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Abstract

Effective leaders are essential for any organization, including law enforcement. Police work is not free from the challenges of leadership, confronted with its own unique challenges, including developing ways to adapt to rapid change and continually having to adjust to various political and environmental factors. This research is an in-depth examination of how transformational leadership and conflict management style drive job satisfaction in law enforcement. The goal is to determine whether employee satisfaction achieved through transformational leadership is, in fact, largely the result of how leadership handles conflict. The idea is to disentangle the relationship between transformational leadership and conflict management style to understand which is a more potent driver of job satisfaction. It specifically examines the lower levels of police organizations, where the majority of subordinate-supervisor relationships occur. Data was collected through three brief survey instruments: Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire, measuring transformational leadership; Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire - Short Form, measuring employees’ individual satisfaction with various aspects of their work and work environment (intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction); and Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II), measuring conflict management style. A multiple regression analysis was conducted of the data, using conflict management style as a confounding variable, transformational leadership as the independent variable, and job satisfaction the dependent variable. Control variables included gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education level. Results show that both conflict management style and transformational leadership lead to employee satisfaction and that incorporating both is a more exacting way to explain employee job satisfaction. Collaboration, a key measure of conflict management style accounted for more of the variance in job satisfaction than transformational
leadership. This research’s primary takeaway is that the combination of transformational leadership and the collaborative measure of conflict management style leads to greater job satisfaction in law enforcement among subordinate members of a police department. This research may help guide changes in law enforcement, departmental policies, and training. It is intended to help police leadership in shaping competent supervisors to help enhance department-wide job satisfaction.
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Chapter I
Introduction

Effective leaders are essential for any organization, and various academic disciplines – including law enforcement -- have explored job satisfaction (Johnson, 2012; Shane, 2010; Zhao, Thurman, & He, 1999), recognizing the importance of understanding which leadership attributes contribute to employees’ overall job performance and satisfaction (Munir, Rahman et al., 2012). Yet, leadership remains poorly understood (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Hoggett, Redford, Toher, & White, 2019). The current literature does not clearly define how to improve team performance and effectiveness in any kind of an exacting way (Santos et al., 2015).

What is leadership? Leadership may be viewed as the capacity to affect others, as specific traits one possesses, or as an act that brings about change. Early research primarily centered on specific traits and behaviors found to make unreliable leaders; current research has focused more on the various situations or contexts in which leaders function (Oc, 2018). Focusing on how leadership looks can help further the study of leadership. By reframing how leadership is viewed, organizational leaders can improve performance and increase satisfaction and organizational performance (Bolman & Deal, 2000). Transformational leadership is a means of focusing on the influence that enhances exchange, collaboration, and openness (Bolman & Deal, 2000).

Police work is not free from the challenges of leadership or lack thereof, confronted with its own unique challenges with which organizational leadership must contend. Leadership needs to withstand the demands of accountability, transparency, and rapid technology advancement that may, in turn, reduce crime, create organizational reforms, and increase engagement with the community, as well as with other officers within the police department itself (Pearson-Goff & Herrington, 2013). Leadership is tasked with developing ways to adapt to rapid changes and
developments (Chen et al., 2005). Specifically, police leadership is in constant flux, contending with numerous and varied factors (Murphy & Drudge, 2003). The pandemic of SARS-CoV-2 (the virus that causes COVID-19) is a clear example of the need for leadership to adapt to rapid changes, and more importantly, continue to adjust to change, as needed.

Research in police leadership has found that all-inclusive decision-making, such as collaboration, can encourage dedication and fidelity, whereas traditional hierarchical police management is often cited as a handicap to line officer empowerment (Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008). The authoritarian-style supervisors, common in police leadership, have been found to seek little input from subordinates (Can et al., 2017). In contrast, transformational leadership has been a leadership approach used to achieve organizational benefits and change in many fields, including law enforcement (as noted in the focus group used in this study) (Baek et al., 2018; Shim et al., 2015). Research suggests that officers favor supervisors using transformational leadership because they communicate well, are trustworthy, effectively train officers for unpredictable circumstances, and build a shared vision (Can et al., 2017). Another important way successful transformational leaders reach employees and achieve employee satisfaction is through an effective conflict management style, which builds trust, strengthens relationships, and raises commitment.

The principal aim of this research is to clarify the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction in law enforcement by examining conflict management style as a confounding variable influencing both leadership and subordinate employee satisfaction. Conflict management styles were examined to compare the amount of variance found in job satisfaction that could be attributed to both conflict management style and transformational leadership. The goal is to determine whether the employee satisfaction achieved through
transformational leadership is actually, at least in part, a result of the way leadership handles conflict. In other words, is job satisfaction achieved through transformational leadership actually a consequence of the way transformational leaders manage conflict? A chief goal of this research is to determine if conflict management styles could be an alternative way of achieving job satisfaction with subordinate police officers.

Conflict is a concept of discord or opposition and a common societal norm. Conflict can be distinguished in two major ways: task or relationship. Relationship conflict stems from personal taste, political preferences, values, and interpersonal styles; whereas, task conflicts are about the distribution of resources, procedures, and policies and judgment and interpretation of facts (De Dreu & Weingart 2003). The focus of this research is on the management of conflict, but it is important to note that not all conflict is bad. As previously noted, collaboration is a form of conflict management style similar to transformational leadership that encourages, motivates, and promotes a fruitful work environment (Andreeescu & Vito, 2010; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2007).

**Approach to Leadership**

Transformational leadership is widely regarded as an effective way to move subordinate members of a group to put the organization first and strive to work beyond expectations (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 1978; Northouse, 2007). It results in members working together and trying to focus team member efforts into putting common organizational goals and interests above that of employee self-interest; they believe that employee’s best interests are tied to the best interests of the organization (Andrews, 2018). They articulate and invoke organizational interests and serve as principal role models for the organization (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978). This is a strikingly different approach from that of bureaucratic, top-down organizations that are traditionally slow
to adopt change (Knight & Meffe, 1997), such as the bureaucratic model of modern police departments, which results in an environment that hinders productivity, initiative, and commitment among employees (Andreescu & Vito, 2010).

Like transformational leadership, conflict management style is an adaptive approach to leadership used to move an organization, its members, or both past conflicts so that members work together cooperatively. It underlies how disagreements are resolved between parties. The goal of managing conflict is to positively address the conflict and not exacerbate it. A positive conflict management style can increase employee job satisfaction, develop mutual trust, and strengthen the supervisor-subordinate relationship (Kassim et al., 2018). Both transformational leadership and conflict management style are in stark contrast to the old-fashioned top-down, control and command styles of police organizations because they encourage partnership and fruitful dialogue within an organization that can be utilized in real-time for productive outcomes.

**Law Enforcement Leadership**

A police organization has numerous moving parts, people, and personalities, and being an effective leader can be challenging within an organization experiencing constant turnover. The topmost leaders within a police organization must set examples of quality leadership for subordinates to follow.

Leaders in police organizations are responsible for providing proper direction and fostering effective and productive relationships with subordinates, as well as for demonstrating effective leadership to encourage future productive leaders (Andreescu & Vito, 2010). Leaders here must stimulate employees to be able to look at different situations from multiple perspectives so that problems can be solved effectively (Bass, 1990). Bass and Riggio (2006) delineate four clear features or qualities of transformational leadership, as shown in Table 1.
### Table 1

*Transformational Leadership Qualities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>Leaders are role models and examples to whom followers look up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>Leaders motivate and encourage subordinates by giving meaning to their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Leaders influence followers in ways that innovate and create by questioning theories, reframing problems, and addressing old problems in different ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>Leaders pay attention to an individual’s needs for achievement and growth by acting as a mentor or coach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managing conflicting views or objectives that stimulate conflict and conflict resolution is a principal goal of a modern police force (Bard, 1973; Shane, 2010). Researchers have developed a myriad of ways to measure conflict, but the underlying premises basically remain the same (Van de Vliert & Kabanoff, 1990). Table 2 summarizes how conflict management style was measured for this current study.
Table 2

Measures of Conflict Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating/Integrating</td>
<td>A person who highly considers his interests as well as the interests of the others. It is when both parties come together to find a common solution that both parties can amicably agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>The opposite of the collaborating style; A person has neither concern for himself nor others. This person does not give-in to conflict but instead avoids it all together rather than confront it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating/Obliging</td>
<td>A state in which a person possesses a deep concern for others but a low concern for himself. In this conflict management style, conflict is resolved by giving in and letting the opposing party have its way despite its own goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing/Dominating</td>
<td>The opposite of the accommodating style of conflict management style; a person has a deep concern for his interests but little concern for the interests of others. In this style, the result is more important than the relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>When a person has some consideration for himself and some for the other; in this style, both parties lower interests and meet in the middle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Job Satisfaction

Because there are so many moving parts, police work is a complicated field in the study of leadership. Competing interest groups are at play looking to influence the environment based on specific interests, such as social-cultural shifts, political moods, and unanticipated...
emergencies (Drodge & Murphy, 2002). Then, too, it is not a work environment that can be mirrored by other fields of work, which can make developing or cultivating quality leadership difficult.

At the topmost levels within a police organization, supervisors predominantly work administratively, with minimal interaction with the public. The higher a police officer reaches in the hierarchy of a police organization, the less day-to-day interaction that officer has with the public. Supervisors are intended to provide direction for subordinates and the police department, as well as set good examples of quality leadership. Because police subordinates or police officers at the lowest levels have more direct contact with the public, they have a more lasting impression in the minds of the community. Leadership at the lower levels is also important so that problems that arise are resolved as quickly and amicably as possible. In effect, quality leadership skills at this level are essential to community engagement and relations.

Police interaction with the public is an important function of a police department. Society depends on specific people who toe the line to preserve the peace; civilization depends on police officers committed to civility and decency (Delattre, 1996). At the same time, public interaction can be one of the most dangerous aspects of being a police officer because people can be unpredictable. Most are law-abiding, but at the same time, the majority of people are also capable of deceitful acts.

Police work is a constantly changing, evolving environment, from day to day and from one police call for service/help to another. Thus, police leadership needs to be present and involved in a supportive and productive way. Moments of uncertainty abound, but the relationship between subordinates and supervisors should not be a cause of consternation or stress (Shane, 2010). As mentioned earlier, organizational leadership behavior can have an
impact on subordinates’ satisfaction and ultimately employee performance, and research has confirmed a definite link between job satisfaction and an employee’s satisfaction with their supervisors (Shane, 2010; Zhao et al., 1999). This underscores the need for supervisors to help create an atmosphere where employees can be committed to each other.

**Transformational Leadership.** Transformational leadership has shown to be vital in forming a supportive work atmosphere (Boamah et al., 2018). Transformational leaders have the ability and enthusiasm to treat subordinates differently so as to stimulate employees’ satisfaction, growth, and commitment (Bass, 1990). Building commitment, empowering followers, and boosting employee performance and satisfaction are all characteristics attributed to transformational leadership (Munir, Rahman et al., 2012).

Transformational leadership acknowledges the genuine wants and needs, purposes, and preferences of coworkers (Burns, 1978; Pillai & Williams, 2004). Stimulating employees, as described by Bass (1990) and Burns (1978), can also be useful in improving employee satisfaction and avoiding police burnout. In *Character and Cops: Ethics in Policing* (1996), Delattre describes burnout as a debilitating malaise that affects people in the helping professions whose expectations go unsatisfied. Transformational leadership can help organizations reduce job stress and burnout (Munir, Nielsen et al., 2012). When employees feel empowered, the feeling of being handcuffed to one’s job and job burnout is decreased, leading to higher job satisfaction (Choi et al., 2016). The literature on transformational leadership has revealed that the supervisor-subordinate relationship plays a significant part in the evolution of employee burnout (Pillai & Williams, 2004). The challenge for departmental leadership is to try to prevent shortcomings that can lead to (1) low or weak work production; (2) disengagement at work; (3) an unsatisfying work environment; or (4) poor effort at work.
Conflict Management Style. Like transformational leadership, conflict management style has shown to be related to job satisfaction. When appropriately utilized, conflict can be used as a means of producing positive changes that promote flexibility and stimulate organizational productivity (Coggburn et al., 2014); these attributes are also commonly associated with transformational leadership. In this way, conflict can be compared to as well as managed in the same way as transformational leadership in its ability to move subordinate members of a group to put an organization first and to strive to work beyond what is expected (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 1978; Northouse, 2007). When conflict is approached to apply results towards organizational change, it can be indistinguishable from transformational leadership and can build team cohesiveness and satisfaction (Pillai & Williams, 2004). On the other hand, mismanaged conflict -- when the interaction is too intense, and individuals lose focus and experience stress, tension, and an inability to collaborate (Coggburn et al., 2014) -- can be detrimental to a relationship. How people address conflict influences whether the conflict is constructive or destructive (Chen et al., 2005). A failure to manage workplace conflict properly can lead to dissatisfaction.

Background

History of Law Enforcement

Sir Robert Peel, a 19th-century statesman, is considered to be the father of modern policing. Credited with creating the first modern form of policing, Peel adopted the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829 to form the London Metropolitan Police Department (Lentz & Chaires, 2007). Peel outlined important viewpoints in policing and identified what he believed as nine fundamental truths and/or principles; these have since been endorsed and mirrored by police organizations around the world, including the US (A Brief History of Policing in US, 2020;
Roufa, 2018). Law enforcement has varied generationally throughout the years, but its basic principles have remained consistent (Roufa, 2018); generally, all law enforcement organizational goals and objectives have been influenced, mirrored, or directly mimicked in the manner that Peel projected in his nine principles. Many examples can be found reflecting the extent to which the fundamental principles of policing have remained the same. Each of Peel’s principles of policing can be found in the current public policy: local, state, and/or federal.

One example of current public policy is the State of New Jersey’s Attorney General’s Policy on the Use of Force, issued 1985 and revised 2000:

In situations where law enforcement officers are justified in using force, the utmost restraint should be exercised. The use of force should never be considered routine. In determining to use force, the law enforcement officer shall be guided by the principle that the degree of force employed in any situation should be only that reasonably necessary. Law enforcement officers should exhaust all other reasonable means before resorting to the use of force. It is the policy of the State of New Jersey that law enforcement officers will use only that force that is objectively reasonable and necessary. (p. 1)

This example of current public policy is similar to Peel’s 6th principle, formulated in 1829, governing the use of force. It states:

Principle #6: To use physical force only when the exercise of persuasion, advice, and warning is found to be insufficient to obtain public cooperation to an extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order, and to use only the minimum degree of physical force which is necessary on any particular occasion for achieving law enforcement objectives. (NY Times, April 15, 2014, A20)
Likewise, Peel’s principles involving “community cooperation” (Principle #4) and “seeking to preserve public favor” (Principle #5) are exactly the ideas today’s police leadership should be fostering in both community and subordinate members:

Principle #4: To recognize always that the extent to which the cooperation of the public can be secured diminishes proportionately the necessity of the use of physical force and compulsion for achieving police objectives. (*NY Times*, April 15, 2014, A20)

Principle #5: To seek and preserve public favor, not by pandering to public opinion, but by constantly demonstrating absolutely impartial service to law, in complete independence of policy, and without regard to the justice or injustice of the substance of individual laws, by ready offering of individual service and friendship to all members of the public without regard to their wealth or social standing, by ready exercise of courtesy and friendly good humor, and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life. (*NY Times*, April 15, 2014, A20)

These ideas echo those of Dean and Gottschalk (2013) in their empirical study on police leadership roles. They explain how leadership in policing is an action that involves setting a good example for both the community and subordinate police officers on how to enforce ” in a manner that is fair, service-oriented professional, and within the standards and expectations of the community” (p. 305).

*Modern Policing*

Local police are the predominant, most visible agents of social control within the criminal justice systems (Jermier & Berkes, 1979). Police services are delivered to the public under multiple constraints and frequently in unprecedented situations. Modern police work can be extremely complicated and highly scrutinized, is often under pressure, and comes with high
expectations (Shane, 2019). Examples include the terror attacks on the World Trade Center on Sept. 11, 2011; the response to the recovery during and immediately after Hurricane Sandy in October of 2012, and the efforts surrounding Sars-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19.

Police leaders deliver services/help under a host of situations, all while working with limited budgets, resources, and personnel (Archambeault & Weirman, 1983). Additionally, demand has increased for accountability on such issues as emerging new crime types and public legitimacy (Hoggett et al., 2019). In law enforcement, leadership also needs to meet the demands of both their subordinate employees and community leaders. Potential tensions that the community leaders and politicians intensify the unique job-related stressors experienced by police officers, making effective police leadership more critical than ever (Can et al., 2017).

Leadership is not limited to the only the topmost of the organization. Police subordinates at all levels or ranks of a police department are expected to be leaders within their respective communities, regardless of organizational rank, while working (Andreescu & Vito, 2010), underscoring the need for practical leadership skills at all levels.

Complicating things even more is how dramatically different each task is or can be from day to day. Police work is sometimes described as monotonous work with sporadic jolts of adrenaline when true emergencies arise (Bard, 1973; Lamin & Teboh, 2016; Shane, 2010). At times, it can be quite dangerous, but for every real emergency, there are dozens of service calls that are more related to quality-of-life-issues, e.g., a property line dispute, garbage pickup, or snow removal from sidewalks (Bard, 1973; Lamin & Teboh, 2016; Shane, 2010). Modern police work is far more accurately characterized as a tool used for social work and service than for crime-fighting (Bard, 1973; Jermier & Berkes, 1979; Lamin & Teboh, 2016). Each day, police officers, regardless of rank, are required to act as community leaders and to use their
discretionary authority ethically and thoughtfully (Lamin & Teboh, 2016; Delattre, 1996).

Whatever the case may be, developing relationships and problem-solving skills with the public provide police officers with leadership opportunities that are an essential function of police organizations in modern society (Girodo, 1998; Lamin & Teboh, 2016). Developing these relationships and problem-solving skills are also crucial tools for managing relationships within an organization.

**Leadership Deficiencies**

Police organizations have firm hierarchical control, with most control residing at the top of the organization, leaving the lowest level of the organization with the highest demand and least control (Shane, 2010). Police leadership has been widely recognized as having a top-down structure with a clear chain of command within a quasi-military bubble (Shane, 2010). This quasi-military model is described by impersonal, highly directive, and authoritative leadership (Jermier & Berks, 1979; Shane, 2010). It is an approach to command and control, with a strong culture of obedience to rank and centralized decision-making (Davis & Bailey, 2018; Shane 2010). It is heavily based on rules, regulations, and standard operational procedures, with leaders exerting full control over subordinates who are expected to follow and contribute little to no feedback.

The problem with the quasi-military type of leadership is that it leads to disengagement and poor job satisfaction by subordinates. Moreover, it gives subordinates a poor example of proper communication and interaction. Dean and Gottschalk’s (2013) empirical study of police management styles and attitudes found that police officers’ perception of their treatment by organizational leaders directly influenced their production and their service to the community, affecting both the caliber of their effort and the service to the people they are mandated to serve
and protect. This speaks directly to how police have interacted with the public that has led to negative interactions and police image. It also provides slow feedback, if any at all, about the progress of implemented plans and the overall tone or health of the organization. (Batts et al., 2012)

Bureaucracy has been the dominant organizational model in the US, described as an authoritarian, hierarchical, pyramidal, and cold system that relies on specific written policies and formalized control procedures (Archambeault & Weirman, 1983; Johnson, 2012; Shane, 2010). Further, disappointment and frustration grow when subordinates feel under-appreciated, a lack of administrative support, and an unbending hierarchy that attempts to limit autonomy and control (Berking et al., 2010; Shane, 2010). A significant problem facing police organizations today is their inability to evolve from these traditional police bureaucracy, which discourages productivity, hinders initiatives, and degrades personal commitment (Archambeault & Weirman, 1983; Shane, 2010). Moreover, the interpersonal environment that police bureaucratic settings provide has also kept qualified candidates from applying to careers in law enforcement (Krimmel & Lindenmuth, 2001). Bureaucracy may be appropriate with jobs that are clear-cut, black and white. Law enforcement, on the other hand, has too many gray areas, too many discretionary rules for it to be an effective police leadership style.

Another alarming problem facing police leadership today is the type of leaders or the style of leadership chosen by supervisors. The traditional police organizations strongly reflect the influence of Weber’s rational-legal authority type in which strict obedience is legitimated (Jermier & Berkes, 1979). According to Weber, the predominant norms that regulate the conduct of an officer emphasize “duty without regard to personal considerations” and an “obligation to obedience” (as cited in Jermier & Berkes, 1979).
Surveying over 200 federal, state, and local officers from around the world, Girodo (1998) found that most respondents self-reported resembling the Machiavellian style of leadership. Machiavellianism is part of the dark triad of personality, consisting of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. In one way or another, all three involve socially poisonous characters tending to be self-promoting, deceptive, antagonistic, and lacking affection or supportiveness (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). The rapid proliferation of narcissism and Machiavellian styles of leadership in law enforcement has made the work environment so difficult. It is an area where subterfuge, vindictiveness, and intimidation by supervisors and leadership are all too common tools used to achieve work-related or professional goals.

Resulting Obstacles. As previously reported, leadership is commonly -- but incorrectly -- viewed as a means of improvement, self-promotion, or way of presenting oneself to others (Northouse, 2007). An authoritarian style that demands strict obedience dominates police organizational leadership (Archambeault & Weirman, 1983). Police leadership has been commonly seen as unbending and domineering, with numerous rules or points of view that subordinates are to follow like dogma that creates an impersonal and often cold work environment (Archambeault & Weirman, 1983). This environment and the police bureaucratic settings previously mentioned have frequently kept qualified candidates from applying to careers in law enforcement (Krimmel & Lindenmuth, 2001).

More research in police leadership needs to be conducted to find a style that fits the needs of today’s society, to attract more qualified applicants, and to provide for a more productive work environment (Densten, 2003). The research for this study focuses on different leadership styles of law enforcement, with an emphasis on transformational leadership, which involves other organizational leaders in decision-making and problem-resolution processes (Boamah et
al., 2018). The idea is to move away from oppressive styles of leadership and towards communal
discussions and resolutions whenever possible.

