction?

- Municipal (1)
- County (2)
- State (3)
- Federal (4)
- Military (5)

Q30 What is the number of sworn officers or agents in your department or agency?

Q31 Are you male or female?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Prefer to not respond (4)

Q32 What year were you born?

Q33 What is the highest level of School you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- High School or GED (1)
 - Some college but no degree (2)
 - Associate degree (3)
 - Bachelor degree (4)
 - Graduate degree (5)
-

Q34 What is your race and/or ethnicity? (check all that apply)

- White (1)
 - Black or African-American (2)
 - Hispanic/Latino (3)
 - Asian/Pacific Islander (4)
 - Native American or American Indian (5)
 - Prefer not to respond (6)
 - Other (8)
-

Q34 What is your current rank (or equivalent, if none apply see the next question)?

- None (1)
- Corporal (2)
- Sergeant (3)
- Lieutenant (4)
- Captain (5)
- Major/Colonel/Deputy Chief (6)
- Chief/Sheriff (7)

Q36 If none of the choices for the previous question were applicable use the space to provide a description of your rank.

Appendix C

Variable Name	Variable Description	Variable Answer	Variable Coding	Level of Measurement
Survey Wave	Which survey is the respondent a part of	First Second	1 2	Nominal
Q1 others interests	I put others' interest ahead of my own	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q2 serve others	I do everything I can to serve others	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q3 sacrifice interests	I sacrifice my own interests to meet others' needs	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q4 call duty	I go above and beyond the call of duty to meet others' needs	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q5 others turn to	I am someone that others turn to if they have a personal trauma	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q6 emotional issues	I am good at helping others with the emotional issues	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q7 heal emotionally	I am talented at helping others to heal emotionally	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q8 hard feelings	I am one that can help mend others' hard feelings	Never Rarely Sometimes Often	0 1 2 3	Ordinal

		Always	4	
Q9 happening around me	I am alert to what is happening around me	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q10 anticipating consequences	I am good at anticipating the consequences of decisions	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q11 good awareness	I have a good awareness of what is going on around me	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q12 in tune	I am in tune with what is happening around me	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q13 good anticipating	I am usually good at anticipating what's going to happen in the organization	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q14 compelling reasons	I encourage others to offer compelling reasons for choices	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q15 dream big	I encourage others to dream "big dreams" about the organization	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q16 share thinking	I encourage the others to share the thinking behind their decisions	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q17 share thoughts	I am good at helping the others to share their thoughts	Never Rarely Sometimes Often	0 1 2 3	Ordinal

		Always	4	
Q18 gently persuading	I am good at gently persuading others without being pushy	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q19 play moral role	I believe that the organization needs to play a moral role in society	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q20 function community	I believe that the organization needs to function as a community	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q21 contribute society	I see the organization for its potential to contribute to society	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q22 community spirit	I encourage others to have a community spirit in the workplace	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q23 preparing organization	I am preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future	Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	0 1 2 3 4	Ordinal
Q29 years experience	How many years of experience do you have as a law enforcement executive in a supervisory position		Numeric	Scale
Q35 job satisfaction	How satisfied are you with your job	Feeling thermometer	0-100	Scale

Q27 jurisdiction type	What is your current area of jurisdiction	Municipal County State Federal Military	1 2 3 4 5	Nominal
Q30 number officers	What is the number of sworn officers or agents in your department or agency		Numeric	Scale
Q31 gender	Are you male or female	Male Female No response	1 2 3	Nominal
Q32 year birth	What year were you born		Numeric	Scale
Q33 highest education	What is the highest level of School you have completed or the highest degree you have received	High school/GED Some college Associate Bachelor Graduate	1 2 3 4 5	Ordinal
Q34 race ethnicity	What is your race and/or ethnicity	White Black/African American Hispanic/Latino Asian/Pacific Islander Native American Prefer no response Multi racial	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Nominal
Q34 current rank	What is your current rank (or equivalent, if none apply see the next question)	None Corporal Sergeant Lieutenant Captain Major/Colonel/Deputy Chief Chief/Sheriff	0 1 2 3 4 5 6	Nominal
Q36 none previous question	If none of the choices for the previous question were applicable use the space to	Open-ended		Open-ended

	provide a description of your rank			
--	------------------------------------	--	--	--