The longer a problem is left to fester, the more difficult it is to curtail (Bass, 1990). A
top-down, do-as-I-say and not-as-I-do approach leads to the type of problems law enforcement is
facing today. This style is also too slow to respond to challenges. The speed of information has
been growing exponentially, and law enforcement officials tasked with decision-making and
policy changes need to respond quickly, as well. Police officers need autonomy to make fast,
deescalating, conflict resolution decisions. In this type of environment, transformational leaders
must be active participants who support sound decision-making skills and use faulty decisions as
teachable, transformational moments. Transformational leadership is an intellectually stimulating
style and, if utilized correctly, can be used by subordinates as an example of leadership that
utilizes rational decision making (Bass, 1990).

Effective Leadership: Challenges in Supervision

The focus of this study is the perception that first-line police officers have in their first-
line supervisors, their police sergeant. The primary role of this first-line supervisor, the sergeant,
is predominantly two-fold: (1) to help develop patrol attitudes and outlooks; and (2) to control
the behavior of their officers (Engel, 2000; Shane, 2010). Senior leaders should spend time
developing and sharing organizational vision, practicing collaboration, mentoring, and coaching
to build teams and empower subordinates (Andreescu & Vito, 2010). The level of actual control
a sergeant has is a matter of debate, but just how little the policing community knows about how
much sway supervisors have over subordinates’ discretionary actions is alarming (Engel, 2000).
Discretionary authority used by police officers, required daily, to act as community leaders
(Delattre, 1996) makes the position so difficult to supervise. At the same time, attempts to
manage supervisors’ discretionary choices elevate tensions between the nature of police work and the imposition of hierarchical controls (Engel & Worden, 2003; Shane, 2010).

Complicating things further, a sergeant’s performance is typically based upon the performance of the police officers he or she supervises. This usually establishes an informal exchange relationship that is more typical of transactional leadership (Engel, 2000). Transactional leadership, like transformational leadership, is part of Bernard Bass’s 1985 Full Range Leadership Model. But whereas transformational leadership focuses on communicating clear organizational goals and motivating organizational members to put the interest of the organization above their own self-interests, transactional leadership is an exchange or give-and-take relationship that occurs based upon the needs of the involved parties (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership inspires employees to perform beyond expectations, whereas transactional leadership has been found to deliver mandatory departmental minimums and behaviors such as “shrinking” (Engel & Worden, 2003).

Some of the entities that define the role of the police officer are legislatures, courts, and relatively inflexible operating policies. As stated earlier, the challenge for first-line supervisors lies in attempts to control behavior. The discretionary nature of the police, especially at the lowest levels in the hierarchy, is what makes supervising so difficult (Jermier & Berkes, 1979). Transformational and transactional leadership styles imply that officers’ conduct affects supervisors’ presumptions about officers’ performance and officers’ interpretations of those expectations (Engel & Worden 2003). The empirical research on police supervision, however, has not estimated the effect of supervisors’ expectations on officers’ behavior, nor has it examined officers’ perceptions of their supervisors’ expectations (Engel & Worden,
2003). On the other hand, management research of police patrol supervisors has found that transformational leadership encourages team vision and positive motivation (Engel & Worden, 2003). Transformational leadership in law enforcement, specifically at the patrol-sergeant level, is the focus of this study.

Framework

Leadership style is an essential predictor of job satisfaction (Braun et al., 2013), and the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction has been firmly established (Deluga & Souza, 1991; Johnson, 2012; Munir, Rahman et al., 2012). Research on subordinates’ perception of supervisors directly relates to the research in this project, which focuses on subordinates’ perception of subordinates on first-line supervisors in a police setting. A study of Malaysian nurses from 2016 found that transformational leadership positively correlated with job satisfaction and concluded that individual consideration afforded to employees through transformational leadership is important for motivating employees to achieve better job performance and satisfaction (Choi et al., 2016). A study involving teams in academia established a link between perceptions of supervisors’ transformational leadership and job satisfaction; the researchers noted a strong positive relationship between the perception of supervisors’ transformational leadership and trust in supervisors (Braun et al., 2013). A 2012 correlational study of transformational leadership and employees’ job satisfaction among 214 academic staff concluded that transformational leadership positively correlated with organizational performance and leadership style was an important organizational antecedent to job satisfaction (Munir, Rahman, et al., 2012). Chun et al. (2009) examined charismatic and contingent reward leadership in 13 Korean companies and found that followers' commitment to the leader mediated relationships between leadership and followers' attitudinal, behavioral, and
performance outcomes in close situations, but not in distant relationships. That study emphasizes that transformational leaders fulfill the needs of followers and encourage their trust by considering their goals and interests.

Research on subordinates’ perception of supervisors directly relates to this current study, which focuses on the perception of subordinates on first-line supervisors in a police setting. However, research examining the subordinate and first-line supervisor relationship in law enforcement is limited. This study attempts to expand the research on police job satisfaction through transformational leadership and conflict management styles.

Research in job satisfaction in law enforcement has been primarily dedicated to job-task or demographics (police officers’ educational level, race, gender, and rank/years of service), but similarities and inconsistencies among study findings are evident. Demographics was the primary focus of both Zhao et al. (1999) (Spokane, WA Police Department) and Johnson (2012) (metropolitan area, Phoenix, Arizona). Both studies found little to no differences in job satisfaction among police officers as it relates to gender, race, and education, but they did both find a strong correlation between job satisfaction and years of service. However, while Zhao et al. found years of service to be the only demographic significantly related to job satisfaction, Johnson also found race to also be a statistically significant variable to job satisfaction. Although past research had consistently found race not statistically significant, Johnson's study suggests that Black police officers have higher levels of job satisfaction than White or Hispanic officers. Unlike Zhao and Johnson, Slovenian police Tomaževič, Seljak, and Aristovnik (2019) found statistically significant differences between gender and education. Women expressed higher levels of satisfaction, and employees with
secondary level schooling (e.g., high school level in the US) were least satisfied. This study also revealed a correlation between employee satisfaction and length of service. The apparent discrepancies between these studies is a strong indication of the need for further research in this area.

Researchers have also explored job task, including autonomy, use of skills and knowledge, stress, and role strain (Johnson, 2012; Tomaževič et al., 2019). Autonomy is defined as the amount of liberty an employee has to perform within an organization (Mowday et al., 1979). Job stress and role strain refer to the required work an employee has that she/he either does not like or is hesitant to perform (Johnson, 2012). Autonomy is typically correlated with higher levels of job satisfaction, whereas job stress and role strain correlate negatively (Johnson, 2012; Zhao et al., 1999). Bureaucratic organizations, typical of police organizations, limit autonomy and the decision-making latitude of individuals, leading to job dissatisfaction (Shane, 2010).

Size, feedback, and support are some organizational characteristics investigated in job satisfaction (Johnson, 2012). The size of an organization has been positively associated with job satisfaction (Johnson, 2012). Feedback in police work has also been associated positively with job satisfaction, but it has been difficult to provide due, in part, to the amount of discretion allotted to the police (Delattre, 1996; Engel & Worden, 2003). Transformational leaders show trust, admiration, collaboration, and respect to their followers, which, in turn, empowers them to do more than expected and enhances job satisfaction (Kheir-Faddul & Dănăiață, 2019).

As aforementioned, transformational leadership has been shown to positively impact subordinates’ job satisfaction (Choi et al., 2016). How this is achieved, however, has not been fully understood. The goal of this study is to assess the types of changes, if any, that occur
between transformational leadership and job satisfaction when the confounding variable of conflict management style is introduced to (1) determine how much variance in job satisfaction is achieved in transformational leadership after influencing this relationship by introducing conflict management styles and (2) to determine if conflict management styles are a more exacting way to gain employee job satisfaction.

Conflict in organizations is omnipresent (Coggburn et al., 2014; Putnam & Wilson, 1982; Terson, 2018), and conflict in police work is everywhere, including among peer police officers. Shane (2010) found that organizational stressors were a greater source of stress, listing such things as being “second-guessed”; punishment for “minor” infractions; lack of reward or recognition for a job well done; fear of suspension and having department firearms confiscated; and lack of morale as a result of any of the above. Stressors can also be a source of conflict among peers that can be appropriately managed through conflict management style techniques. Conflict management is the manner in which we resolve disagreements between parties. The goal of managing conflict is to positively resolve the conflict and not exacerbate it.

To reiterate, the focus of this study was to examine the perception of leadership in law enforcement in the first-line supervisor setting. Although much research has been conducted regarding transformational leadership in law enforcement, the bulk has examined the topmost levels of police departments (e.g., police directors and/or police chiefs). The problem with examining leadership at this level is that most officers have little to no interaction with that leadership level. Few studies have examined transformational leadership on subordinate levels of law enforcement, where most subordinate-supervisor interaction takes place. Moreover, leaders and subordinates are known to have a bidirectional relationship that influences one another to achieve personal and organizational goals (Deluga & Souza, 1991). Although the subordinate-
supervisor relationship is bidirectional and both parties have a responsibility in maintaining the relationship, it is the supervisor’s responsibility to shepherd that relationship and allow for open and productive communication. More research needs to be done on how to do that and on the impact of the subordinate side of this relationship at the patrol/police officer level. A greater understanding of leadership at the lower levels of a police organization can help to promote organizational goals in a positive direction (Deluga & Souza, 1991).

Typically, it would be difficult to determine in which direction the relationship between leadership and conflict originates. However, a strong connection with police leadership top-down, control and command, intimates that the supervisor-subordinate relationship is predicated upon the supervisor initiating the conflict management type or style (Can et al., 2017).

This study examines the amount of variance in police officer job satisfaction in order to investigate how transformational leadership and conflict management styles impact job satisfaction. Additionally, this research intends to bridge the gap between conflict management style and job satisfaction in the law enforcement setting between first-line police officers and first-line supervisors: the sergeant and subordinate level. Research on the benefits of conflict management styles within a law enforcement organization has not been fully explored and sets this research apart from others like it.

In summary, this research is an in-depth examination of how transformational leadership and conflict management styles drive job satisfaction. It explains how that relationship is realized in law enforcement by way of multiple regression analyses, using conflict management style as a confounding variable. No previous research on law enforcement has used conflict management style as a confounding variable, which sets this study apart from similar studies. Through this
analysis, this research explores a model with suggestions for changes in departmental policy that might enhance employee satisfaction.

This study builds on existing literature on transformational leadership, conflict management style, and job satisfaction in law enforcement. It extends the current research on conflict management style as a confounding variable and its effect on job satisfaction in police organizations. Additionally, it seeks to understand, in what way conflict management style relates to employee satisfaction. This research and others like it are essential in guiding changes in departmental policies and training. It is intended to help police leadership in shaping competent supervisors to help enhance department-wide job satisfaction within their respective police departments.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does the perception of transformational leadership in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?

2. To what extent does the perception of conflict management style in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?

3. To what extent does the variance in job satisfaction resulting from transformational leadership remain after accounting for the influence of conflict management styles?

For this study, as noted in Table 3, I examined the existing literature involving transformational leadership (independent variable), job satisfaction (dependent variable), and conflict management style (confounding variable). Each variable was examined independently, as well as in a law enforcement setting.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable (IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus of this project is transformational leadership, conflict management style, and job satisfaction. A key component in influencing employees’ job satisfaction and efficacy is the effectiveness with which conflict is controlled (Choi et al., 2016). This study is centered on delivering research that may bring light to similarities between transformational leadership and conflict management styles.

The study examines Transformational Leadership by detangling the relationship with Conflict Management Style. A principal component of Maslow’s Theory of Motivation (1943) suggests that needs are consummatory behaviors that can be satisfied or channeled through other needs. In other words, hunger can be satisfied by eating, or maybe, hunger may alternatively be satisfied by other means such as drinking or smoking. Similarly, the goal of this study is to determine if employee satisfaction, often achieved through transformational leadership, can be achieved by the way a leader approaches or handles conflict at work. In other words, is job satisfaction achieved through transformational leadership actually a result of the way transformational leaders handle conflict?

The results of this study will enable police managers to plan and implement strategies for future training. The goal is to help in the development of police managers, to achieve job satisfaction among employees, and to effectively approach conflict among both subordinates and peers. This will likely lead to more production, cooperation, and commitment among employees.
Chapter II delineates in more depth previous research involving law enforcement in the above variables, as well as other related fields of work. Chapter III outline the actions taken to achieve the successful completion of this study, including survey types, survey instruments, sample population, and statistical analysis. Chapter IV presents an analysis of the study findings from the survey respondents. The final chapter, Chapter V, summarizes and draws conclusions from the results and provides recommendations for further research.
Chapter II
Literature Review

This study is an exploration of leadership in law enforcement, specifically the subordinate-supervisor relationship between first-line police officers and their immediate supervisors: police sergeants. The subordinate-supervisor relationship at this level is particularly important because the leadership characteristics of the most immediate supervisors may, indeed, have the most significant influence on the behavior of police officers (Can et al., 2017; Densten, 2003). This is where information is disseminated to first-line police officers, and their awareness and understanding of the importance and value of task outcomes (Densten, 2003) is needed for building efficacy (Alper et al., 2000). Although extensive research has been conducted on transformational leadership, its focus has been at the top ranks; little has focused on first-line supervisors and first-line employees where a majority of the supervisor-employee relationship occurs.

This study examines the amount of variance in police officer job satisfaction, how transformational leadership impacts job satisfaction by controlling for a confounding variable. Confounding variables are used as outside influences to examine the impact of the independent/predictor variables and dependent/outcome variables. In this study, the independent variable is transformational leadership; the confounding variable is conflict management style; and the dependent variable is job satisfaction.

Extensive research supports the strong relationship between leadership and leadership styles and organization performance. It also reflects that, although leadership is one of the most observed phenomena, it is also one of the least understood (Andreeescu & Vito, 2010; Burns,
Proper leadership provides direction and sets challenges for employees that allow them to succeed beyond expectations (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kumar, 2017). Transformational leadership is a tool for empowering employees by encouraging them to work beyond the norm and successfully promoting job satisfaction (Choi et al., 2016). On the other hand, poor leadership leaves employees looking for direction, alienates group members, and creates a poor climate in which subordinates limit themselves to mandatory minimums of performance or production (Kumar, 2017). Research into job satisfaction, as it relates to law enforcement, has found that leaders who utilize transformational leadership and inspire positive attitudes of subordinates improve employee satisfaction (Espinoza-Parra et al., 2015).

This chapter reviews the literature on the three aforementioned variables key to this study. It begins with a brief overview on police leadership, then focuses on transformational leadership, including basic distinctions between transformational and transactional leadership styles, then more detailed discussion of transformational leadership, including the Full Range Leadership Model and its measures of leadership behavior, charisma and transformational leadership, and criticism and strengths of transformative leadership. Next, the literature on the other two variables -- job satisfaction and conflict management style -- is reviewed, first from a general definitive standpoint and then particularly through the lens of law enforcement.

**Police Leadership**

The study of police work and leadership is a challenging arena because of the many separate interest groups pulling each police organization toward their own goals that may not necessarily align with each other (Drodge & Murphy, 2002). Such service requests are particularly stressful today, when police service is under scrutiny for increased accountability...
(Hoggett et al., 2019). Understanding these stressors is important because they may lead to increased tensions on individual police officers that may produce unwanted effects, such as anger, poor self-esteem, and conflict at work or home (Can et al., 2017). Understanding these stressors is important because they may lead to increased tensions on individual police officers that may produce unwanted effects, such as anger, poor self-esteem, and work or home conflicts (Can et al., 2017). Studying organizational stressors of police officers, Shane (2010) found that a substantial basis of police stress comes from the social environment and the bureaucratic structure of police work, not from the job content or inherent aspects specific to the occupation. These stressors and conflict that comes with this line of work highlight the need for effective leadership in law enforcement, especially at the first-line supervisor level.

Can et al. (2017) found authoritarianism to be the preferred leadership style of police supervisors, with little input from subordinates, and in a 1998 survey of police managers, Girodo (1998) found most respondents working administratively self-reported resembling a Machiavellian style. Both may be popular police leadership styles, but both also negatively impact employee commitment, creativity, and performance, underscoring the importance of this and similar research on leadership in law enforcement. Can et al., 2017 also found transformational leadership to be the preferred leadership style of police, with supervisors effectively communicating and creating a shared cooperative vision. Transformational leadership values the individual, inspiring employees to achieve beyond expectation and boosts job satisfaction and can effectively help mitigate the aforementioned stress officers’ experience (Choi et al., 2016). Table 4 lists perceived effective and ineffective leadership traits (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Kassim et al., 2018; Shane, 2010).
Table 4

Leadership Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Communication Skills</td>
<td>Poor Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Decision-Making Skills</td>
<td>Inconsistent in Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Honest</td>
<td>Micromanagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>Not Open to Suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By building upon the current literature on effective leadership in law enforcement, this study is an attempt to help law enforcement supervisors and community leaders promote a motivated, enthusiastic work environment that, in-turn, decreases stress, turnover, internal affairs complaints, and lawsuits, all of which lead to monetary concerns for a community.

Transformational Leadership

Overview: Transformative vs. Transactional

Leadership (Burns 1978) spearheaded the momentum into transformational leadership research. Here, Burns views followers and leaders as equally important entities (Northouse, 2007). According to Burns, "Leadership over human beings is exercised when a person with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers" (p. 18). More simply put, it is a person within a group or organization that moves all
other members of the group in a general direction, developing a shared sense of "us" to galvanize and motivate others (Hoggett et al., 2019).

In *Leadership* (1978), Burns delves into transformational and transactional leadership. The main component that discriminates between the two styles is the individualized attention of group members (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 14). Transactional leadership works within a set of established goals and organizational boundaries; it is an exchange process between followers and leaders (Northouse, 2007). Leaders use disciplinary power and various incentives to motivate employees to perform. For example, in many organizations, certainly in law enforcement, pay increases depend primarily on seniority and promotions, and promotions depend on qualifications and policies; a leader may have little or no say about either pay or seniority (Bass, 1990). In this respect, pay is not an effective way to inspire subordinates to increase their production. Burns uses the term *exchange gratification* to describe the process of transactional leadership (Burns, 1978). Transactional leaders focus on or placate the self-interest of those employees whose work they find to be agreeable (Burns, 1978), providing tangible rewards for the work and loyalty of their employees. In the political arena, transactional leaders use "voters are bargainers seeking to maximize their political profit" (Burns, 1978, p. 258). In *Reframing Organizations*, Bolman and Deal (2000) describe transactional leadership as a give-and-take or an exchange that involves pay for performance.

Transactional leadership occurs when leaders reward or discipline based upon the group member’s performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Here, leaders provide rewards to followers; in return, followers allow leaders to lead (Bass, 1990; Hoggett et al., 2019). Compensation is typically based or dependent upon whether group members fulfill their commitment, which is typically a prescription for mediocrity (Bass, 1990). Transactional leadership is more of an
authoritative style similar to some levels of law enforcement. It is also something from which law enforcement is looking to change, moving into, “a more inclusive approach that seeks to enable and empower rather than simply command” (Fritsvold, 2018, Promoting a New Generation into Leadership Roles section, para. 2). This is the type of transformational change in law enforcement that this study is exploring.

Transformational leaders serve to alter or change the organization’s current state of affairs by zeroing in on deficiencies and providing new solutions or directions for the organization (Alatawi, 2017). They direct their employees’ behavior toward a shared vision, inspiring them to follow by making them aware of the meaning and importance of the job and to commit to its collective value in an authentic and lasting way (Espinoza-Parra et al., 2015). Bass (1990) describes transformational leaders as having clear vision, inspiring and respecting their subordinates and sharing a mutual trust. Trust has proven to be a potent mediator in the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction (Braun et al., 2013). Research has shown transformational leaders to motivate their subordinates and to inspire them to perform at higher levels, to put forth extra effort, and to be significantly more committed to the organization (Popper et al., 2000).

Transformational leadership is a process whereby leaders try to build a relationship with other members of the organization to inspire the group as a whole (Northouse, 2007; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). By refocusing on indifferent and uninvolved members, these unmotivated group members can be reinvigorated (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership can inspire others to surpass expected output, leading to an elevated sense of fulfillment (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leadership attempts to encourage followers to rise above already set goals.
(Bolman & Deal, 2000; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Rising above set goals and surpassing expectations is a direct link to why research like this is vital for the commitment of subordinates.

Overall, the literature has shown transformational leadership leads to far better employee satisfaction and productivity than does transactional leadership. Transactional leadership produces more expected results or productivity, whereas transformational leadership has shown to out-pace expected employee production or outcomes (Northouse, 2007).

**Transformational Leadership: Further Defined**

Bass (1990) attempted to fully encapsulate the idea of transformational leadership by building upon the works of both Burns (1978) and House (1976) (Northouse, 2007). Bass’s (1990) idea of transformational leadership is constructed more upon a continuum between transformational and transactional leadership. He aligns this by explaining that when coaching or showing appreciation for employees, a leader must be transformational; on the other hand, when leaders need to approach what needs to be done, describing rewards for doing so, or corrections for required tasks, a leader needs a transactional approach (Bass & Riggio, 1990). According to Northouse (2007), the transformational continuum includes (1) raising followers’ levels of consciousness about the importance and values of specified and idealized goals; (2) getting followers to transcend their self-interest for the sake of the team or organization; and (3) moving followers to address higher-level needs.

Transformational leadership is a management style that shows consideration for others and inspires reciprocal thoughts toward management and the organization (Bass, 1990). It promotes extra effort and organizational commitment. At its core, the transformational leadership approach wants to establish a positive organizational change by transforming followers into leaders (Bass & Riggio, 2006). It is an effort to inspire followers to work together
and rise above self-interests in favor of organizational goals (Bolman & Deal, 2000). It inspires employees through demonstrating democratic leadership and constructive feedback, increasing both job satisfaction and worker productivity (Johnson, 2012. In essence, transformational leaders strive to remodel subordinate motives from self-interest to group-oriented and shared interest goals (Demir, 2008). It encourages group members to succeed beyond expectations (Choi et al., 2016; Northouse, 2007; Yukl, 1999).

Not only has transformational leadership shown to have a positive impact on employee’s behavior, but it has also proven itself to be a model for developing future supervisors and leaders. Turning followers into leaders lies at the heart of transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006, Decker, 2018; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Transformational leadership is a leadership style that can be both learned by subordinates and taught by leaders (Flynn, 2009). As a learned skill, it is especially fruitful in organizations that generate high turnover, like law enforcement, where one retirement creates opportunities for promotion, typically from within the organization.

Transformational leadership also looks to create a shared sense of purpose within the members of an organization; it enriches group members to look past individual needs and to focus on the overall health of the organization (Bass, 1990; Decker, 2018; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). It promotes a shared purpose with similar values and a work environment with an evident culture everyone equally shares in order to promote harmony within an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2000; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Leaders encourage and influence members to do more, to go above and beyond what is expected (Northouse, 2007; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016; Yukl, 2013). The idea of “above and beyond” that results in “more than the expected effort” directly speaks to research like this (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).
Bass (1990) describes transformational leaders as considerate and attentive to group members and their needs; they act as mentors, giving more help and attention to those who need it (Bass, 1990; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Its main objective is with “emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals and includes assessing followers’ motives, satisfying their needs, and treating them as full human beings” (Northouse, 2007, p. 175). This type of attentive leadership leaves organizational members with a sense of commitment.

In conclusion, transformational leadership adds extra effort, commitment, productivity, and satisfaction to an organization (Bass & Yammarino, 1990; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). The impact that it has on job satisfaction is particularly important for this study.

**Full-Range Leadership Model**

A true review of transformational leadership would not be complete without further discussion of the Full-Range Leadership Model. In fact, it has become nearly synonymous with transformational leadership. It includes both transformational and transactional leadership styles (but it should be noted that this study focuses on transformational leadership). Although transactional leadership is not transforming as previously discussed, it is an appropriate form of leadership depending upon the type of job or organizational goals. In addition to Bass’s Full Range Leadership Model, (1985), the conceptual framework for this study on transformational leadership also includes Burns’ *Leadership* (1978) and House’s *Charismatic Leadership Theory* (1976).

While Burns introduced the ideas and contrasting styles between transformational and transactional leadership in his (1978) book, *Leadership*, Bass (1990) further identified the following eight dimensions of leadership behaviors as part of his Full-Range Leadership Model in *Transformational Leadership* (1985), as listed in Table 5 and further delineated below.
Table 5

Measurements of Leadership Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Passive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>Non-Leadership or Laissez-Faire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transactional Leadership Measures of Behavior.**

**Contingent Reward.** Contingent reward involves an exchange of resources (Bono & Judge, 2004). Although not as effective as transformational leadership, contingent reward theory does have useful motivational characteristics concerning growth and performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This type of leadership establishes agreed-upon rewards from group members for work done well (Northouse, 2007). An example of a contingent reward would be commission-based sales job, where employers pledge rewards for performance and recognize accomplishments with compensation (Bass, 1990).

**Management-by-Exception -- Passive.** Both Northhouse (2007) and Bass and Riggio (2006) describe two types of management-by-exception: Active and Passive. A passive manager sits and waits for any reported difficulties from subordinates before taking action (Bass & Riggio, 1990; Northhouse, 2007; Wood, 1999). At the most practical level of management-by-exception, a supervisor is continually assessing and evaluating subordinates’ state of affairs as it relates to their work process for opportunities to intercede or assist (Dekker & Woods, 1999). A fundamental goal is to reduce micromanagement or involvement in routine events, freeing group...
members to focus on the task at hand; managers intervene or help when an exceptional event arises, or when help is requested (Decker & Woods, 1999).

**Management-by-Exception – Active.** In the active form of management-by-exception, managers closely monitor the activities of subordinates to detect any deviations from standards, rules, mistakes, or fundamental procedure so corrections can be immediately made (Bass, Riggio, 1999; Northouse, 2007). Machiavelli (1532/1908) states that “if one is on the spot, disorders are seen as they spring up, and one can quickly remedy them” (p. 18). In the passive form of management-by-exception, managers only intercede when mistakes occur or an issue arises (Bass, Riggio, 1999; Northouse, 2007). Machiavelli describes similar instances to this line of thought when noting that one should not interfere but should “deal prudently with circumstances as they arise” (p. 11).

**Non-Leadership Factors.** The non-leadership approach is also called laissez-faire, a French phrase or attitude for not interfering or letting things take their course (Northouse, 2007). This type of leadership is considered as avoidance of responsibility (Bono, Judge, 2004). Non-leadership is quite similar to the conflict management style of avoidance. Avoiders in conflict management disregard problems and make no effort to intercede to resolve conflict or problems (Kassim et al., 2018). Non-leadership is separate from both transformational and transactional leadership approaches and is the most ineffective of all of the leadership styles; it is inaction and inactivity, or the truancy of leadership (Bass, Riggio, 1999). “This leader abdicates responsibility, delays decision-making, gives no feedback & makes little effort to help followers satisfy their needs” (Northouse, 2007, p. 186). To explain the problem with this type of leadership, Machiavelli (2013) compares it to an illness: The initial onset of maladies is easy to
cure but difficult to detect; on the contrary, as illnesses go undetected, they become more
threatening and are easier to identify but very difficult to cure.

Transformational Leadership Measures of Behavior.

Idealized Influence. Bass and Riggio (2006) describe two components of idealized
influence: the leader’s behavior based upon followers’ discernment and follower observations,
credited to the leader by the subordinates’ observations. These leaders act as role models (Braun
et al., 2013; Northouse, 2007). They have high principles and moral standards and are viewed
particularly well by and invoke trust and loyalty from their subordinates (Bass & Riggio, 1990;
Bono & Judge, 2004; Choi et al., 2016). Idealized influence is a significant vehicle for pushing
the leader’s or organization’s agenda, a means to "uncovering and exploiting contradictions
among and between values and practice, the realigning of values, the reorganization of
institutions where necessary, and the governance of change" (Burns, 1978, p. 43).

Inspirational Motivation. Leaders who use inspirational motivation attempt to drive
followers by setting high standards and expectations (Northouse, 2007). They have strong
visions of and aspirations for the future for the organization (Bono & Judge, 2004). They attempt
to develop or kindle a passion for work and challenge followers to do more (Bass & Riggio,
1990), invoking a team atmosphere to inspire followers or subordinate members to go above and
beyond (Northouse, 2007). Transformational leadership is a tool for empowering employees that
encourages them to work beyond the norm and successfully promotes job satisfaction (Choi et
al., 2016). The team concept and the “above and beyond” approach to work are emblematic of
transformational police organizations. Burns (1978) describes an "essential strategy of leadership
in mobilizing power is to recognize the arrays of motives and goals in potential followers, to
appeal to those motives by words and action, and to strengthen those motives and goals in order
to increase the power of leadership, thereby changing the environment within which both followers and leaders act" (p. 40).

**Intellectual Stimulation.** Transformational leaders use intellectual stimulation to encourage followers to advance new and original ideas (Bass & Riggio, 2006). A leader may challenge employees to find new ways to deal with problems that might arise within an organization (Northouse, 2007), attempting to approach old problems with new solutions (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Employees are motivated to think for themselves and draw up new and creative problem-solving strategies (Northouse, 2007). Leaders here are not afraid to contest organizational norms and welcome varying viewpoints (Bono & Judge, 2004).

**Individualized Consideration.** In individualized consideration, the leader creates a venue for open communication and exchange (Burns, 1978). Leaders here are caring and treat members as unique individuals (Northouse, 2007), providing a supportive work climate in which all members are listened to respectfully (Bass & Riggio, 2006). They offer a positive work environment that stimulates working, coaching, and learning and consciously takes into account the needs of group members (Northouse, 2007).

**Charisma and Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership gives much attention to the charismatic effects of leadership (Northouse, 2007). Bass (1990) built upon Burns’s (1978) work by emphasizing followers; he also built upon House’s work by putting more emphasis on the emotional elements of charisma (Northouse, 2007). Through charisma, leadership empowers followers to modify group efforts (Hoggett et al., 2019).

Charisma is the capacity to affect the behavior of others to accomplish outstanding feats (House, 1976). It is a distinctive style that enables leaders to modify groups’ and organizations’
thinking and approaches (Hoggett et al., 2019), helping leaders provide a vision and sense of mission for an organization, as well as gain pride, respect, and trust (Bass, 1990; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Around the same time that Burns produced his signature book about leadership (1978), House (1976) published his theory on charismatic leadership. Northouse (2007) describes both works as having the same meaning or thought process as transformational leadership. House (1976) describes charismatic leaders as those able to communicate on an emotional level with subordinates, and lists dominant personalities, strong desire to influence, high level of self-confidence, and high values as common characteristics. The main difference between House’s (1976) and Burns’s (1978) theories and the conundrum of the charismatic theory is Burns’ (1978) design includes the concept of good and evil, as well as whether a leader has goals that are ultimately beneficial or harmful to others (Bass & Riggio, 1990). Bolman and Deal (2000) describe charismatic leaders as having the ability to inspire others around an organizational idea with underlying core values.

Northouse (2007) postulates several behavioral characteristics of charismatic leadership:

- They are strong role models for the belief and values they want followers to adopt.
- Charismatic leadership appears competent to followers.
- They articulate ideological goals that have moral overtones.
- Charismatic leaders communicate high expectations for followers.
- Charismatic leaders arouse task-relevant motives in followers that may include affiliation, power, and esteem. (pp. 178,179)

A leader must have the ability to discern and identify his or her own emotions and those of others, as well as an exceptional ability to influence individual behavior (Northouse, 2007).
Transformational leadership has consistently been associated with worker attitudes and behavior in management settings (Boamah et al., 2018). Being able to recognize the emotional state of ourselves and subordinates helps the work environment by allowing grievances to be aired “as helpful critiques, creating an atmosphere in which diversity is valued rather than a source of friction, and networking effectively” (Goleman, 2006, p. 150). Other elements of transformational leadership noted through observational behaviors include “leading by example, inspiring others, maintaining trusting and cordial relationships with peers, and demonstrating initiative and courage” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 29), helping followers reach their full potential (Northouse, 2007).

**Strengths**

Transformational leadership has dominated the leadership literature, confirming the powerful impact it has had on organizations that champion it (Bolman & Deal, 2000). As a leadership approach, it has shown to improve and/or advance employees’ fulfillment in their work, resilience, and cooperation (Flynn, 2009). Surveys such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire have found that subordinates appreciated leaders or managers with transformational leadership qualities (Bass, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Yukl, 1999). In Leadership, Burns (1978) states that transformational leadership is a powerful tool for indicating the effectiveness of group members, as well as organizational and team development.

In 2017, Alatawi conducted a quantitative study involving transformational leadership and turnover intention of about 3000 workers in Southern California from diverse industries and part of the Professionals in Human Resources Association (PIHRA). Alatawi found that transformational leadership negatively correlated with the turnover intention of subordinates. It predicted lower levels of turnover intention. Additionally, Alatawi found that job satisfaction and
commitment reduced turnover intention. Transformational leadership has shown to produce outcomes beyond expectations; at the same time, some transactional leadership has shown to deliver predictable and consistently expected results (Alatawi, 2017).

Alatawi’s (2017) descriptions of job commitment, engagement, satisfaction, as well as effects on production, directly relates to the aspects of transformational leadership examined in this study:

Overwhelming empirical research has claimed that transformational leadership is a highly effective style of leadership at all managerial levels and in all kinds of organizations. Supporters of the current model have highlighted that subordinates of transformational managers are more committed to their job, more engaged, more satisfied, and thus produce more. (p. 21).

Criticisms

Little research has been conducted on the negative aspects of transformational leadership. In Reframing Organizations, Bolman and Deal (2000) expressed concern about this lack of research, and how and when this type of leadership actually functions at its best (Bolman & Deal, 2000). The effectiveness of managers that lead by example using this type of management style have either not been explored or efforts are lacking to pinpoint areas in which leaders move from one area of leadership style to another to understand the channels that lead to and from these leadership transitions (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Are transformational leaders more attuned to manage conflict more competently? One goal in this study is to determine, by way of a confounding variable, whether conflict management style can be a more exacting way of achieving employee job satisfaction.
The comprehensive research in the field of transformational leadership has focused on the influence of leaders or managers on subordinate members of their respective organizations. The transformational leadership theory could be more robust, with more research on its effects at a group level (Yukl, 1999). This research expands the literature on transformational leadership by looking at it from the first-line supervisor and first-line police office level. Also, to build upon the group-level effects, more research is needed that measures subordinate interactions with each other (as listed below) in an environment led by a leader with transformational leadership characteristics:

1. How well they organize resources
2. How well they coordinate
3. How they compromise priorities
4. Trust among subordinate members
5. Whether they identify themselves with the group or organization
6. Confidence level not only with their leader, but other subordinate members, as well
7. Efficiency of their time and resources
8. How well they coordinate with outside organizations, (Yukl, 1999)

Ambiguity is another weakness of transformational leadership (Northouse, 2007). Grouped so tightly together, distinguishing between behaviors of transformational and transactional leadership can be confusing (Bono & Judge, 2004). Transformational leadership could be a more robust theory if its capacitive effects and different behaviors showed specific, consistent outcomes (Yukl, 1999). In other words, the four different types of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and
individualized consideration) are not subdivided and have overlapping qualities (Northouse, 2007). Basically, more research is needed to determine if transformational leadership overlaps with other styles but takes most or all of the credit. Additionally, the four dimensions of transactional leadership (contingent reward, management-by-exception, laissez-faire) have received the same criticism. They have overlapping qualities without precise subdivisions. Collectively, all eight dimensions of transactional and transformational leadership represent distinctive leadership conduct but are not necessarily free of each other (Bono & Judge, 2004). There are also questions as to whether or not leaders can transition to different dimensions of transformational leadership or whether some leaders have limitations (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Bono and Judge (2004) take a similar stance when pointing out that the transformational and transactional leadership dimensions lack independence from each other (Bono & Judge, 2004).

Another criticism of transformational leadership has been its overstating charisma and emotions in leadership. Bolman and Deal (2000) explain that interests in symbolic elements like charisma and transformational leadership are overrated, attributing the success of leaders to discipline and determination. Alatawi (2017) believes that the compounding impact of the 4-Is of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration), is a myth, as well.

Additionally, a comparison between transformational leadership and other forms of leadership should be studied to identify missing characteristics or behaviors that other leadership styles have that transformational leadership does not, i.e., enhancing follower skills or empowering a less vocal member of an organization (Yukl, 1999). This research study does compare an alternative leadership style -- the impact of the relationship between conflict
management style, job satisfaction, and subordinate police officers are examined for changes or similarities.

Northouse’s book *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (2007) also finds fault in how this type of leadership is measured. A popular form of measuring leadership, including transformational leadership, has been questionnaires like the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire in which subordinates answer questions using a Likert-type scale (Bass, 1990; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bolman & Deal, 2000; Northouse, 2007; Yukl, 1999). Questionnaires have been varied, modified, and improved upon over time, which has led to some inconsistencies; there has been a varied overlap of leadership behaviors and styles that can be, and have been attributed to an assorted number of leadership theories, including within and outside of transformational leadership (Yukl, 1999).

There is also the potential for pseudo-transformational leadership or leadership with ill-intended ends. In occupations that hold power and authority, i.e., police or military leaders, there is always a concern of abuse of power (Northouse, 2007). An extreme example of an abuse of power or pseudo-transformational leadership was Nazi Germany and Hitler during World War II (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2007). A more common example would be a manager or supervisor with a bullying mentality; a manager that manipulates rules; or a manager that evokes seldom enforced rules for his/her ends. Although we may never meet a maniacal leader like Hitler again, a bullying boss in the workplace may be a more common occurrence, than one realizes.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction has been and continues to be, a related antecedent for work success (Ghazzawi, 2008). It derives from employees finding fulfillment through their work, which, in
turn, adds to his or her feelings of job satisfaction (Kheir-Faddul & Dănăiață, 2019). Job satisfaction is also popularly memorialized as to how individuals perceive or feel about their occupation (Johnson, 2012; Reiner & Zhao, 1999).

Research has linked transformational leadership behavior to higher levels of employee satisfaction (Boamah et al., 2018; Alatawi, 2017). By utilizing transformational leadership techniques, leaders can confidently promote followers’ self-efficacy and job satisfaction (Kheir-Faddul & Dănăiață, 2019; Munir, Nielsen et al., 2012). Transformational leaders demonstrate trust, admiration, and respect for their followers, empowering them to do more than expected and enhancing job satisfaction (Kheir-Faddul & Dănăiață, 2019); this is evident within law enforcement context, where transformational leadership reaches higher levels of subordinates’ extra effort and job satisfaction (Espinoza-Parra et al., 2015).

In contrast, detrimental work environment -- such as those that are pessimistic or have low morale -- breed job dissatisfaction (Johnson, 2012; Shane, 2010). Moreover, managers who are less likely to listen or tolerate others’ viewpoints produce higher levels of turnover, which, in turn, results in despondent and unfaithful employees who take on tasks reluctantly and inadequately (Alatawi, 2017). Too much conflict at work can also lead to stress, anger, dissatisfaction, absenteeism, and poor performance (Kheir-Faddul & Dănăiață, 2019).

Low job satisfaction can create problems within law enforcement organizations (Johnson, 2012); on the other hand, job satisfaction among police has shown had positive work-related outcomes and improved relationships among the officers (Akram et al., 2019). This study investigates how subordinate police officers’ job satisfaction relates to their senior sergeants’ transformational leadership and conflict management styles.
Ascribing satisfaction is very subjective and difficult to qualify in police work because of the primary function of police work. Often the nature of police work requires officers to act when community members fail to conform to basic acceptable behaviors; they frequently see people at their worst, committing crimes of violence, cruelty, and indifference to the welfare of others (Johnson, 2012; Shane, 2010). Demands and stressors also come from government bureaucracy, stationhouse politics, promotions, task assignments, politics from outside groups seeking advantages, as well as unsympathetic supervisors (Johnson, 2012).

Most supervisors, no matter the profession, do not recognize the needs of their employees, and even if they do, very often will satisfy the employees’ needs to the degree that achieves the supervisor’s own goals (Burns, 1978). Simply put when given a choice of satisfying their own goals or that of their employees, supervisors will often choose their own (Burns, 1978). Such a selfish supervisor/leader tends to bring about a negative work environment that leaves employees bitter and dissatisfied with current conditions, with low spirits and low job satisfaction (Johnson, 2012).

Supervision, in general, is a problem facing law enforcement leaders because of the inability to monitor information, actions, and discretion (Brehm & Gates, 1994; Shane, 2010). For police work, officers are given a police car and left to their own devices until someone calls for help or assistance. This autonomy makes supervision efforts difficult for supervisors. At the same time, autonomy typically correlates with higher levels of job satisfaction (Johnson, 2012; Zhao et al., 1999).

A system component of Maslow’s Theory of Motivation (1943) suggests that needs are consummatory behaviors that can be satisfied or channeled through other needs. In other words, hunger can be satisfied by eating; conversely, hunger can also be met by other means, such as
drinking or smoking. The purpose of this study is to determine if police satisfaction frequently attributed to transformational leadership can be satisfied by channeling other means, such as conflict management style.

What sets this study apart from others like it is its emphasis on the work environment regarding job satisfaction in police work. Research in job satisfaction, as it relates to law enforcement, has been primarily dedicated to job-task or demographics. What little research there is has shown that the immediate work environment has an impact on the determinant of job satisfaction (Tomaževič et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 1999). In that same respect, how leadership makes its presence known or felt throughout the organization also has a strong impact on an organization (Bass, 1990). The emphasis on community policing and problem-solving skills has made the work environment a relevant prime topic for job satisfaction with police work and (Zhao et al., 1999). Then too, in studying transformational leadership and job satisfaction, Espinoza-Parra et al. (2015) found that the amount of variance in job satisfaction could be attributed to both work engagement and group identification (Espinoza-Parra et al., 2015).

One thing is certain: Job satisfaction is an important issue facing police organizations. As mentioned earlier, low job satisfaction may lead to turnover; this, in turn, leads to costs incurred from training new employees, as well as low work productivity (Kassim et al., 2018). Gerhart’s 1990 study on voluntary turnover links low employee job satisfaction to many essential topics directly related to law enforcement professionals, such as low productivity, organizational commitment, absenteeism, and turnover (Shane, 2010). These topics give high importance to the need for more research involving police officer job satisfaction.

Transformational leadership establishes the footings of organizational job satisfaction (Kheir-Foddul & Dănăiață, 2019). That is to say, leaders who transform the values, wants, and
needs of employees and motivate them to outpace their expectations impact job satisfaction through perception (Choi et al., 2016). Job satisfaction occurs when employees are valued through transformational leadership behaviors, such as individual consideration and inspiration -- a reciprocal exchange in which employees gain satisfaction and commit to better job outcomes when they are valued by the organization (Choi et al., 2016).

**Conflict Management Style**

The term *conflict* has acquired many definitions, but research has defined it as an interactive process that presents itself in inconsistency, disagreement, opposition, or core-tensions between entities (Terason, 2018). Supervisors consume up to 20% of their time dealing with conflict at work and its resulting consequence (Chan et al., 2008; Kaitelidou et al., 2012; Meyer, 2004). Conflict at work hinders team effectiveness, leading to reduced productivity and job satisfaction (Kaitelidou et al., 2012). Poorly handled conflict results in a cumulative recruiting cost, decreased service and quality, and demoralization of employees (Kassim et al., 2018). Conflict can be distinguished as either task or relationship. Relationship conflict stems from personal taste, political preferences, values, and interpersonal styles; task conflicts are about the distribution of resources, procedures, policies, judgment, and interpretation of facts (De Dreu & Weingart 2003). How a supervisor responds to conflict affects how much and how intense future conflict is realized (Meyer, 2004). Trust is a foundational measure found in both job satisfaction and transformational leadership.

Managers that adopt a conflict management style that focuses on satisfying the needs of both parties in conflict tend to build relationships based upon trust; trust in leadership is related to various leadership styles, including transformational leadership, and positive work attitudes, like job satisfaction (Chan et al., 2008).
Conflict in organizations – public or private -- is omnipotent (Coggburn et al., 2014; Putnam & Wilson, 1982; Riaz et al., 2016; Terason, 2018), and conflict resolution in police work is stock-in-trade. Managing conflicting views or objectives that stimulate conflict and conflict resolution is a principal purpose for a modern police force (Bard, 1973; Shane, 2010). Police are all too often used by civilians as a tool for conflict resolution among neighbors and citizens. One reason for the conflict is that individuals cannot constructively participate in the conflict or engage in a fractious situation (Caprino, 2019).

This research examines relation-related conflict within a police organization, i.e., the supervisor-subordinate relationship. Troubled relation-related conflict negatively impacts performance and organizational outcomes (Terason, 2018). As discussed in Chapter I, job satisfaction and employee performance, as well as organizational outcomes, are linked (Munir, Rahman, et al., 2012). Transformational leadership stresses that proper leadership provides direction for employees and sets challenges that allow them to succeed beyond expectations, including organizational outcome and performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 1978; Northouse, 2007). On-the-other-hand, poor leadership leaves employees looking for direction, alienates group members, and creates a poor climate where subordinates limit themselves to mandatory minimums for performance and production output (Kumar, 2017).

Inappropriately handled conflict or conflict mismanagement style can lead to employees’ decreased service quality, job dissatisfaction, and job burnout. A critical factor in the influence of employees’ job satisfaction is how effectively supervisors handle conflict (Kassim et al., 2018). The interdepartmental conflict between employees will affect daily tasks and organizational performance. Therefore, job dissatisfaction as a result of conflict should not be ignored (Kassim et al., 2018).
Tension in police work stems from the exercise of police discretion and the influences in which supervisors attempt to control that discretion (Engel & Worden, 2003; Shane, 2010). Moreover, discrepancies between how officers perceive supervisors’ priorities or police organization’s attempts to control the discretion of police frequently result in supervisor-subordinate conflict (Shane, 2010). Competence in conflict resolution techniques is a fundamental tool for police in and out of headquarters, working with each other and the public alike (Engel & Worden, 2003).

Much of the research involving conflict has revolved around the Managerial Grid, Blake and Mouton’s (1964) investigation on conflict management style. Blake & Mouton created five categories or modes of handling social conflict: avoiding; accommodating/obliging; compromising; competing/dominating; and collaborating/integrating. These five modes are framed along two dimensions: (1) Assertiveness -- concern for self or others and (2) Cooperation -- concern for production (Bernardin & Alvares, 1976). Dimension 1 represents the levels to which a person will endeavor to satisfy his or her own needs (ranked high or low) (Rahim, 1983). Dimension 2 ranks (high to low) the eagerness or concern with satisfying the needs of others in the group (Rahim, 1983). Although the terminology for the two dimensions and five modes they developed has varied somewhat among researchers, the basic premises have remained consistent (Thomas & Kilman, 1978; Van de Vliert & Kabanoff, 1990).

Each category in the grid interacts with both dimension, basically with one dimension ranked higher and the other lower, as indicated in Table 6 below. For example, someone falling under the Competition category would be rated at a high level for assertiveness but at a low level for cooperation. Under Blake and Mouton’s (1964) managerial grid, the objective for the manager or supervisor is to maximize behavior under both dimensions, emphasizing both
organizational objectives, as well as improvement & synergy among group members (Bernardin & Alvares, 1976).

Table 6

Conflict Handling Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Mode</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Assertive and Uncooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Assertive and Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>Unassertive and Uncooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Unassertive and Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Intermediate Assertiveness and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


We do know that other professions, like nursing and teaching, have identified a variety of strategies in conflict to explain the coping processes in those professions (Montoro-Rodriguez & Small, 2006). Although conflict in professions like nursing and teaching has been examined, its role as a core tension between subordinate and supervisor in law enforcement has yet to be fully understood. This study intends to eliminate the ambiguity as it relates to the conflict between peers within a police unit. Indeed, the literature on conflict management styles involving police is limited. What little literature that does exist involves police training of conflict management style in response to public interaction and not peer or coworker interaction.

Fellows in Community Psychiatry at the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons studied 54 probationary police officers of the New York City Police Housing Authority
The recruits were trained in conflict management style techniques, designated to improve officer ability to manage interpersonal conflict and the effectiveness of police intervention in conflicts among civilians. The results of the study showed that the training the officers received significantly improved their performance in handling conflict among civilians. Could training involving the handling of the conflict between police officers have similar results? Answering this question will be valuable in guiding changes in departmental policies and training.

Zhang et al. (2011) examined how transformational leadership affected 108 teams from a large enterprise in China using a cooperative or competitive leadership approach. The cooperative leadership approach involves open communication and a willingness to consider the opinions of others. Open discussions of conflict can help reduce interpersonal tensions; as a consequence, team members seem more settled, have added social support, and promote trust (Masood & Javed, 2016; Zhang et al., 2011). The competitive leadership approach imposes opinions on others and neither values nor accommodates ideas and efforts of others. A competitive path to conflict management style reflects negatively upon teamwork and team outcomes (Masood & Javed, 2016; Zhang et al., 2011). It also adds to interpersonal tension among the group members, further deterring communication and impeding efficient coordination (Hunitie, 2016; Masood & Javed, 2016; Zhang et al., 2011).

The study found that transformational leadership encourages a cooperative approach toward conflict management style (Hunitie, 2016). It further showed that transformational leadership helps team members handle conflict and is a critical tool in which transformational leadership enhances team coordination and performance (Zhang et al., 2011). Furthermore,
transformational leadership is secure in its ability to allow followers the ability to voice concerns or resolve conflict through intellectually stimulating ways (Braun et al., 2013).

Chan et al. (2008) explored the mediating effects of trust among Chinese managers’ conflict management styles involving 169 employees in Guangzhou, China. They discovered that conflict management style correlated positively with trust and job satisfaction and confirmed that utilizing conflict management style by supervisors leads to positive subordinate outcomes, including behavioral compliance, and positive work attitudes. This study also demonstrated the mediating position of trust in the connections between conflict management style and employee positive attitudinal results, such as job satisfaction; trust is a significant measure of various forms of leadership, including both transformational leadership (Chan et al., 2008; Samanta & Lamprakis, 2018).

The above study examined conflict management style and leadership within the Chinese culture. Leaders in this culture have a strong association with power and validate a superior’s authority over subordinates; they maintain absolute authority over subordinates (Chan et al., 2008). Similarly, law enforcement has an approach of command and control, with a strong culture of obedience to rank and centralized decision-making (Davis & Bailey, 2018; Shane, 2010). At the same time, definite cultural differences exist between the US and countries like China and Korea. As reported by Baek et al. in a 2018 study on the organizational commitment of Korean police, cultural differences may account for varying perceptions about commitment and leadership among Korean police and US police (Baek et al., 2018).

For this study, conflict refers to the disagreement or difference of opinions between two or more parties that affect daily tasks and the organization (Ronquillo, et al., 2019; Kassim et al., 2018). Conflict management style is how the conflict is resolved; the goal of conflict
management style is for a positive outcome, which satisfies all parties involved (Ronquillo et al., 2019).

**Conflict Management Style, Transformational Leadership, and Job Satisfaction**

Directly related to this study, Hunitie (2016) examined the impact of transformational leadership on the integrative style of conflict management style. The study population was 75 frontline managers from 15 Jordanian public ministries. Two types of conflict were cited: (1) task conflict -- disagreements about job tasks; and (2) interpersonal conflict -- disagreements concerning relationships. They found that task conflict could be considered a health condition in which team members could collectively decide on positive outcomes to move the organizational task forward. This is not unlike the central position of transformational leadership, more specifically intellectual stimulation, where its purpose is to develop opportunities and create a new way to address problems together (Samanta & Lamprakis, 2018).

Any conflict presented as dysfunctional should be identified, minimized, or terminated. Certainly, identifying task conflict quickly is necessary not to exacerbate itself and become an unhealthy condition. Effective conflict management style techniques can reduce dysfunction and enhance positive processes and outcomes (Hunitie, 2016). The results of Hunitie’s study revealed that all of the dimensions of transformational leadership (individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence) have a significant influence on the integrative style of conflict management.

In another related study Samanta and Lamprakis (2018) examined the relationship between leadership and organizational conflict management style within the Greek public sector of Greek Public Procurement. Of the 180 questionnaires distributed, 139 valid questionnaires were returned. Specifically, they explored transformational leadership (individual consideration,
intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence) and transactional leadership (management by exception/active, management by exception/passive), and laissez-faire leadership or non-leadership approach. They identify conflict management style similar to how this study identifies it: two dimensions, of concern for self and concern for others; and five styles or categories -- integrating, obliging, compromising, dominating, and avoiding. They also identify two principal conflict resolution approaches: constructive/cooperative approach; and non-constructive/destructive/competitive approach. In the constructive approach, conflict is addressed to identify a solution based on open communication and an exercise of synthesizing ideas. On the other hand, a non-constructive approach is characterized as a failure to communicate and focuses on stiffening differences between opposing groups.

Overall, Samanta and Lamprakis (2018) showed that transformational and transactional leadership are positively correlated with the constructive conflict management style approach and negatively correlated with the non-constructive conflict management style approach. Their results suggest that the overall impact of transformational leadership is comparatively a more robust construct. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership positively correlated with a non-constructive conflict management style and negatively correlated with the constructive conflict management style approach.

Conflict is ubiquitous, and the ability to manage conflict affects team performance, commitment, and satisfaction (Coggburn et al., 2014; Samanta & Lamprakis, 2018; Zhang et al., 2011). The above research has established a relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. There is also an association between transformational leadership, conflict management styles, and job satisfaction. What sets this research apart is in its attempt to
determine if the confounding variable of conflict management style can be an alternative explanation to the causal pathway between transformational leadership and job satisfaction.

The purpose of this current study involves the examination of transformational leadership and conflict management style between subordinates and supervisors within police departments’ influence on job satisfaction. The goal is to examine how transformational leadership impacts job satisfaction by controlling for a confounding variable: conflict management style. The introduction of a confounding variable (conflict management style) as an outside influencer exposes the changes that affect or modify, in some way, the outcome between the independent/predictor variable (transformational leadership) and dependent/outcome variables (job satisfaction). By doing so, this research attempts to determine how much variance in job satisfaction is impacted by conflict management style.

Research connecting conflict management style and transformational leadership is limited. It is suggested that transformational leadership supports performance, coordination, and satisfaction by affecting how organization members reach an agreement when conflict inevitability arises (Zhang et al., 2011). The examination as to how transformational leadership exacts its influence on job satisfaction through conflict management style has been lacking. What literature has shown is that transformational leadership promotes performance, commitment, and job satisfaction, and helps organizational members manage conflict for their mutual benefit (Zhang et al., 2011). The purpose of this research is to examine the amount of variance in job satisfaction after taking into consideration the confounder of conflict management style.
Table 7
Measures of Conflict Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating/Integrating</td>
<td>A person highly considers his or her interests and those of others. Both parties come together to find a common solution upon which they can amicably agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>This is the opposite of the collaborating style; A person has neither a concern for himself nor others, indicating low concerns in both major two dimensions. This person does not give in to conflict, but instead avoids it all together rather than confront it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating/Obliging</td>
<td>This is a state in which a person possesses a deep concern for others but possesses a low concern for him or herself. In this conflict management style, conflict is resolved by giving in and letting the opposing party have its way despite its own goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing/Dominating</td>
<td>This is the opposite of the obliging style of conflict management style. A person has a deep concern for his or her interests but little concern for those of others. Here, the result is more important than the relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>When a person has some consideration for himself and some for the other. In this style, both parties lower their interests and they meet in the middle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Rahim and Bonama (1979), how one settles interpersonal conflict is based on two dimensions: (1) consideration for oneself and one’s own concerns; and (2) consideration of and for others (Maitlo et al. 2012). Using these as the foundation, they identify five specific conflict managing styles: integrating, avoiding, obliging, dominating, and compromising. These five categories, along with the five modes for handling social conflict created Blake and Mouton (1964), form the basis used to measure conflict in this study and are presented above in Table 7.

A leader able to discern and identify his or her own emotions and that of others may then be able to impact individual behaviors (Northouse, 2007). Other elements of transformational
leadership noted through observational behaviors include "leading by example, inspiring others, maintaining trusting and cordial relationships with peers, and demonstrating initiative and courage" (Bass & Riggio, 2006 p. 29). These are some transformational leadership elements used to help develop followers to reach their full potential (Northouse, 2007). Conflict management style strategies vitally increase the performance and effectiveness of an individual and, in turn, the efficacy of subordinates and the group (Maitlo et al., 2012).

We can extrapolate a nexus between transformational leadership views and that of the intervening category of conflict management style. Integrating both transformational leadership and conflict management style involves considering both the interest of both the subordinate and supervisor (Maitlo et al., 2012).

Obliging is a category within conflict management style that has more concern for others rather than for one's self, whereas compromising is a balanced position or an agreement by both conflicting parties (Maitlo et al., 2012). Obliging is similar in regards to transformational leadership. A leader builds trust in his/her followers and, like individualized consideration, discusses the concerns and needs of her/his needs (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2007). Cooperative goals raised through transformational leadership contribute to group members’ understanding that conflict is a mutual problem that deserves common consideration (Zhang et al., 2011). Each participant in the conflict can move forward together to achieve common goals (Zhang et al., 2011).

Table 8 provides some descriptors to illustrate similarities between leadership and conflict management style. It is a side-by-side comparison of the two independent variables used in this study. The primary goal of this study is to detangle the relationship between the two, to
examine whether what has been attributed to transformational leadership can be linked to conflict management style.

Table 8

*Transformational Leadership vs. Conflict Management Style Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Conflict Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence:</strong> Leaders act as an example and role models.</td>
<td>Integrating: Both subordinates and supervisors reach their goals in the effort to resolve conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation:</strong> Attempt to drive followers by setting high standards and expectations.</td>
<td>Avoiding: Resolves conflict by avoiding rather than face it directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation:</strong> Encourage followers to advance new &amp; original ideas and are imaginative.</td>
<td>Obliging: To resolve conflict one party gives in to the other’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation:</strong> Provides a supportive work climate where all members are attentive and listen respectfully.</td>
<td>Dominating: Conflict is resolved by one party directing or dominating the other to accept his/her position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compromising:</strong> Conflict is resolved when both parties lower demands and meet in the middle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Research identifies the integrating style of conflict management style as the most effective, whereas avoiding is the least effective (Ronquillo et al., 2019). Additionally, integrating, obliging, and comprising are considered cooperative approaches to conflict management style; uncooperative styles are dominating and avoiding approaches (Chan et al., 2008). Research supports the view that the cooperative styles of conflict management style yield beneficial outcomes or job satisfaction, whereas uncooperative styles generally produce adverse consequences or job dissatisfaction (Ronquillo et al., 2019; Kassim et al., 2018). Additionally, a
leader’s conflict management style directly relates to the subordinates’ level of job satisfaction (Ronquillo et al., 2019; Kassim et al., 2018).
Chapter III

Methodology

This chapter details the methodology used to conduct this research. This study was designed to identify the variance in police officers’ job satisfaction (JS), which is explained by the subordinate police officers’ perception of their first-line supervisors’ transformational leadership (TL) behaviors and conflict management style (CMS) style. Perceptions of law enforcement subordinates may not be a totally accurate indicator of their supervisors’ leadership style. However, the extent to which perception impacts an employee’s job satisfaction is significant and deserving of research.

This chapter describes the boundaries of this project, including a description of the study sample and data collection, the survey instruments, and the method of analysis.

Research Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the subordinate/supervisor relationship at the lowest levels of police organizations, where the majority of subordinate/supervisor interaction occurs, to determine if job satisfaction is realized through perceptions of transformational leadership style are actually how transformational leaders manage conflict.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does the perception of transformational leadership in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?
2. To what extent does the perception of conflict management style in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?
3. To what extent does the variance in job satisfaction resulting from transformational leadership remain after accounting for the influence of conflict management styles?
**Research Design**

A research design is a guide used to gather, analyze, and describe the investigation; it is the basis of proof that supports the researcher’s inferences regarding relationships among the inspected variables (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1976). This study used a quantitative research design -- a structured factual investigation of observable events or situations analyzed using statistical analysis, testing theories by scrutinizing any possible connection among variables (Creswell, 2009). It has been used throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries to study leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2000). This quantitative approach also incorporated a correlational design, which is a practice in which a researcher or investigator measures associations, if any, among variables (Creswell, 2009). Here, a correlational design was implemented to determine any relationship between the police sergeants’ behavior (transformational leadership and conflict management style) and police subordinate job satisfaction. The goal was to look for any changes in the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction when controlling for conflict management style.

The survey developed for this study was executed using Qualtrics, a web-based tool used for creating surveys and generating statistics.). It was developed for a sample population of police officers to provide quantitative descriptions of behaviors, attitudes, and opinions (Creswell, 2009) to determine if transformational leadership (independent variable) has an impact on, or any relationship to, job satisfaction (the dependent variable), and if conflict management style (the confounding variable), has any impact on, or any relationship with, job satisfaction (the dependent variable). Finally, both transformational leadership and conflict management styles were examined for any changes in the amount of variance observed in job satisfaction.
Sample and Data Collection

The sample population was drawn from a convenience sampling of police departments from Bergen, New Jersey, and Rockland County, New York. Convenience sampling targets a group accessible to the researcher, so communicating and corresponding with prospective participants could be more easily accomplished. Contact information was obtained from both the Policemen’s Benevolent Association website (http://www.njspba.com/members/locals/) and the Rockland County’s Policemen’s Benevolent Association (PBA) website (https://www.rcpba.org/).

The researcher first contacted the PBA presidents in Bergen County, NJ, and Rockland County, NY, by telephone to explain the study and ask for their help in soliciting participation from their respective membership. These police departments ranged in size from approximately 15 to 200 total members. An email request followed (Appendix A) that specifically asked these PBA presidents to email their members a letter of solicitation (Appendix B) that included the link and instructions to the Qualtrics survey, which they were asked to complete within a four-week period. Members were also asked to complete an informed consent form (Appendix C). The survey began by asking each PBA member if they held rank (i.e., chief, captain, lieutenant, or sergeant); the survey ended at that point for any member who replied that he or she did hold rank; those participants not holding rank were able to continue with the survey. A follow-up reminder email was sent a week later to the PBA presidents requesting they remind their members to complete the survey if they had not already done so (Appendix D). One month later, PBA presidents were emailed once again, notifying them of a brief extension of the survey deadline and to again urge their members to complete the survey if they had not yet done so (Appendix E).
The survey questionnaire results produced 154 total responses; out of the 154 respondents, 43 responded that they held the rank of sergeant, lieutenant, captain, or chief within their police department and were not permitted to complete the survey; an additional 34 participants were eliminated for not completing the survey in its entirety, leaving 77 total participants to be included in the study analysis (N=77).

**Demographics**

Because past researchers have documented that conflict management style preferences change with time (Riaz et al., 2016), it is reasonable to believe that demographics, such as race, might also affect job satisfaction over time, as reported by Buzawa et al. (1994) when comparing job satisfaction among 170 patrol officers in Detroit, Michigan, and Oakland, California. The authors found that before 1984, black police officers had reported less job satisfaction, but as the police department’s racial profile changed, so did the satisfaction level of black and white police officers. As part of an affirmative action plan, Detroit had reduced the number of white employees by 20% and increased promotions of black and female police officers by 50%, resulting in increased job satisfaction among black police officers and decreased satisfaction among white police officers. It stands to reason that since the Buzawa et al. (1994) study, additional demographics may account for differences in job satisfaction, for example, among female police officers. Past research has shown minority and female police to be dissatisfied with work (Reiner, & Zhao, 1999), but this study may reveal differences, as the current climate finds more women and other minority employees with rank more commonplace.

Tenure is another demographic that has also shown mixed results. Zhao et al. (1999) reported that an officer’s length of service was negatively associated with job satisfaction; however, Johnson (2012) found that years of service had repeatedly been the most potent fit for
Table 9

Key to Dummy Coding Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gender                     | 1. Female  
                               | 2. Male  
                               | 3. Other                             |
| Age                        | 1. 25 years old and under  
                               | 2. 26 - 30  
                               | 3. 31 - 35  
                               | 4. 36 - 40  
                               | 5. 41 - 45  
                               | 6. 46 - 50  
                               | 7. Over 50 years old       |
| Years of Service           | 1. Fewer than 5 years  
                               | 2. 5 - 10  
                               | 3. 11 - 15  
                               | 4. 16 - 20  
                               | 5. 21 - 25  
                               | 6. 26 - 30  
                               | 7. More than 30 years      |
| Highest Level of Education | 1. Less than High School  
                               | 2. High School Graduate  
                               | 3. Some College/Associate’s Degree (2yrs)  
                               | 4. College Graduate (4yr)  
                               | 5. Master’s Degree  
                               | 6. Doctorate (e.g., EdD/PhD/JD)  
                               | 7. Other                  |
| Race                       | 1. Black  
                               | 2. White  
                               | 3. Asian  
                               | 4. Other                             |
| Ethnicity                  | 1. Hispanic  
                               | 2. Non-Hispanic  
                               | 3. Other                             |

job satisfaction among police officers. The following demographic data were included as part of the survey in this study in order to help identify any inconsistencies with past research: gender,
age; race, years of service in law enforcement, and educational background (see Table 9). This information is also important for statistical controls.

**Instruments**

Questions on participant demographics were included at the beginning of the survey in order to help determine if the study findings were consistent with those of past research and to be able to control for the effect of demographics. The survey consisted of demographic information about the participants, and three formal instruments: the Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (GTLQ); the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (measuring job satisfaction). Each is discussed below.

**Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (GTLQ)**

The Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (GTLQ) was developed to measure transformational leadership. It was specially designed to use broad statements that would help develop a brief measure consistent with the ideals of transformational leadership (Carless et al., 2000). This nine-item short form was created as a tool to assess others; it was not developed as a self-assessment instrument. In developing this short form, 1,440 subordinates assessed the leadership behavior of 695 bank branch managers in Australia (Carless et al., 2000). For this research, the GTLQ was completed by police subordinates to assess the leadership behavior of their senior sergeants.

Although many instruments measure transformational leadership, such as the MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) (Carless et al., 2000), they tend to be somewhat long and cumbersome to complete. Thus, the GTLQ was purposefully developed to be a reliable, valid measure of transformational leadership but, at the same time, short and easily administered
The GTLQ measures seven categories of transformational leadership behavior: (1) communicates a vision; (2) develops a staff; (3) provides support; (4) empowers staff; (5) is innovative; (6) leads by example; and (7) charisma (Carless et al., 2000). Each of these seven items of measurement has been mentioned throughout the literature review (Chapter II) as an integral part of both leadership in general and police leadership more specifically.

Participants were asked to indicate how frequently their senior sergeant exhibits the following characteristics using a five-point Likert scale ranging from “rarely” (1) to “frequently” (5) (Overstreet et al., 2013):

- TL1: Communicates a clear and positive vision of the future.
- TL2: Treats staff as individuals, supports and encourages their development.
- TL3: Gives encouragement and recognition to staff.
- TL4: Fosters trust, involvement, and cooperation among team members.
- TL5: Encourages thinking about problems in new ways and questions assumptions.
- TL6: Is clear about his/her values.
- TL7: Practices what he/she preaches.
- TL8: Instills pride and respect in others.
- TL9: Inspires me by being highly competent.

Carless (2009) extensively tested the convergent validity of the GTLQ by calculating correlations between the GTLQ and two other commonly used measures of transformational leadership: The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire MLQ-5 short (MLQ-5) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Carless et al., 2000). Each test was administered to branch bank managers at an Australian financial organization, and the results were compared to tests for validity and reliability. Convergent validity is a test that indicates whether or not related
constructs have a relationship or connection to one another. The convergent validity test indicated that the GTLQ, the MLQ, and the LPI are conceptually similar (Carless et al., 2000; Overstreet et al., 2013). The GTLQ was also found to be highly reliable in assessing transformational leadership, correlating strongly with the LPI and MLQ (Carless et al., 2000).

Measures of reliability and validity were obtained using Cronbach’s $> 0.90$, providing proof of internal conformity and reliability (Overstreet et al., 2013). For this research, the alpha coefficient ($\alpha$) was recalculated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ($\alpha$) in SPSS. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ($\alpha$) is a measure of internal consistency or an indication of how closely a set of items are grouped. In this case, it indicates that the items are closely related to the topic of transformational leadership and, if/when tested, provide consistent and reliable results.

In conclusion, the Global Transformational Leadership Scale provides a broad assessment of transformational leadership. It is administered quickly and provides reliability and validity (Carless et al., 2000). It has also proven to be consistent with other forms of commonly used evaluation instruments of transformational leadership.

**Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II)**

The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) was selected to examine the five (5) conflict management styles. This instrument contains three forms: Form A, designed for conflict with superiors; Form B, designed for conflict with subordinates, and Form C, designed for conflict with peers. It uses a five-point Likert scale, with each answer ranging from five (strongly agree) to one (strongly disagree). The higher the score, the higher the use of that particular conflict management style (Weider-Hatfield, 1988).

The ROCI-II consists of 28 items and has been used for self-reporting conflict management styles in a variety of settings (Hammocket al., 1990) and can also be adapted to
measure how one’s supervisor manages conflict with him or her (Rahim, 2010). For the purposes of this study, the ROCI-II was modified to measure a subordinate’s feelings regarding how his or her supervisor handles conflict. Participants were asked to answer questions by reflecting upon their previous work-year. Given the following prompt, “On my present job, this is how I feel about...” respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with each of the following items (Rahim & Magner, 1995):

- I try to investigate an issue with my supervisor to find a solution acceptable to us.
- I generally try to satisfy the needs of my supervisor.
- I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my supervisor to myself.
- I try to integrate my ideas with those of my supervisor to come up with a decision jointly.
- I try to work with my supervisor to find solutions to a problem that satisfies our expectations.
- I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with my supervisor.
- I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.
- I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.
- I use my authority to make a decision in my favor.
- I usually accommodate the wishes of my supervisor.
- I give in to the wishes of my supervisor.
- I exchange accurate information with my supervisor to solve a problem together.
- I usually allow concessions to my supervisor.
- I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.
• I negotiate with my supervisor so that a compromise can be reached.
• I try to stay away from disagreement with my supervisor.
• I avoid an encounter with my supervisor.
• I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.
• I often go along with the suggestions of my supervisor.
• I use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made.
• I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.
• I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.
• I collaborate with my supervisor to come up with decisions acceptable to us.
• I try to satisfy the expectations of my supervisor.
• I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation.
• I try to keep my disagreement with my supervisor to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.
• I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my supervisor.
• I try to work with my supervisor for a proper understanding of a problem.

The ROCI-II 28-item questionnaire considers two dimensions: concern for self vs. concern for others (Weider-Hatfield, 1988) and measures five styles that are derived from the two dimensions (1) integrating; (2) obliging; (3) dominating; (4) avoiding; and (5) compromising. Blake and Mouton (1964) first presented the theoretical literature on managing conflict in a grid for classifying the handling of interpersonal conflict (Rahim & Magner, 1995; Weider-Hatfield, 1988). Rahim (1983) further developed the literature on conflict management style by adding concern for self and concern for others (Weider-Hatfield, 1988).
Rahim and Magner (1995) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis of the five subscales of the ROCI-II by surveying 484 management students, 550 public administrators, 214 university administrators, and 250 bank managers in Bangladesh (Rahim & Magner, 1995). The results showed support for the convergent and discriminant validities for handling the five styles of interpersonal conflict (Rahim & Magner, 1995; Weider-Hatfield, 1988).

Rahim (1983) also tested the reliability of the ROCI-II using a test-retest at one-week interludes (Rahim & Magner, 1995). The range was 0.60 and 0.83 when computed from the collegiate sample (Rahim & Magner, 1995). The internal consistency reliability coefficient assessed with Cronbach’s alpha ranged from 0.72 to 0.76 and from 0.65 to 0.80 for managerial and collegiate samples (Rahim & Magner, 1995). These numbers compared favorably with those of other similar instruments (Rahim & Magner, 1995). Although Cronbach’s alpha was previously calculated to have internal consistency and reliability for the above projects, for this study, Cronbach’s alpha was used and recalculated in IBM’s Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, (SPSS). The data collected was also analyzed using SPSS.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ-SF)**

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form (MSQ-SF) was used to measure police officer job satisfaction in relationship to such things as independence, compensation, and values (Velez et al., 2013). Developed at the University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center as part of the Work Adjustment Project to measure various aspects of satisfaction about work and work environments (Weiss et al., 1967), it contains 20 items that measure intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction. Individuals with intrinsic satisfaction are motivated by the satisfaction of a job well done; they are prideful in the work they produce and look to earn the respect of their other employees (Strickler, 2006). Extrinsic satisfaction is
typically motivated by rewards and sanctions; satisfaction is derived from the exchange of rewards that are based upon performance (Calabrese 2012; Frey, 1997). General satisfaction is considered happiness. The Google online dictionary defines it as the fulfillment of one’s wishes, expectations, or needs, or pleasures.¹

In this study, participants were asked to respond to 20 questions geared toward how they felt about their present job over the previous work-year, using a five-point Likert Scale, ranging from five (very satisfied) to one (very dissatisfied). Given the following prompt, “On my present job, this is how I feel about...” respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with each of the following items:

- Being able to keep busy all the time. (Intrinsic)
- The chance to work alone on the job. (Intrinsic)
- The chance to do different things from time to time. (Intrinsic)
- The chance to be “somebody” in the community. (Extrinsic)
- The way my boss handles his/her workers. (Extrinsic)
- The competence of my supervisor in making decisions. (Extrinsic)
- Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience. (Extrinsic)
- The way my job provides for steady employment. (Extrinsic)
- The chance to do things for other people. (Intrinsic)
- The chance to tell people what to do. (Intrinsic)
- The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities. (Intrinsic)
- The way company policies are put into practice. (Extrinsic)

¹ https://www.google.com/search?q=Google+Definitions&rlz=1C1GCEA_enUS873US873&oq=Google+Definitions&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64.3087j0j1&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#dobs=satisfaction
• My pay and the amount of work I do. (Extrinsic)

• The chance for advancement at this job. (Intrinsic)

• The freedom to use my own judgment. (Intrinsic)

• The chance to try my own methods of doing the job. (Intrinsic)

• The working conditions. (Extrinsic)

• The way my co-workers get along with each other. (Extrinsic)

• The praise I get for doing a good job. (Intrinsic)

• The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job. (Intrinsic)

Weiss et al. (1967) conducted tests for the validity and reliability of the MSQ-SF, which returned high-reliability coefficients, similar to that of the 100-question version of the MSQ (Jermier & Berkes, 1979). Since its inception, it has been used widely by researchers to test job satisfaction. Using the MSQ-SF to measure minority stress theory in the workplace, Velez et al. (2013) utilized Cronbach’s alpha as a measure of reliability and consistency, which yielded high-reliability coefficients.

In a similar investigation, Jermier and Berks (1979) utilized the MSQ-SF in studying 158 police officers; the MSQ-SF internal reliability was 0.92, calculated by using the Kuder-Richardson 8 Formula. Both Cronbach’s alpha and Kuder-Richardson 8 were previously calculated to have internal consistency and reliability. For this research, Cronbach’s alpha was used and recalculated in IBM SPSS. The data collected was also analyzed in SPSS.

Confounding Variables Regression Analysis

Study analysis involves the confounding variable conflict management style (CMS). A confounding variable is an added variable that has not been previously accounted for but one that accounts, at least in part, for the apparent relationship between two variables -- in this case,
leadership and satisfaction. The effect of the independent variable (transformational leadership [TL]) was carried to the dependent variable (job satisfaction [JS]) through the confounding variable (conflict management style) (see Fig. 1).

**Figure 1**

Confounding Variable Model

This research was performed using multiple regression.

1. First, a relationship was established through a correlational analysis between the outcome/dependent variable (JS) on the predictor/independent variable (TL).

2. Next, a relationship was established through a correlational analysis between the confounder variable (CMS) on the predictor/independent variable (TL).

3. Next came regression of the outcome/dependent variable (JS) on both the predictor/independent variable (TL) and on the confounder variable (CMS).

4. I used control variables that included tenure, age, and education. The use of the demographics was data-driven, i.e., if leadership exerted greater influence among younger people, then a regression was conducted for an established linear relationship.

The literature suggests a relationship between the quality of leadership and the satisfaction of subordinates. This research explored the possibility that this apparent relationship
is due, at least in part, to the character of conflict management style. Proving higher specificity to the exact nature of this relationship could help police departments marshal their limited time and resources more effectively.

The purpose of this study was to examine the amount of variance in police officer job satisfaction. The goal was to examine how transformational leadership and conflict management styles impact job satisfaction to determine if job satisfaction in transformational leadership is or is not a consequence of conflict management style. Additionally, this research intends to bridge the gap between conflict management style and job satisfaction in the law enforcement setting between first-line police officers and first-line supervisors: the sergeant and subordinate-police-officer level. Research on the merits of conflict management style within a law enforcement organization has not been fully explored and sets this research apart from others like it.

The first step in the analysis was to gauge the reliability of critical measures. All of the measures used in this research have previously been tested for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha (Carless et al., 2000; Koopmans et al., 2013; Mowday, et al., 1979; Velez et al., 2013). Nevertheless, Cronbach’s alpha was once again calculated to ensure the reliability of the measures in the sample.

The next step in the analysis was establishing the simple bivariate relationships between leadership style and the dependent variables: job satisfaction. The significance of these relationships was established via a simple bivariate correlation analysis. Next, I narrowed in on each of the significant relationships to explore how leadership style exerts its impact by running a multiple regression to determine which aspects of the 9-item transformation leadership index and 28 conflict management style index were most closely associated with job satisfaction.
Job satisfaction was measured for the percent of variance that was explained by both transformational leadership and the confounding variable, conflict management style. The overall goal of the data analysis was to determine what, if any, changes in the amount of variance in job satisfaction can be attributed to the confounder: conflict management style.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the subordinate/supervisor relationship at the lower levels of police organizations where the majority of the subordinate/supervisor relationship occurs. What, if any, is the impact of first-line supervisors’ transformational leadership and/or conflict management style behavior in police officer job satisfaction? This study was intended to expose new findings in the field of police work in regards to leadership, specifically by examining the importance of day-to-day leadership style on the attitudes and commitment of police officers.
Chapter IV  
Data Analysis and Results

This research attempted to clarify the relationship between transformational leadership in law enforcement and subordinate officers’ job satisfaction by studying police sergeants’ conflict management style as a confounding variable. Simply put, it examined whether non-ranking officers’ job satisfaction is a consequence of how their transformational leaders manage conflict and whether conflict management style of those transformational leaders may be an alternative way to achieving job satisfaction. The primary focus was on leadership at the lower levels of police organizations. The premise was that supervision at the higher levels of police organizations involved more administrative work and less subordinate supervision, but by examining leadership at the lowest levels of a police department -- the police sergeant level -- there would be a higher likelihood of understanding how leadership accounts for job satisfaction among police subordinates.

A quantitative approach was used to conduct this investigation, and a confounding variable study design was applied. Data was collected through three short survey instruments: (1) the Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (GTLQ), which measures transformational leadership; (2) the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form (MSQ-SF), developed at the University of Minnesota to measure employees’ individual satisfaction with various aspects of their work and the work environment; and (3) the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II), developed to measure conflict management style. Each survey has been extensively used in past research and found to be valid and reliable. Police Union PBA presidents from Bergen County, NJ, and Rockland County, NY, were asked to request, via email, their respective non-ranking officers to participate in the survey and distribute the corresponding
survey links and informed consent forms. All completed survey data was downloaded from Qualtrics for statistical analysis through SPSS.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted of the data. The goal was to determine if a more significant effect on job satisfaction could be achieved through transformational leadership or conflict management style. This study intended to further the development of research in (1) police administration; (2) transformational leadership; (3) conflict management style; (4) job satisfaction; and, finally, (5) overall leadership.

**Descriptive Characteristics**

The online survey questionnaire results produced 154 total responses; out of the 154 respondents, 43 responded that they held the rank of sergeant, lieutenant, captain, or chief within their police department. Officers that held a position were not intended for this study and were not permitted to complete the survey leaving 111 unranked participants. An additional 34 participants were eliminated for not completing the survey in its entirety, leaving 77 total participants to be included in the study analysis (N=77).

As Table 10 illustrates, almost all participants were white and male. The demographics also revealed that 11 participants (14%) self-identified as Hispanic or Latino. Nearly 60% percent (57.2%) were age 34 or younger, 18 participants (23%) were between the ages of 35 and 44, and 15 (20%) were age 45 and older (about 34.4%); participants aged 45 and older accounted for 26% of all respondents.

Participants’ educational levels also varied widely: 6 respondents (7.8%) had attained a high school diploma only; 21 (27.3%) reported having an associate degree; 41 participants
## Table 10

**Descriptive Characteristics of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participants (N=77)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 29 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 40 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree or Higher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(53.2%) had completed a bachelor’s degree; 9 (11.7%) had a graduate degree (master’s or higher). It is important to point out that whereas the lowest education level category was high school diploma, over half of the respondents were in the bachelors’ degree category – the largest of the four education level categories. Although employment requirements may differ from department to department, the departments tended to overwhelmingly choose to hire those with a bachelor’s degree or higher. To make this a more definitive statement, a more robust look at police recruits is necessary.

Finally, the last descriptive was years of service of participants: 46 participants (59.8%) – the largest group in this descriptive category -- reported having been police officers for 9 or fewer years ); 17 participants (22.1%) reported having worked between 10 and 19 years; and the 14 respondents (18.2%) had 20 or more years of service -- the smallest group in the years-of-service category.

Some things are important to consider when discussing years of service within New Jersey and New York police departments. In New Jersey, police officers can be employed between the ages of 18 and 65 years old, and, after 20 years of service, officers may retire with a pension of 50% of that individual’s highest base salary. At 25 years of service, police officers receive 65% of their base salary (not to include overtime), with one additional percent (1%) every year until they reach 30 years of service (or 70%). The majority of New Jersey police officers choose to retire between 25 to 30 years of service. In New York State, police officers can be employed between the ages of 21 and 65, but those in a Sheriff’s Office can be employed between the ages of 21 and 72 years old. Under their pension plan, New York police officers receive 50% of their total salary, including overtime, after completing 20 years of service and 1.6% for every year thereafter, up to 75% of their total salary.
The literature reflects mixed results regarding the relationship between these demographics and job satisfaction among police officers. Some research has found a strong association between years of service and job satisfaction (Johnson, 2012; Zhao et al., 1999); on the other hand, other researchers have reported a negative correlation between an officer’s length of service and job satisfaction (Zhao et al., 1999). The implication is that, if satisfied, police officers will choose to remain working past their initial year of eligible retirement, between 20 and 30 years of service. Likewise, unsatisfied police officers will elect to retire or leave a job with which they are not satisfied when they are first eligible. Interestingly, in this research, officers with 25 years of service or more represented the smallest number of officers participating in this study (7.8%). One or both of the following explanations are plausible:

1. Officers reaching the retirement mark tend to take their retirement, their pensions, and leave.

2. At 25 years of service, officers tend to have rank and were thus ineligible to participate in this study; thus, they are so underrepresented here.

**Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (GTLQ)**

The following section focuses on the responses to the nine statements on the Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire, designed specifically using broad statements to help create a brief measure consistent with the ideals of transformational leadership (Carless et al., 2000). Table No. 11 presents the results of participants’ responses.
### Table 11

**Participant Responses on GTLQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GTLQ Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communicates a clear and positive vision of the future.</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Treats staff as individuals, supports, and encourages their development.</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gives encouragement and recognition to staff.</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does not foster trust, involvement, and cooperation among team members. (R)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Encourages thinking about problems in new ways and questions assumptions.</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is clear about his/her values.</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Practices what he/she preaches.</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instills pride and respect in others.</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Inspires me by being highly competent.</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ negative responses seemed to particularly center around four items:

Statements 1, 4, 5, and 9:
• Statement 1: *Communicates a clear and positive vision of the future.* Almost one-third of respondents (32.5%) disagreed with this statement; this percentage increases to 46.8% when adding those respondents that neither agreed nor disagreed.

• Statement 4: *Does not foster trust, involvement, and cooperation among team members.*2 Almost one-quarter of the officers agreed with this statement, which jumps to 42.9% when including those respondents who neither agreed nor disagreed.

• Statement 5: *Encourages thinking about problems in new ways and questions assumptions.* Police officers only disagreed with this statement 27.3% of the time, but that percentage almost doubled (52%) when adding the responses of officers that neither agreed nor disagreed.

• Statement 9: *Inspires me by being highly competent.* The results show that 28.6% of officers disagreed with this statement, which increased to 44.2% when also considering responses of those officers that neither agreed nor disagreed.

When we look at these four questions and include the neither-agree-nor-disagree responses, we can see that nearly half of all respondents did not believe that their supervisors communicated a clear vision, did not encourage them to think about problems in new ways, and did not inspire them by being highly competent. They also strongly disagreed (32.5%) and somewhat disagreed (24.7%) that their supervisors did not foster trust, involvement, or cooperation. When combined with the neither-agree-nor-disagree responses, this percentage total jumps to 76.7%. Officers had the lowest rated disagreement with Question 6 (*Is clear about*

---

2 It should be noted that this question was reverse coded, which is a common validation technique for survey items, rephrasing a "positive" item in a "negative" way to check if respondents are giving consistent answers.
his/her values); only 15.6% disagreed with this statement, with an additional 23.4% of officers neither agreeing or disagreeing.

The transformational leadership statements with which the officers most agreed included Numbers 2, 3, 7, and 8:

- Statement 2: Treats staff as individuals; support, and encourages their development.
  Almost two-thirds of participants (62.4%) agreed with this statement, with another 9.1% neither agreeing or disagreeing) with that statement.

- Statement 3: Gives encouragement and recognition to staff. Almost three-quarters of the respondents (71.5%) were in agreement, with another 7.8% neither agreeing or disagreeing.

- Statement 7: Practices what he/she preaches. Most participants (61.1%) agreed with this statement, with another 13% neither agreeing or disagreeing.

- Statement 8: Instills pride and respect in others. Almost two-thirds of officers agreed with this statement (62.4%), with another 15.6% neither agreeing or disagreeing.

Responses to these four items revealed that police officers perceived that their supervisors treated staff as individuals and encouraged their development. Their strongest agreement lay in their belief that their supervisors encouraged and recognized them.

Overall, the officers’ responses to the GTLQ appear to reveal more agreement with the qualities of their supervisor’s transformational leadership. The overall numbers show that more than 30% of the respondents strongly agreed and another 30% of the respondents somewhat agreed with the statements for an approximate 60% total agreement. The somewhat disagree responses only averaged approximately 15% of the total responses, and the average strongly
disagree responses approximately only 9%. Responses rated as neither agree nor disagree averaged approximately 16%.

**Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II)**

The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) Form-B (designed for conflict with subordinates) was selected to examine conflict management style. It uses a five-point Likert scale, with each answer ranging from five (strongly agree) to one (strongly disagree). The higher the score, the higher the use of that particular conflict management style (Weider-Hatfield, 1988).

The ROCI-II index measures five conflict management styles: (1) collaborating; (2) accommodating; (3) competing; (4) avoiding; and (5) compromising. When responding to the items, participants are asked to reflect upon their previous work-year. Tables 12 to 16 illustrate respondents’ responses (by percent) regarding each of these five conflict management styles. Each table includes the respective statements corresponding to each of the conflict management styles being measured.

Table 12 contains the responses of participants to the seven collaborating style items from the ROCI-II: Statements 1, 4, 5, 12, 22, 23, 28. Someone who employs a collaborating style (sometimes referred to as an integrating style) highly considers her/his interests and the interests of others, and both parties come together to find a common solution that both parties can agree upon amicably. The results indicate that respondents most agreed with Statement 12, that their *supervisor tries to exchange accurate information with subordinates to solve problems together*. Nearly 60% (59.8%) of respondents agreed with this statement; an additional 20.8% neither agreed or disagreed with that statement. On the other hand, respondents disagreed most with Statements 1 (*My supervisor tries to investigate issues with subordinates to find a solution* ...)
acceptable to us) and 4 (My supervisor tries to integrate his/her ideas with those of subordinates to come up with a decision). Nearly 30% (29.9%) of respondents disagreed with each of those statements, with an additional 23.4% and 16.9%, respectively, neither agreeing or disagreeing.

Table 12
Participant Responses on ROCI-II: Collaborating Style Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborating Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My supervisor tries to investigate issues with subordinates to find a solution acceptable to us.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My supervisor tries to integrate his/her ideas with those of subordinates to come up with a decision jointly.</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor tries to work with subordinates to find solutions to a problem that satisfies our expectations.</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My supervisor tries to exchange accurate information with subordinates to solve problems together.</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 My supervisor tries to bring all concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 My supervisor tries to collaborate with subordinates to come up with decisions acceptable to us.</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 My supervisor tries to work with subordinates for a proper understanding of a problem.</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Participant Responses on ROCI-II: Accommodating Style Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodating Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. My supervisor generally tries to satisfy the needs of subordinates.</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My supervisor usually accommodates the wishes of subordinates.</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My supervisor gives in to the wishes of subordinates.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My supervisor usually allows concessions to subordinates.</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My supervisor often goes along with suggestions of subordinates.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My supervisor tries to satisfy the expectations of subordinates.</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 represents the results of participants’ responses for the six statements focusing on the accommodating conflict management style within the ROCI-II: Statements 2, 10, 11, 13, 19, and 24. Those with an accommodating conflict management style possesses a deep concern for others but a low concern for him or herself. Here, conflict is resolved by giving in and letting the opposing party have its way despite one’s own goals.

Of the six statements, police officers agreed with Statement 11 the least: *My supervisor gives in to the wishes of subordinates*. Only a little more than one-quarter of the officers (26%) somewhat or strongly agreed with the statement, whereas 41.6% either somewhat or strongly disagreed – and the percentage rises to almost three-quarters of the respondents (74.1%) when
taking into account those who neither agreed or disagreed. Respondents also notably disagreed somewhat or strongly to Statement 19 (28.6%): *My supervisor often goes along with suggestions of subordinates.* Interestingly, however, a large percentage (37.7%) somewhat agreed with that same statement and, coupled with the 5.2% who strongly agreed, results in a 42.9% agreement score for Statement 19.

Respondents also strongly or somewhat agreed highly with *My supervisor generally tries to satisfy the needs of subordinates* (Statement 2, 55.6% agreement); *My supervisor usually accommodates the wishes of subordinates* (Statement 10, 55.9% agreement); and the statement, *My supervisor, tries to satisfy subordinates’ expectations* (Statement 24, 54.6% agreement). Although these results show over half of responding officers agreed with these statements, the flip of that same coin indicates that nearly half were indifferent or disagreed with those same statements – primarily falling within the neither-agree-nor-disagree response category.

Table 14 represents the responses to the competing conflict management style items found within the ROCI-II: Statements 8, 9, 18, 21, 25. The competing conflict management style – the opposite of the obliging style -- is sometimes referred to as the dominating style. Someone with this conflict management style has a deep concern for their own interests but very little concern for others’ interests. This person values results over her/his relationship with subordinates.

Respondents had the most agreement with Statement 21, *My superior is generally firm in pursuing her/his side of the issue,* generating 57.2% of the total responses (strongly and somewhat agree). This question also generated the most disagreement, with 14.3% of strongly and somewhat disagree responses. *My supervisor uses authority to make a decision in her/his favor* (Statement 9) generated 45.5% of the total agreed-upon responses, closely followed by .
Statement 8, *My supervisor uses influence to get ideas accepted*, with 42.9% of the respondents strongly or somewhat agreeing.

Table 14

*Participant Responses on ROCII-II: Competing Style Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competing Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. My supervisor uses influence to get ideas accepted.</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My supervisor uses authority to make a decision in his/her favor.</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My supervisor uses expertise to make decisions in his/her favor.</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My supervisor is generally firm in pursuing his/her side of the issue.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My supervisor sometimes uses power to win a competitive situation.</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents most disagreed with Statement 25, *My supervisor sometimes uses power to win a competitive situation* (45.5% disagreement; 35.1% agreement; 19.5% neither agree nor disagree). Overall, the responses indicate that respondents tended to view their supervisors as firm and unbending.

The fourth measure used in the ROCII-II focused on the avoiding conflicting management style, Statements 3, 6, 16, 17, 26, and 27. This style is opposite of the integrating style; a person with this conflict management style has neither concern for him/herself nor for
others, indicating minimal concern in both of the major two dimensions (self and others). This person does not give in to conflict; instead of confronting conflict, this person avoids it altogether, similar to the non-leadership style of laissez-faire.

**Table 15**

*Participant Responses on ROCI-II: Avoiding Style Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoiding Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. My supervisor attempts to avoid being &quot;put on the spot&quot; and tries to keep conflict with subordinates to themself.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My supervisor usually avoids open discussion of differences with subordinates.</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My supervisor tries to stay away from disagreement with subordinates.</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My supervisor avoids encounters with subordinates.</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My supervisor tries to keep disagreement with subordinates to him/her-self in order to avoid hard feelings.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My supervisor tries to avoid unpleasant exchanges with subordinates.</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 reflects that responding officers most often strongly or somewhat strongly agreed with Statement 6 (48.1%), *My supervisor usually avoids open discussions of difference with subordinates.* This statement also generated 37.7% of strongly or somewhat strongly disagree responses, with 14.3% neither agreeing nor disagreeing. Respondents disagreed most
with Statement 17, *My supervisor avoids encounters with subordinates* (54.6%); it was also the least agreed-upon statement (28.6%) and 16.9% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

The final items in the ROCI-II focus on the compromising measure of conflict management style, represented by Statements 7, 14, 15, 20; these statements constitute the compromising measure items. In this style, both parties’ lower interests and meet in the middle; they consider themselves and others.

**Table 16**

*Participant Responses on ROCI-II: Compromising Style Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compromising Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. My supervisor tries to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My supervisor usually proposes a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My supervisor negotiates with subordinates so that a compromise can be reached.</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My supervisor uses &quot;give and take&quot; so that a compromise can be made.</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 16 reflects, Statement 14 was the most agreed-upon statement (54.6%), *My supervisor usually proposes a middle ground for breaking deadlocks*; this statement also found least disagreement among the four statements that focused on the compromising style, with less than one-fifth of the respondents (19.7%) either somewhat or strongly disagreeing. Respondents least agreed with Statement 20, *My supervisor uses 'give and take' so that a compromise can be made.*
made, with 44.2% in either strong or somewhat strong agreement; yet, interestingly, a third (33.8%) of the responding officers were in either somewhat or strong disagreement.

Overall, respondents were in far more agreement than disagreement (strong or somewhat strong) with all four statements about the compromising conflict management style (strongly or somewhat) far more than they disagreed. Whereas approximately half of the respondents were in agreement, another approximately one-quarter were neutral on these items.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire- Short Form (MSQ-SF)**

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire - Short Form (MSQ-SF) was selected to examine police officers’ job satisfaction. The MSQ-SF was developed at the University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center as part of the Work Adjustment Project studies to measure various aspects of satisfaction concerning work and work environments (Weiss et al., 1967). This instrument measures such things as independence, compensation, and values (Velez et al., 2013).

The short form MSQ discerns both intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Weiss et al., 1967). Individuals with intrinsic satisfaction are motivated by the satisfaction of a job well done; they take pride in the work they produce and look to earn the respect of their other employees (Strickler, 2016). Intrinsic items are represented in Statements 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, and 20.
Table 17

*Participant Responses on MSQ-SF: Intrinsic Satisfaction Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic Satisfaction Statements</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A chance to do work alone on the job.</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A chance to advance on this job.</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 presents the responses of the police officers to the 12 intrinsic satisfaction items of the MSQ-SF. Respondents agreed most frequently with Statement 9, *The chance to do things for other people*: almost two-thirds (64.9%) were extremely satisfied, and almost one-third (32.5%) were somewhat satisfied, for a combined satisfaction total of 97.4%. Only 2.6% noted being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and not one participant disagreed with Statement 9. The next highest satisfaction rating was found for Statement 2, *A chance to work alone on the job*, with a combined (extremely and somewhat) satisfaction total of 88.1%; only 2.6% were somewhat dissatisfied with this statement; not one officer noted extreme dissatisfaction, and the remaining 9.1% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Officers most frequently noted dissatisfaction with Statement 14, *A chance to advance on this job*: 19.5% somewhat dissatisfied and 9.1% extremely dissatisfied, for a total of 28.6% dissatisfied respondents. Conversely, 16.9% were extremely satisfied and 26% somewhat satisfied, for a combined total of 42.9% satisfied responses. The remaining 28.6% responded as being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Statement 10 is particularly interesting -- *The chance to tell people what to do*. Two-thirds (66.2%) of officers reported being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 6.5% extremely satisfied and 16.9% somewhat satisfied (for a combined satisfaction total of 23.4%). On the other hand, 2.6% were somewhat dissatisfied, and 7.8 extremely dissatisfied (for a combined dissatisfaction total of 10.4%).

Table 18 presents the responses of the police officers to the 8 extrinsic satisfaction items of the MSQ-SF, Statements 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 17, and 18. Extrinsic satisfaction is typically motivated by rewards and sanctions; satisfaction comes from the exchange of rewards based upon performance (Calabrese, 2012; Frey, 1997).
Table 18

Participant Responses on MSQ-SF: Extrinsic Satisfaction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extrinsic Satisfaction Statements</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The chance to be “somebody” in the community.</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The competence of my supervisor making decisions.</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The way my company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The work conditions.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The way my coworkers get along with each other.</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 8 generated the highest satisfaction response: *The way my job provides for steady employment*. Police officers were overwhelmingly satisfied, with a combined response rate of 96.1% (83.1% extremely satisfied and 13% somewhat satisfied); the remaining 3.9% were
neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. None of the responding police officers responded that they were dissatisfied with this statement.

Statement 12 generated the lowest satisfaction response, *The way my company policies are put into practice*, with 11.7% extremely satisfied and 29.9% somewhat satisfied, for a total satisfaction rate of 41.6%. Over one-third expressed dissatisfaction with this statement: 18.2% were somewhat dissatisfied, and 18.2% were extremely dissatisfied, with 22.1% neither in agreement nor disagreement.

The mean response for each measure was calculated through SPSS and is represented in Table 19. The mean (or average) of the responses for intrinsic satisfaction was 3.83, compared to 3.67 for extrinsic satisfaction. Although the mean for extrinsic satisfaction was higher, the average levels of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction were similar, overall.

**Table 19**

*Response Minimum, Maximum, and Mean for each Measurement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Instrument</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTLQ</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Collaborating</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Accommodating</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Competing</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Avoiding</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Compromising</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 presents the minimum response, maximum response, and mean of the total responses for each of the eight measures utilized for this study. Global Transformational
Leadership Questionnaire (GTLQ) (one measure); the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) (five measures); and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire – Short Form (MSQ-SF) (two measures).

When examining all of the responses to the Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire, which uses a five-point scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, the mean/average is 3.544, which places it midway within the neither agree nor disagree rating. Table 19 also presents the mean for each the five measures of conflict management style from the ROCI-II: collaborating (mean = 3.41); accommodating (mean = 3.21); competing (mean = 3.16); avoiding (mean = 2.94); and compromising (mean = 3.32). This table reveals that the responding officers perceived that leadership is more avoiding; moreover, the weakest category of the five measures of conflict management style appeared to be collaborating. When looking at the mean for each measure of conflict management style and considering these responses from the lowest possible score (1 out of 5) to the highest possible score (5 out of 5), only the avoiding conflict management style mean was less than 3; the range of all the measures were between avoiding at 2.94 and GTLQ at 3.54.

The final two measures presented in this table are the means from the intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction items of the MSQ-SF. As aforementioned, intrinsic satisfaction is the feeling or sense of reward or satisfaction, whereas extrinsic satisfaction derives from external factors, such as earning a reward or avoiding a punishment. Although the two satisfaction measures reflect similar results, the intrinsic satisfaction mean was higher, at 3.83, whereas the extrinsic satisfaction average was 3.67.
Research Question 1: Results

To what extent does the perception of transformational leadership in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?

Table 20

Research Question 1: Multiple Regression Output GTLQ Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTLQ***</td>
<td>0.248 (0.066) [0.430]***</td>
<td>0.426 (0.084) [0.531]***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.132 (0.222)</td>
<td>0.053 (0.282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.044 (0.198)</td>
<td>0.069 (0.251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: 10 to 19 Years**</td>
<td>0.428 (0.213)**</td>
<td>0.650 (0.270)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: 20 Years &amp; More</td>
<td>0.326 (0.280)</td>
<td>0.223 (0.355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 35 to 44</td>
<td>-0.216 (0.207)</td>
<td>-0.171 (0.262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45 &amp; Older</td>
<td>-0.331 (0.280)</td>
<td>-0.306 (0.356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.145)</td>
<td>-0.020 (0.148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s &amp; Above</td>
<td>-0.081 (0.239)</td>
<td>-0.265 (0.304)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized Coefficient B; (Standard Errors are in parentheses); [Standardized Coefficient Betas are in brackets]; *p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.

Table 21

Research Question 1: Multiple Regression Output GTLQ Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Constant]</td>
<td>3.078</td>
<td>3.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Squared</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The multiple regression results (Tables 20 and 21) show the relationship between the perception of police sergeants’ transformational leadership and their subordinate police officers’ intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The main independent variable is the perception of transformational leadership; the control variables are education level, age, gender, Hispanic origin, and years of service. Table 21 illustrates the amount of variance in intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction for the entire model, a combination of the main variable (GTLQ) and control variables (gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education), whereas Table 20 shows the relative strength of each variable in the model.

**ANOVA: Intrinsic**

The results from the ANOVA portion of the multiple regression output shows that the overall model is significant: MSQ-SF Intrinsic indicates $p<0.031$, $F=2.22$. The ANOVA results from the SPSS output show that the predictors’ combination significantly predicts job satisfaction for intrinsic job satisfaction.

**Model Summary: Intrinsic**

The middle column of Table 21 (Multiple Regression Output GTLQ Model Summary) reflects the amount of variance explained in intrinsic job satisfaction. The R-squared value indicates variance, which denotes how much each data-point’s values in a set are spread out around its mean -- in other words, the percent of the variation in the outcome that is predicted from the input variables. This model represents how the perception of transformational leadership can explain how much variance there is in job satisfaction. More simply put, how much does the perception about police sergeants’ transformational leadership explain the job satisfaction among police officers.
Table 21 shows that the R-Squared is 0.23 or 23%. This means that 23% of the variance in the MSQ-SF Intrinsic measure can be predicted from the results gathered through the main predictor, GTLQ, and the control predictors (gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education) combined. In other words, the relationship between the primary variable, (IV) transformational leadership and other control variables (IV), accounts for 23% of the variation in intrinsic job satisfaction (DV).

The adjusted R-squared is a modified version of the R-squared that takes into consideration the number of independent variables in the model. The R-squared has a value that increases as variables are added but never decreases, but not all variables in this model contribute equally. The adjusted R-squared accounts for those variables. The adjusted R-squared penalizes the value as more variables are added. The Adjusted R-Squared, 0.126 or 12.6% in the intrinsic job satisfaction model, indicates that the added control variables are overfitting the data. Overfitting is a random sampling error that is corrected through the Adjusted R-Square.

**Coefficients: Intrinsic**

Table 20 (Multiple Regression Output GTLQ Coefficients) indicates two things: (1) *which* variables predict the outcome variable, job satisfaction (DV); and (2) *to what extent* does the predictor variables (IV) predict the outcome variable, (DV) job satisfaction. The middle column of Table 20 presents the regression output for MSQ-SF intrinsic coefficients. The t-value and the Sig opposite each independent variable indicate whether the relationship between that variable and intrinsic job satisfaction is statistically significant. In the coefficient table of the multiple regression for intrinsic satisfaction, both transformational leadership (GTLQ mean) and those officers with 10 to 19 years of service are the only variables that are statistically significant when the other seven predictor variables are also examined.
The transformational leadership (GTLQ mean) variable is a statistically significant predictors of intrinsic job satisfaction ($p=0.01$). The Standardized Coefficient Beta is identified in brackets. The Standardized Coefficient $Beta$ for transformational leadership perceived by subordinate officers (GTLQ mean) predicts that each standard deviation increase in transformational leadership is associated with a standard deviation increase of 43% in intrinsic job satisfaction, on average. The Unstandardized Coefficient B values, shown in the middle column, represent the regression values used for predicting the dependent variable from the independent variable. This is interpreted by dividing the Unstandardized Coefficient B by the standard deviation of the y-variable multiplied by 100: \[ \frac{\text{Unstandardized Coefficient B}}{\text{Standard Deviation of Y-Variable}} \times 100 \].

As indicated above, in regards to years of service, those officers with 10 to 19 years of service (Service: 10 to 19) were the only indicators that significantly predicted intrinsic job satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient B indicated that police officers that have 10 to 19 years of service have, on average, intrinsic satisfaction that is $\frac{0.428}{0.59} \times 100 = 72.54$ 73% of a standard deviation higher than police officers that have fewer than 10 years of service. For police officers with 20 or more years of service, the standardized coefficient $Beta$ increased to 55% of a standard deviation higher than police officers that have fewer than 10 years of service.

**ANOVA: Extrinsic**

Next are the results for extrinsic satisfaction. The results from the ANOVA portion of the multiple regression output shows that the overall model is significant: MSQ-SF Extrinsic indicates $p<0.001$, $F=4.124$. Thus, the combination of predictors (GTLQ, gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education) significantly predict the outcome of extrinsic job satisfaction.
**Model Summary: Extrinsic**

The last column of Table 21 (Multiple Regression Output GTLQ -- Model Summary) reflects the amount of variance found in extrinsic job satisfaction. It shows that the R-Squared is 0.365 or 37%. This means that 37% of the variance in the MSQ-SF extrinsic measure can be predicted from the results gathered through the predictors: GTLQ-SF, gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education combined. In other words, the relationship between the combination of transformational leadership and other independent variables and extrinsic job satisfaction accounts for 37% of the variation. The adjusted R-squared, 0.27 or 27% in the extrinsic job satisfaction model, indicates that the added control variables are overfitting the data.

**Coefficients: Extrinsic**

The last column of Table 21 presents the regression output for MSQ-SF extrinsic coefficients. The t-value and the Sig opposite each independent variable indicated in the coefficient tablet of the output indicate that both transformational leadership (GTLQ mean), and police officers with 10 to 19 years of service are the only variables significant to this model. The transformational leadership (GTLQ Mean) variable statistically and significantly predicts extrinsic job satisfaction ($p=0.01$). The Standardized Coefficient $Beta$ (in brackets) is used to divide the size of the effect by the relevant standard deviations. The Standardized Coefficient $Beta$ for transformational leadership perceived by subordinate officers (GTLQ mean) predicts that every single standard deviation increase in transformational leadership is associated with a 53.1% of a standard deviation increase in extrinsic job satisfaction (MSQ Extrinsic), on average.

The Unstandardized Coefficient $B$ values shown in this middle column represent the regression values used for predicting the dependent variable, job satisfaction, from the independent variable. As indicated above, 10 to 19 years of service is the only indicator that
significantly predicted extrinsic job satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient B indicated that police officers that have 10 to 19 years of service have, on average, an extrinsic satisfaction 78.3% of a standard deviation higher than police officers with fewer than 10 years of service. For police officers with 20 or more years of service, the standardized coefficient Beta increased to 26.8% of a standard deviation higher than police officers that have fewer than 10 years of service.

In Table 20, we see that the only variables that are significantly impacting or predicting job satisfaction are both transformational leadership (GTLQ mean) and 10 to 19 years of service. These two variables were found to be significant for both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, respectively. The transformational leadership coefficient was more strongly predictive of extrinsic satisfaction -- extrinsic standardized coefficient Beta of 53.1%, of a standard deviation - - compared to that of the intrinsic standardized coefficient Beta of 43% of a standard deviation. The same could be said for 10 to 19 years of service. The unstandardized coefficient B was 78.3% of a standard deviation for extrinsic satisfaction and 72.5% of a standard deviation for intrinsic satisfaction of a standard deviation, respectively. The Adjusted R-squared values were also more robust for extrinsic satisfaction at 27% than the intrinsic Adjusted R-squared value of 12.6%. All other predictor variables used in either model are not significant predictors of job satisfaction.

**Research Question 2: Results**

To what extent does the perception of conflict management style in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?

For Research Question 2, the five conflict management styles replaced transformational leadership as the independent variable: integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding and
compromising. This section identifies and explains the effects of the different measures of conflict management style (IV) that police sergeants have on subordinate police officer’s job satisfaction (DV). The multiple regression results (Table 22 and Table 23) show the relationship between a police sergeant’s conflict management style and his/her subordinate police officers’ intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The control variables are education level, age, gender, Hispanic origin, and years of service (IVs). Table 23 illustrates the amount of variance in intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction for the entire model, a combination of the main variable (ROCI-II) and control variables (gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education), whereas Table 22 shows exactly which variable is the strongest variable in the model.

**Table 22**

*Research Question 2: Multiple Regression Output ROCI-II Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Collaborating</td>
<td>0.273 (0.111) [0.478]**</td>
<td>0.590 (0.145) [0.744]***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Accommodating</td>
<td>0.103 (0.129) [0.159]</td>
<td>-0.590 (0.168) [-0.046]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Competing</td>
<td>-0.075 (0.083) [-0.122]</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.108) [-0.013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Avoiding</td>
<td>0.100 (0.093) [0.139]</td>
<td>0.047 (0.121) [0.047]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Compromising</td>
<td>-0.104 (0.111) [-0.179]</td>
<td>-0.169 (0.144) [-0.208]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.010 (0.220)</td>
<td>-0.068 (0.287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.097 (0.198)</td>
<td>0.065 (0.258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: 10 to 19 Years</td>
<td>0.393 (0.215)*</td>
<td>0.583 (0.281)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: 20 Years &amp; More</td>
<td>0.263 (0.272)</td>
<td>0.102 (0.355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 35 to 44</td>
<td>-0.269 (0.209)</td>
<td>-0.172 (0.273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45 &amp; Older</td>
<td>-0.241 (0.279)</td>
<td>-0.173 (0.363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>0.103 (0.145)</td>
<td>0.137 (0.190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s &amp; Above</td>
<td>0.004 (0.233)</td>
<td>-0.208 (0.305)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Unstandardized Coefficient B; (Standard Errors are in parentheses); [Standardized Coefficient Betas are in brackets] *p<0.10; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01.

Table 23

Research Question 2: Multiple Regression Output ROCI-II Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Constant]:</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>2.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Squared</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA: Intrinsic

The ANOVA results for the multiple regression output’s intrinsic job satisfaction portions show that the overall model is significant: conflict management style indicates \( p<0.012 \), \( F=2.356 \). This shows that the combination of the predictors significantly predicts the outcome for intrinsic job satisfaction.

Model Summary: Intrinsic

Table 23 (Multiple Regression Output ROCI-II Model Summary) reflects the strength of the relationship between the main independent variables (five measures of conflict management styles – collaborating, accommodating, competing; avoiding; and compromising), the control variables, (gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education level), and the impact on police officers’ job satisfaction: outcome variable for intrinsic satisfaction,

The intrinsic satisfaction model summary table results from the multiple regression output show that the R-Squared is 0.327 or 32.7%. This means that approximately 33% of the variance in the dependent variable (MSQ-SF Intrinsic) can be predicted from the results gathered.
through the combined independent variables of the ROCI-II (collaborating, accommodating, competing, avoiding, and compromising), gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education level. In other words, the relationship between conflict management style and other independent variables (IV) and intrinsic job satisfaction (DV) accounts for about 33% of the variation. The Adjusted R-Squared, 0.188 or 18.8% in the intrinsic job satisfaction model indicates that the added control variables are overfitting the data.

**Coefficients: Intrinsic**

The middle column of Table 22 presents the regression output for MSQ-SF intrinsic coefficients. It shows that the collaborating measure of conflict management style variable statistically and significantly predicts intrinsic job satisfaction ($p=0.017$). The Beta (in brackets) is used to divide the size of the effect by the relevant standard deviations. The standardized coefficient $Beta$ for the collaborating style of conflict management predicts that every individual increase in standard deviation in the collaborating conflict management style is associated with a 47.8% increase of a standard deviation in intrinsic job satisfaction (MSQ Intrinsic), on average.

The Unstandardized Coefficient $B$ values shown in this middle column represent the regression values used for predicting the dependent variable, job satisfaction, from the independent variable. As indicated above, 10 to 19 years of service was the only indicator that significantly predicted intrinsic job satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient B indicated that police officers that have 10 to 19 years of service have, on average intrinsic satisfaction that is 66.6% of a standard deviation higher than police officers that have fewer than 10 years of service. For police officers with 20 or more years of service, the standardized coefficient $Beta$ increased to 44.5% of a standard deviation higher than police officers with fewer than 10 years of service (*Service: 9yrs and under*). This represents a 22.1% of a standard deviation difference
between the officers with 10 to 19 years of service and the officers with 20 or more years of
service.

**ANOVA: Extrinsic**

The ANOVA results for the multiple regression output’s extrinsic job satisfaction
portions show that the overall model is significant: conflict management style indicates \( p<0.012, \)
\( F=2.356. \) This shows that the combination of the predictors significantly predicts the outcome for
extrinsic job satisfaction.

**Model Summary: Extrinsic**

This section focuses on the third column of Table 22 (Multiple Regression Output ROCI-
II Coefficients), representing the multiple regression output for extrinsic satisfaction, the strength
of the relationship between the model, conflict management style’s impact on job satisfaction,
and the outcome variable for extrinsic satisfaction (DV: Job Satisfaction). The model summary
table output of the multiple regression (Table 23) shows that the R-Squared is 0.406 or 40.6%.
This means that about 41% of the variance in the *MSQ-SF extrinsic* measure can be predicted
from the results gathered through the combined predictors: ROCI-II, gender, Hispanic origin,
years of service, age, and education level. In other words, the relationship between conflict
management style and other independent variables used for this model and extrinsic job
satisfaction accounts for 41% of the variation. The Adjusted R-Squared, 0.283 or 28.3% in the
extrinsic job satisfaction model, indicates that the added control variables are overfitting the data.

**Coefficients: Extrinsic**

The third column of Table 22 (Multiple Regression Output ROCI-II Coefficients)
illustrates that the collaborating measure of the conflict management style variable statistically
and significantly predicts extrinsic job satisfaction \((p=0.001)\). The standardized coefficient \(Beta\) for the collaborating style of conflict management variable predicts that each standard deviation increase in transformational leadership predicts a rise of 74.4\% of one standard deviation in extrinsic job satisfaction, on average.

The Unstandardized Coefficients \(B\) values shown in this third column represent the regression values used for predicting the dependent variable, job satisfaction, from the independent variable. As indicated above, 10 to 19 years of service was the only indicator that significantly predicted extrinsic job satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient \(B\) indicated that police officers with 10 to 19 years of service have, on average, an extrinsic satisfaction that is 70.2\% of a standard deviation higher than police officers that have fewer than 10 years of service. For police officers with 20 or more years of service, the standardized coefficient \(Beta\) increased to 12.2\% of a standard deviation higher than police officers with fewer than 10 years of service. This is a standard deviation change of 58\% higher for those officers with 10 to 19 years of service.

The results presented in Table 23 for Research Question 2 are similar to those in Table 21 for Research Question 1 in terms of significance. We can see that the only variables that are significantly impacting or predicting job satisfaction are both the collaborating measure of conflict management style and 10 to 19 years of service. These two variables were found to be significant for both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, respectively. The collaborating measure of conflict management style coefficient was more strongly predictive of extrinsic satisfaction: extrinsic standardized coefficient \(Beta\) of 74.4\% of a standard deviation compared to that of the intrinsic standardized coefficient \(Beta\) of 47.8\% of a standard deviation. The same could be said for 10 to 19 years of service. The unstandardized coefficient \(B\) was 70.2\% of a standard deviation
for extrinsic satisfaction and 66.6% of a standard deviation for intrinsic satisfaction of a standard deviation, respectively. The adjusted R-squared values were also more robust for extrinsic satisfaction at 28.3% than the intrinsic adjusted R-squared value of 18.8%. All other predictor variables used in either model are not significant predictors of job satisfaction.

**Research Question 3: Results**

To what extent does the variance in job satisfaction resulting from transformational leadership remain after accounting for the influence of conflict management styles?

For Research Question 3, the transformational leadership variable was added and combined with the five measures of conflict management style: integrating, obliging; dominating, avoiding, and compromising. This section identifies and explains any significant effect, specifically if any transformational leadership and/or conflict management style significantly has an impact on police job satisfaction. The linear regression results (Tables 24 and 25) show the relationship between a police sergeant’s transformational leadership and/or conflict management style and their subordinate police officers’ intrinsic job satisfaction. This multiple regression’s main independent variables are the five measures of conflict management style and the one measure of transformational leadership (GTLQ-SF). The control variables are education level, age, gender, Hispanic origin, and years of service. Table 25 illustrates the amount of variance in intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction for the entire model, a combination of the main variable (ROCI-II and GTLQ) and control variables (gender, Hispanic origin, years of service, age, and education), whereas Table 24 shows exactly which variables are the strongest variables in the model.
Table 24

Research Question 3: Multiple Regression Output GTLQ and ROCI-II Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTLQ</td>
<td>0.145 (0.085)</td>
<td>0.281 (0.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Collaborating</td>
<td>0.210 (0.115)</td>
<td>0.468 (0.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Accommodating</td>
<td>0.110 (0.127)</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Competing</td>
<td>-0.068 (0.082)</td>
<td>0.002 (0.104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Avoiding</td>
<td>0.131 (0.093)</td>
<td>0.106 (0.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCI-II Compromising</td>
<td>-0.137 (0.111)</td>
<td>-0.232 (0.140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.216)</td>
<td>-0.078 (0.274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.118 (0.195)</td>
<td>0.054 (0.247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: 10 to 19 Years</td>
<td>0.435 (0.214)**</td>
<td>0.664 (0.271)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: 20 Years &amp; More</td>
<td>0.343 (0.272)</td>
<td>0.256 (0.345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 35 to 44</td>
<td>-0.271 (0.206)</td>
<td>-0.177 (0.261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45 &amp; Older</td>
<td>-0.310 (0.278)</td>
<td>-0.307 (0.352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>0.076 (0.144)</td>
<td>0.084 (0.183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s &amp; Above</td>
<td>0.024 (0.230)</td>
<td>-0.168 (0.292)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized Coefficient B; (Standard Errors are in parentheses); [Standardized Coefficient Betas are in brackets] *p<0.10; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01.

Table 25

Research Question 3: Multiple Regression Output GTLQ and ROCI-II Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Constant]:</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>1.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared:</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Squared:</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA: Intrinsic

The final results for Research Question 3, from the ANOVA portion of both outputs, show that the overall model is significant: MSQ-SF intrinsic measure indicates \( p<0.008, F=2.47 \). This indicates that the predictors’ combination significantly predicts job satisfaction for the intrinsic job satisfaction model of Research Question 3.

Model Summary: Intrinsic

This section examines the model summary of the multiple regression output for the GTLQ and ROC-II, the strength of the relationship between the model, transformational leadership and conflict management style’s impact on job satisfaction, and the outcome variable for intrinsic satisfaction. Table 25 shows that the adjusted R-squared is 0.358 or 36%. This means that 36% of the variance in the MSQ-SF intrinsic measure can be predicted from the results gathered through the combined predictors: GTLQ, ROCI-II, education, age, years of service, etc. In other words, the relationship between conflict management style and the other independent variables and intrinsic job satisfaction accounts for 36% of the variation. The adjusted R-squared, 0.213 or 21.3% in the intrinsic job satisfaction model, indicating that the added control variables are overfitting the data.

Coefficients: Intrinsic

The middle column of Table 24 presents the regression output for MSQ-SF intrinsic coefficients. The transformational leadership (GTLQ mean) variable statistically and significantly predicts intrinsic job satisfaction (\( p=0.090 \)). The standardized coefficient Beta for transformational leadership perceived by subordinate officers (GTLQ mean) predicts that each standard deviation increase in transformational leadership is associated with a 25.2% increase of a standard deviation in intrinsic job satisfaction, on average.
The collaborating measure of conflict management style variable statistically and significantly predicts intrinsic job satisfaction ($p=0.073$). The standardized coefficient Beta for the collaborating measure of conflict management style predicts that, on average, every one standard deviation increase in collaborating measure of conflict management style is associated with a 36.8% of a standard deviation increase in intrinsic job satisfaction.

**ANOVA: Extrinsic**

The results from the ANOVA portion of the multiple regression output shows that the overall model is significant -- MSQ-SF extrinsic indicates $p<0.001$, $F=3.855$ -- and that the predictors’ combination significantly predicts job satisfaction for extrinsic job satisfaction.

**Model Summary: Extrinsic**

This section examines the model summary of the multiple regression output for the GTLQ and ROCI-II. The third column of Table 25 represents the strength of the relationship between the model, transformational leadership and conflict management style’s impact on job satisfaction, and the extrinsic measure can be predicted from the results gathered through the combined predictors: GTLQ, ROCI-II, education, age, years of service, etc. In other words, the relationship between conflict management style and other independent variables and extrinsic job satisfaction accounts for 47% of the variation. The adjusted R-squared, 0.345 or 34.5% in the extrinsic job satisfaction indicates that the added control variables are overfitting the data.

**Coefficients: Extrinsic**

The third column of Table 24 (Multiple Regression Output GTLQ and ROCI-II Coefficients) represents the extrinsic satisfaction coefficients of the multiple regression, showing that the transformational leadership (GTLQ Mean) variable statistically and significantly predicts
extrinsic job satisfaction ($p=0.090$). The *beta*, located under the standardized coefficients portion of the coefficients table, is used to divide the effect by the relevant standard deviations. The standardized coefficient *beta* for transformational leadership perceived by subordinate officers (GTLOQ mean) predicts that each one standard deviation increase in transformational leadership is associated with a 35.1% of a standard deviation in extrinsic job satisfaction, on average.

The collaborating measure of conflict management style variable statistically and significantly predicts extrinsic job satisfaction ($p=0.073$). The standardized coefficient *beta* for the collaborating measure of conflict management style variable predicts that each standard deviation increase in the collaborating measure of the conflict management style variable is associated with a 59% standard deviation increase in extrinsic job satisfaction, on average.

**Conclusion**

The Model Summary Tables of the multiple regression output (Tables 21, 23, and 25) reflect the strength of the relationship among the respective models.

- Model 1 (GLTQ) examined the extent to which perception of transformational leadership in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict the job satisfaction of police officers.
- Model 2 (ROCI-II) examined the extent to which perception of first-line supervisors’ conflict management styles within law enforcement organizations predict the job satisfaction of police officers.
- Model 3 (GLTQ and ROCI-II) examined the extent to which any variance in job satisfaction as a result of transformational leadership remained after accounting for the influence of conflict management styles.
In comparing the results between Model 1 (GLTQ) and Model 2 (ROCI-II), the variance in job satisfaction was slightly higher for Conflict Management Styles than that of transformational leadership. The delta between the first two models was 1.3% for extrinsic satisfaction and 6.2% for intrinsic satisfaction, both in favor of Conflict Management Style (CMS). The amount of variance in job satisfaction was greater in the final model. Transformational leadership (GTLQ) and conflict management style (ROCI-II) were combined in the final model. For extrinsic job satisfaction (DV), Model 3 showed a delta of 7.5% greater than in Model 1 and 6.2% higher than Model 2. For intrinsic job satisfaction (DV), Model 3 showed a delta of 8.7% higher than Model 1 and 2.5% greater than Model 2.

Table 26

*Adjusted R-Squared: MSQ-SF*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted R-Squared</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Extrinsic</th>
<th>MSQ-SF Intrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: GTLQ</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: ROCI-II</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: GTLQ/ROCI-II</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 indicates that the adjusted $R$-squared representing extrinsic satisfaction shows a stronger relationship than that of intrinsic satisfaction. For Model 1, 27% of the variance can be explained by job satisfaction through transformational leadership. At the same time, only 12.6% of the variance in job satisfaction can be predicted through intrinsic satisfaction. This represents a 14.4% greater variation difference in extrinsic satisfaction than in intrinsic satisfaction.

In Model 2, the adjusted $R$-squared for extrinsic job satisfaction indicated 28.3% of the variance could be explained through the collaborating measure of conflict management; the
intrinsic satisfaction portion indicated only 18.8% could be predicted. This shows that extrinsic satisfaction was 9.5% higher than intrinsic satisfaction.

Model 3 examined the model’s strength using both independent variables: transformational leadership (GTLQ) and conflict management style (ROCI-II). Similar to the previous models, Model 3 was stronger for the extrinsic satisfaction outcome variable than for intrinsic satisfaction. The adjusted R-squared indicated 34.5% of the variance in extrinsic job satisfaction could be explained by Model 3; the intrinsic satisfaction portion of Model 3 indicated 21.3% could be predicted. This was a change of 13.2% greater for extrinsic job satisfaction than for intrinsic job satisfaction.

A comparison of the adjusted R-squared from each of the model summary regression outputs shows a stronger overall relationship in the MSQ-SF extrinsic compared to the MSQ-SF intrinsic variations for each model. Some extrinsic satisfaction examples could be job tasks, working conditions, supervisor relationships, peer relationships, pay, etc.

In the coefficients tables of the multiple regression output (Tables 20, 22, and 24), the unstandardized coefficient $B$ value represents the slope of the line between the predictor variable and the dependent variable; in other words, it represents the amount of change in the outcome variable due to each unit change in the predictor variable. The standardized coefficient $\beta$ refers to the percent of, or how many, standard deviations an outcome variable will change as per the standard deviation increase/decrease in the predictor variable. For the analysis, the standardized coefficients $\beta$ was used to analyze the continuous variables: transformational leadership (GTLQ mean) and conflict management Style (ROCI-II). The unstandardized coefficients $\beta$ was used to analyze the binary variable, for example, 10 to 19 years of service. In examining the coefficients table of the multiple regression output from all three models, the
strongest of the main independent variables was in Model 2, the collaborating measure of conflict management style variable, at 74.4%. This indicates that a one standard deviation increase in the collaborating measure of conflict management style variable is associated with a 74.4% of a standard deviation change in extrinsic job satisfaction, on average. The next highest was found in Model 3, which contained a combination of transformational leadership and conflict management style within the model. It accounts for a one standard deviation increase in the collaborating measure of conflict management style, which is associated with 59% of a standard deviation change in extrinsic job satisfaction, on average.

The next highest percentage was found in Model 1, transformational leadership (GLTQ mean). A one standard deviation increase in transformational leadership is associated with 53.1% of a standard deviation change in extrinsic job satisfaction, on average. A one standard deviation increase in the collaborating style of conflict management is associated with 47.8% of a standard deviation change in intrinsic job satisfaction, on average. A one standard deviation increase in transformational leadership is associated with 43% of a standard deviation change in intrinsic job satisfaction, on average.
Chapter V

Discussion

No one takes on a leadership position expecting to do a poor job. At the same time, there are far too many examples of poor leadership. News and media outlets highlight far too many examples of bankrupt leadership with egomaniacal and narcissistic leaders, such as Enron and Lehman Brothers (Stein, 2013; Stein & Pinto, 2011). Law enforcement is no exception.

Literature involving police leadership has shown that authoritarian style supervisors seek little input from subordinates (Can et al., 2017). A survey of police chiefs by Girodo (1998) revealed that most respondents self-reported to resemble the Machiavellian style. Other research in police leadership has found that all-inclusive decision-making can encourage dedication and fidelity (Northouse 2007). In contrast, traditional hierarchical police management is often cited as a handicap to line officer empowerment (Steinheider & Wuestewald 2008). Both Machiavellian and Authoritarian leadership styles are in stark contrast to this research’s focus and show a clear need for a shift in the way law enforcement leadership looks. The results of this research found that the collaborative measure of conflict management style (CMS) and transformational leadership (TL) was the most significant predictor in job satisfaction (JS) among subordinate police officers’ perception.

In summary, this research examined how transformational leadership (IV) and conflict management styles (IV) drive job satisfaction (DV). This research was a confounding variables study using conflict management style as the confounding variable (CV). The idea was to disentangle the relationship between transformational leadership (IV) and conflict management style (CV) to understand which was a more potent driver of job satisfaction.
Research Questions

1. To what extent does the perception of transformational leadership in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?

2. To what extent does the perception of conflict management style in first-line supervisors within law enforcement organizations predict police officers’ job satisfaction?

3. To what extent does the variance in job satisfaction resulting from transformational leadership remain after accounting for the influence of conflict management styles?

This study confirms that all three models were significant in predicting intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction through multiple regression analysis. Also, extrinsic satisfaction was more strongly predicted by the independent variables, including transformational leadership. The variance in job satisfaction increased for each model, with the third model having the highest job satisfaction variance. The final model combined both transformational leadership (GTLQ) and conflict management style (ROCI-II); the adjusted R-squared of the model summary tables of the multiple regression increased in each succession model for each succeeding question.

In the coefficients tables of the multiple regression output (Tables 20, 22, and 24), the collaborating measure of conflict management style had the largest effect size on job satisfaction. In Model 2 (ROCI-II) of the extrinsic job satisfaction portion of the multiple regression output, the collaborating measure of conflict management style predicts 74.4% of a standard deviation change in extrinsic job satisfaction; in Model 3, the collaborating measure of conflict management style predicts 59% of a standard deviation change in extrinsic job satisfaction. In Model 1, transformational leadership predicts 53.1% of a standard deviation change in extrinsic job satisfaction.
For Research Question 1, the results revealed that transformational leadership was significant and an influential predictor of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Although both were significant, extrinsic satisfaction had a 14.4% higher adjusted R-squared value; this indicates that extrinsic satisfaction is a more significant predictor of job satisfaction than intrinsic satisfaction.

For Research Question 2, the results similarly revealed that intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction were significant predictors of job satisfaction. The adjusted R-squared value was 9.5% greater for extrinsic satisfaction than intrinsic satisfaction; this indicates that extrinsic satisfaction is a more significant predictor of job satisfaction than intrinsic satisfaction.

In Research Questions 1 and 2, the variance was similar, albeit higher for Question 2, conflict management style over transformational leadership. The adjusted R-squared value in Question 2 increased by 6.2% for intrinsic satisfaction and 1.3% for extrinsic satisfaction. The largest driver of conflict management style was the collaborating measure. The results regarding the collaborating measure of conflict management style are consistent with the literature review, which showed parallels between both transformational leadership and the collaborating measure of conflict management style.

In Research Question 3, both transformational leadership and conflict management style were combined into one model for examination. Again, both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction were significant predictors of job satisfaction. In the same way that job satisfaction improved from Model 1 to Model 2; job satisfaction was even greater in Model 3 (the combination of transformational leadership and conflict management style). It showed wider employee job satisfaction than either transformational leadership or conflict management style alone. Model 3 improved upon Model 2 by 2.5% and improved upon Model 1 by 8.7% for intrinsic job
satisfaction. Employee extrinsic job satisfaction in Model 3 improved from Model 2 by 6.2% and improved upon Model 1 by 7.5%.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework is clear: Leadership style is an essential organizational antecedent to job satisfaction (Munir, Rahman et al., 2012). A collective organizational culture that shares common goals and strong group identification like law enforcement was positively related to transformational leadership (Murphy & Drodge, 2003). This research, involving the perception of first-line supervisors involving transformational leadership, revealed the same. This research study was consistent with the theoretical framework that leadership style is an essential predictor of job satisfaction (Braun et al., 2013). Leadership style as a positive predictor was also true in the field of academia involving the perceptions of supervisors’ transformational leadership and job satisfaction (Braun et al., 2013). Research on subordinates’ perception of supervisors directly relates to the research in this project, as it focuses on the subordinates’ perception of first-line supervisors in a police setting.

Research has been limited in law enforcement as it relates to the subordinate first-line supervisor relationship. The literature in law enforcement and job satisfaction has primarily focused on the following three areas: demographics, job-task, and organizational characteristics. This research expands what is known about job satisfaction among police officers through transformational leadership and conflict management styles.

This study extends the literature of transformational leadership by detangling its relationship with conflict management style. It found that both conflict management style and transformational leadership lead to employee satisfaction, but also that incorporating both is a more exacting way to gain employee job satisfaction. It also found that the collaborating measure
of conflict management style accounted for more job satisfaction than transformational leadership and that the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction is due, in part, to conflict management style.

Although this study never intended to answer which is better (transformational leadership or conflict management style), the results can lead the reader to ask just that: Which is better, transformational leadership or conflict management style? The model that combined both transformational leadership and conflict management style was more potent than either variable alone. The results show that, when looked at independently, conflict management style had a more significant amount of variance in the perception of employee job satisfaction than did transformational leadership. In that way, the conflict management style of supervisors is more substantial. But the answer is more complicated. Transformational leadership is a more all-encompassing approach to leadership, whereas conflict management style is more of a situational approach. Transformational leadership is a robust leadership approach that offers direction and inspiration; it motivates, encourages and considers the needs of the followers. Transformational leadership does this in a way that conflict management style does not because conflict management style was not designed to do so. We cannot always control what comes our way, but how we respond matters. The theory of conflict management style is situational and designed to respond to exigencies as they arise in the best way possible.

Conflict in organizations is omnipresent (Coggburn et al., 2014; Putnam & Wilson, 1982; Riaz et al., 2016; Terason, 2018), including among peer officers in police work. This research marks what we know about police work and conflict and how we might improve both.
Police Leadership

Leadership is a dynamic social process dependent upon numerous variables in constant flux (Murphy & Drodge, 2003). This research sets itself apart because it examines leadership perception in law enforcement in the first-line supervisor setting. Past research on transformational leadership and law enforcement has centered upon its highest levels, e.g., police directors and police chiefs. The problem with examining leadership at this level is that most officers have little to no leadership interaction. Communication at the very top of law enforcement is primarily disseminated downward and rarely delivered from the bottom-up. When it does, it is at a snail pace. Few studies have examined transformational leadership in law enforcement on the subordinate level, where most subordinate-supervisor interaction occurs. This research further extended what we know about leadership by exploring the impact of the relationship between police officers and police sergeants from the subordinates’ perspective.

Conflict Management Style

Typically, it would be difficult to determine in which direction the relationship between leadership and conflict originates. However, a strong connection with police leadership top-down, control-and-command, suggests that the supervisor-subordinate relationship comes from the supervisor initiating the conflict management type or style. This study is the first study on conflict management style conducted in a police supervisor-subordinate setting.

This study, involving police officers’ perception of their supervisors, supports what we know about conflict management style and its general antecedent effect on employee job satisfaction. This research extended what we know about the relationship between conflict management style and job satisfaction in law enforcement between first-line police officers and first-line police supervisors to the sergeant and subordinate level. Research on the benefits of
conflict management style in law enforcement organizations has not been fully explored and sets this research apart from others like it.

**Limitations**

This study was based on how subordinates perceive the behavior of their senior sergeants within a police organization. It was not intended to measure satisfaction, conflict, or leadership based upon other members of a police organization’s command staff, e.g., police lieutenant, captain, or chief. Another limitation was the sample size; this research was conducted using convenience sampling. Participation in this project was voluntary, so participation could not be controlled. Similarly, casual responses could not account for participants, which may or may not affect the conclusion. Although the police population chosen to be sampled was considered a delimitation, the demands of shiftwork, availability, or lack thereof were other limitations of this study. Participant skepticism and hesitation about this study may have also affected their responses.

Moreover, although every effort was made to make it clear to participants that this project was anonymous, police officers’ skepticism about the anonymity of the project is an additional limitation. Additionally, results were limited to the willingness or unwillingness of participants who chose to participate or change their minds and decide not to participate. Finally, research was limited by the population demographics regarding the demographic variables listed above.

Finally, the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) was initially used as a self-assessment instrument. A literature review of ROCI-II revealed that it is permitted to be adapted to measure how their supervisor manages conflict with them (Rahim, 2010). For this research, the ROCI-II was used to assess the subordinate’s supervisor.
This study expands upon the research on conflict management style as a confounding variable and its effect on police subordinates’ job satisfaction. This research and others like it are essential in guiding changes in departmental policies and training. The intention is to help police leadership shape competent supervisors to enhance department-wide job satisfaction within their respective police departments. A principal goal was to build upon what we already know about police leadership. The goal is quality leadership in law enforcement and a positive example for subordinates to follow and emulate. This project’s ancillary goal is that subordinates who are satisfied employees and those with positive supervisors will translate positively into better police-public interactions.

The dependent variable for this research project centers on job satisfaction among police officers. A limitation of this study is its time in history and its impact on satisfaction among the police profession. At the time of the data collection, a global pandemic -- SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) -- impacted the world. While large segments of the US population were shut down or working from home, the police population was part of the essential workforce that could not work remotely or from home. While most of the general workforce was asked to stay home, police were asked to enforce local shutdowns, social distancing, and mask mandates, all of which while still being responsible for other seemingly normal activity while understaffed, underfunded, and underappreciated (Stogner et al., 2020). Large-scale police protests may also have impacted police satisfaction; some resulted in rioting, calling for social justice and police reform (Laufs & Waseem, 2020). Both COVID-19 and protests centered around police reform may have impacted the participating police officers’ satisfaction in this study beyond what the survey tool used or asked.
Additionally, these various limitations could also have limited the total number of participants (N=77). Then, too, the research included more white participants than members of minority groups -- Asian, black, and female. A low response rate gives rise to a sampling bias, resulting in potentially inaccurate generalizations or conclusions (Nielsen et al., 2017). In terms of this study, generalizations can be made specific to this project, e.g., suburban, white, male police officers.

Although preparation for this study was thorough and thoughtful, participants’ satisfaction could have been different in another time and place, for example, at a time when police sentiment is higher. Future research should consist of participants from another time frame and outside of this geographical area.

**Future Research**

The independent variables (IV) for this project were transformational leadership and conflict management style. Conflict management style was examined to determine which measure was the strongest drive of job satisfaction; the analysis revealed collaboration as the most vital driver for job satisfaction. Research that examines transformational leadership in the same way would enhance a future study overall to determine which measure or measures of transformational leadership are the largest drivers of job satisfaction. Another improvement could be to open the population to other police department members, not specifically to the police officer/police sergeant level. Questions to all members of a police department below the rank of chief, not just those below the rank of sergeant, would allow for more possible participants and, hence, a larger pool or sample size.

Furthermore, a qualitative analysis might provide more insight into the most common interview responses of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Qualitative research with semi-
structured interview questions would be important in furthering the subject matter from this research. It would allow participants to talk in some depth in their own words. This approach might bring about influential questions or responses that might be new to this topic.

Then, too, some questions could focus on emotional responses regarding how a supervisor addressed conflict. Another interesting angle that could be paired out from interview questions might be to determine if subordinates' approaches to civilians could be related to the leadership style of his/her supervisor. If poor supervisor leadership were correlated to low police-civilian interaction, one could make a stronger case for both leadership training and help to move law enforcement past the dark leadership style that is so pervasive in law enforcement today. Then, too, a study conducted outside of a police setting could help determine if results might be similar in other professions.

Other areas of research might include:

1. How transformational leadership and conflict management styles drive job satisfaction can be further researched, utilizing a more extensive sample size and focusing on minority members of a police department, i.e., black, female, and Hispanic.

2. Collaboration was found to be the most substantial conflict management style measure; similarly, transformational leadership should be examined to determine its strongest measure/s.

3. This study selected two main independent variables, conflict management style and transformational leadership. Perhaps further research could include other variables that impact job satisfaction, such as emotional intelligence.
4. A qualitative methodology investigation of conflict management style and transformational leadership could use interviews to determine research-based anecdotal evidence.

It is clear that conflict is an inevitable consequence of any relationship, regardless of its source. Leaders that fail to handle conflict effectively in a working relationship can be detrimental to a work environment. On the other hand, conflict appropriately managed can be a useful tool for good leaders. This research has shown that dynamic leadership that incorporates a collaboration leadership style leads to greater satisfaction among subordinates. The collaborative leadership style emphasizes building relationships so that task conflict can be overcome collectively, with a shared purpose, so that all parties involved can be invested in its successful outcome.

This research’s primary takeaway is that the combination of both transformational leadership and the collaborative measure of conflict management style leads to the perception of job satisfaction in law enforcement among subordinate members of a police department. These findings call for police leadership that emphasizes collaboration. This should also include training and promotional examinations. Law enforcement must develop a clear pattern of successful leadership qualities in prospective candidates. Work history should be part of it. A professional examination should be part of it, too, but training police officers consistently to lead appropriately is something the law enforcement and communities they serve deserve.

Conclusion

James McGregor Burn’s book *Leadership* (1978) began the research momentum into the field of transformational leadership. This may be the most popular leadership construct in the past 100 years. It has been written about and studied in many work fields. This study sets itself
apart by analyzing transformational leadership with conflict management style as the confounding variable. This research has shown that dynamic leadership, which incorporates collaboration, leads to greater satisfaction among subordinates. It has clearly shown that a combination of transformational leadership and the collaborating measure of conflict management style led to higher satisfaction among police subordinates.

This research is not, and never intended to be, a this-or-that evaluation of transformational leadership versus conflict management style. In fact, the literature has shown an inevitable overlapping of ideas related explicitly to collaboration in conflict management style (cms) and intellectual stimulation, a construct of transformational leadership, which values creativity, autonomy, and decision-making among its members. Transformational leadership focuses on the influence that enhances exchange, collaboration, and openness (Bolman & Deal, 2000). This research project has shown that collaboration is the most significant conflict management style measure. This research has also shown that supervisors who utilize transformational leadership and the collaborating measure of conflict management style foster greater satisfaction among subordinates.

Research in leadership is essential, clearly, but training individuals to be good leaders is equally important. Individuals cannot be left to do the work of self-improving their leadership skills. The unintended consequences of not doing enough leadership training have, far too often, led to poor leadership. There are far too many people eager to lead but not willing to put in work. Not wanting to study leadership as a craft, not wanting to put in the essential hard work to become a responsible candidate, is a quality of poor leadership. If the law enforcement profession trained officers to become better leaders, the law enforcement community would have
far better opportunities for selecting quality leaders. Asking someone to do the work of self-improvement is not enough and too often fallen short.

Law enforcement needs leadership training throughout a law enforcement career. A passive approach to leadership, a best-available approach, has failed time and time again. Law enforcement must develop a clear pattern of successful leadership qualities in prospective candidates. Police officers need consistently trained police officers who lead appropriately; this is something the law enforcement community needs.

The conclusion of this research indicates a positive association in subordinate job satisfaction through both transformational leadership and conflict management style, specifically collaboration. This research has shown that supervisors, managers, and anyone in a leadership role can exact higher satisfaction among his/her subordinates by incorporating a collaborative approach in tandem with transformational leadership.

Research in leadership is essential, clearly, but training individuals to be good leaders is equally important and largely overlooked. Individuals cannot be left to do the work of self-improving their leadership skills. The unintended consequences of not doing enough leadership training have led to selecting the "best available option," which has, far too often, led to failures in leadership. There are far too many people eager to lead but not willing to put in the necessary work at becoming a good leader. The consequence is leaders that fail to evolve and lead, based upon what they had seen or told when they initially began their career. These leaders are dated and offer little to no good leadership for the law enforcement profession -- the public expects more.

Asking someone to do the work of self-improvement is not enough and has far too often fallen short. To become more powerful, athletes strength-train; to become smarter, students
study. If the law enforcement profession trained officers to become better leaders, the law enforcement community would have far better opportunities for selecting quality leaders -- and police-citizen relations would be far better off for it. Moreover, examples of quality leadership that lead to job satisfaction among subordinates give subordinates positive examples for interacting with citizens; this may, in turn, lead to greater police-citizen satisfaction. Future research that duplicates this study using citizen satisfaction with police interaction would strengthen this study’s findings.
References

*Grassroots, 52*(1), 188-199.

Alatawi, M. A. (2017). The myth of the additive effect of the transformational leadership model. 


https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/238338.pdf


https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2505


https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484302238435


https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.215


Appendix A

Initial Email to PBA Presidents

Dear PBA President,

My name is Giuseppe Alise. I am a current police officer and a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University. I am writing because I need help completing my dissertation. I am asking for help in a study that examines Transformational Leadership/Conflict Management Style and Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement. Participation in this project is entirely voluntary & COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS, which will be described in detail before taking a prepared survey.

To complete this dissertation, as PBA President, I ask for your help by doing the following:

1. Please deliver the attached "Solicitation Letter" to your PBA Members. Within the attachment, there is a link to a survey I have prepared.

   - Please ask participating members to complete the survey within ten (10) days. I will email you in seven (7) days to ask you to send a reminder email to complete the survey.
   - The survey can be completed on anything with an internet connection: cellphone/tablets/computers.
   - Once the survey is complete, there is nothing left to do; the results, and only the results, are automatically uploaded so that totals can be analyzed.

2. After sending the survey letter, please email me at alisegiu@shu.edu with an approximate number of members who would have received the survey. I realize that number is not the amount that will choose to participate. I am just looking to see how large the pool of participants could be.

If you have any questions about this project- please email or call me anytime at 201-292-4563. Thank you again for helping me with this project!

G. Alis
Appendix B
Letter of Solicitation

Dear Participant,

My name is Giuseppe Alise, and I am a Police Sergeant with the Northvale Police Department, as well as a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University. I am in the process of completing my dissertation on transformational leadership in law enforcement. This dissertation is on the impact that senior sergeants’ behavior has on officers’ job satisfaction and conflict management style within their respective agency.

The purpose of this letter is to request participation in this study. The goal is to further develop knowledge within the field of leadership with a focus on law enforcement. The intended participants for this project are subordinate police officers. As police officers, you are invited to participate in this project by completing the prepared survey. The survey will be asking information about your job satisfaction as well as your perception of your supervisors’ leadership style and approach to conflict. If you would like to participate in this survey, following the consent form, please click on the following link: (LINK GOES HERE)

The completion of these survey instruments is approximately 10 minutes. All data collection results will be stored on a memory drive that will be password protected on a USB drive in a locked safe at the research’s home. The information will be safely stored for a minimum of five (5) years, with access to only this researcher. After five (5) years, all reports and demographic questionnaire information will then be destroyed. Furthermore, given the nature of the study, no individual results will be shared with police leadership, and any results coming from this study will be aggregated.

If you have questions, please contact this researcher at alisegiu@shu.edu. This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Richard Blissett, richard.blissett@shu.edu. Any questions/concerns about your rights can be directed to the Institutional Review Board at Seton Hall University. Please contact Michael LaFountaine, Ed.D., at Michael.lafountaine@shu.edu Officer of the IRB, Presidents Hall, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.

Giuseppe Alise, Ed.S
Appendix C

Informed Consent

This researcher is a police officer with the Northvale Police Department, as well as a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University, The School of Education and Human Services. This researcher is preparing my dissertation in Transformational Leadership, Conflict Management Style, and Job Satisfaction. The goal is to determine if employee satisfaction achieved through transformational leadership is a result of the way leadership handles conflict. In other words, is the job satisfaction achieved through transformational leadership a consequence of the way transformational leaders manage conflict? A chief purpose of this research is to determine if conflict management styles can be an alternative way of achieving job satisfaction with subordinate police officers.

The purpose of this letter is to request to invite you to participate in this study, which seeks to contribute to the growing body of knowledge in law enforcement leadership.

The sample population for this study will be the sworn police officers of participating law enforcement agencies. As this study is of quantitative design, the data will be gathered through three short surveys. The survey instruments used will be the following:

1) **Global Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (GTLQ):** This instrument was developed to measure transformational leadership behavior.

2) **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ):** This instrument was developed at the University of Minnesota to measure individual satisfaction with various aspects of their work and work environment.

3) **Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II):** This instrument was developed to measure conflict management style.

Each survey has been extensively used in past research. Each survey has been tested and found to be valid and reliable. The completion of these survey instruments is approximately 10 minutes.
Permission to conduct this study was granted by your PBA President. Each participant should follow their department’s Standard Operating Procedures involving any notifications to their respective departments or Chief of Police. This permission does not imply any requirement or expectation that you participate in the study. You as a participant and your responses will remain anonymous and will not be directly shared with your Chief, nor will your agency be named in the study. The Informed Consent Letter is also attached, explaining the research, parameters of the study, and a demographic questionnaire for review.

This researcher is calling on you to voluntarily share your experiences within the law enforcement profession to participate in this study by completing the demographic questionnaire along with the GTLQ, MSQ, and ROCI-II surveys. This researcher would like to thank each of you in advance for your consideration.

All data collection results will be stored on a memory drive that will be password protected on a USB drive in a locked safe at the researcher’s home.

The information will be safely stored for a minimum of five (5) years, with access to only this researcher. After five (5) years, all reports and demographic questionnaire information will then be destroyed. There are no anticipated or foreseeable risks to participants associated with this research.

If you have any questions, please contact this researcher by email at giuseppe.alise@shu.edu. You may also contact my Dissertation Mentor, Dr. Richard Blissett, at richard.blissett@shu.edu.

Any questions/concerns about your rights can be directed to the Institutional Review Board at Seton Hall University at (973) 313-6314 or by mail c/o Michael LaFountaine, Ed.D., Officer of the IRB, Presidents Hall, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ 07079 or by email at, michael.lafountaine@shu.edu.

Giuseppe Alise Ed.S.
Appendix D

Reminder Email to PBA Presidents

Dear Rockland County, NY, & Bergen County, NJ, PBA Presidents,

Thank you for taking the time to send out the survey to your PBA members. Please take the time to read the below email I prepared for your members. Please copy & paste it into an email so that your members that choose not to participate reconsider.

Thanks again,

G. Alise

Dear PBA Members,

First, I would like to thank all of you for extending yourselves on my behalf. I truly appreciate all the help with this project.

Unfortunately, I do not have enough responses to complete this project so far. I am asking any PBA member who has decided not to participate to please reconsider. I am going to continue to keep the survey open so that PBA members have a chance to reconsider participating. The survey will close to all members on Monday, Aug. 17, 2020.

Finally, anyone who has any trouble with the survey link can copy-&-paste the link into a web browser. If you copy-&-paste the below link, it will take you straight to the survey as well. Again- thank you for taking the time to consider this project. If anyone has any questions please call or text me any day or night at 201-292-4563.

Link:
https://shu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3X9C8ubLj4Pynrv

G. Alise
Dear PBA Members,

Thank you again for helping me with this project. I truly appreciate all the help with this project.

I have decided to extend the closing of this police survey to gain more participants. I am asking any PBA members who have opted not to participate to please reconsider. The survey will close to all members on Wednesday, Sept. 5, 2020.

A large number of participants (30%) have begun but not completed the survey. I need them to please complete the survey. Please ask members who have started the survey to please continue & complete the survey. If they open the survey on the device they started it on, the survey will continue where they left off.

Thank you again for helping with this project.

Survey Link:

https://shu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3X9C8ubLj4Pynrv

Giuseppe Alise
Appendix F

Institutional Review Board Approval

July 13, 2020

Giuseppe Alise

Re: Study ID# 2020-093

Dear Mr. Alise:

The Research Ethics Committee of the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved your research proposal entitled, “Transformational Leadership, Conflict Management, Job Satisfaction” as resubmitted. This memo serves as official notice of the aforementioned study’s approval as exempt. If your study included an informed consent form, letter of solicitation or flyer, a stamped copy is included for your use.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol, informed consent form or study team must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

You will receive a communication from the Institutional Review Board at least 1 month prior to your expiration date requesting that you submit an Annual Progress Report to keep the study active, or a Final Review of Human Subjects Research form to close the study. In all future correspondence with the Institutional Review Board, please reference the ID# listed above.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mara C. Poshey, PhD, OTR
Associate Professor
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

Office of the Institutional Review Board
Presidents Hall · 400 South Orange Avenue · South Orange, New Jersey 07079 · Tel: 973.275.4654 · Fax 973.275.2978
www.shu.edu
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