

5-2011

Turnover intent, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: An assessment of municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, Texas

Joel Rivera
University of Texas-Pan American

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/leg_etd



Part of the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rivera, Joel, "Turnover intent, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: An assessment of municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, Texas" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations - UTB/UTPA*. 77.

https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/leg_etd/77

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations - UTB/UTPA by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. For more information, please contact justin.white@utrgv.edu, william.flores01@utrgv.edu.

TURNOVER INTENT, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND JOB SATISFACTION:
AN ASSESSMENT OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS
WITHIN HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

A Thesis

by

JOEL RIVERA

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Texas-Pan American
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

May 2011

Major Subject: Public Administration

TURNOVER INTENT, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND JOB SATISFACTION:
AN ASSESSMENT OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS
WITHIN HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

A Thesis

by

JOEL RIVERA

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Cynthia E. Lynch, PhD. Rev.
Chair of Committee

Aziza Zemrani, PhD.
Committee Member

Mr. John R. Milford
Committee Member

May 2011

Copyright 2011 Joel Rivera
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Rivera, Joel, Turnover intent, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: An Assessment of Municipal Police Departments within Hidalgo County. Master of Public Administration (MPA), May, 2011, 86 pp., 81 tables, 1 figure, references, 39 titles.

There is a paucity of research on turnover intent among police officers, particularly municipal police officers. This study examines the importance of turnover intent as it relates to job satisfaction and organizational commitment for municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, Texas. This research is important because attrition costs are among the largest expenses that municipal police agencies incur, and mitigation of that loss may benefit the municipal police agencies during times of financial hardships.

This study found organizational commitment to be a predictor of turnover intent.

DEDICATION

The completion of my graduate studies would not have been possible without my Lord, for he is my strength, and the love and support of my family. My mother, Aurora Rivera, who never lost hope in me, my late father, Eubaldo Rivera, who was the greatest man next to Christ I will ever know, and my wife, Marissa Rivera, who supported me throughout . Thank you for your love, patience, and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I will always be grateful to my thesis committee, Dr. Cynthia E. Lynch, chair of my thesis committee, for all her mentoring, advice, guidance, and encouragement. Dr. Aziza Zemrani, thesis committee member and methodologist, for her patience, professionalism, and guidance. Mr. John Milford, committee member, for his invaluable insight on local governments. From research, research design, to manuscript editing, they each encouraged me to complete this process exercising infinite patience and guidance.

I would like to acknowledge my brothers in blue, both chief of police and police officers who took time from their busy schedules to help one of their own complete his education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
RESEARCH QUESTION.....	2
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	13
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS.....	28
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION.....	67
REFERENCES.....	71
APPENDIX.....	75
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	86

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Description of Survey Items- Demographics	16
Table 2: Survey Excerpt- Job Satisfaction	17
Table 3: Survey Excerpt- Group Cohesion	18
Table 4: Survey Excerpt- Organizational Commitment	18
Table 5: Survey Excerpt- Organizational Fairness	19
Table 6: Survey Excerpt- Supervisor Support	20
Table 7: Survey Excerpt- Turnover Intent.....	21
Table 8: Gender	21
Table 9: Age.....	22
Table 10: Education.....	22
Table 11: Ethnicity.....	23
Table 12: Rank.....	24
Table 13: Duty Assignment.....	24
Table 14: Tenure.....	25
Table-15: Years of Service.....	26
Table 16: Hours worked per week.....	26
Table 17: Annual income.....	27
Table 18: Second job.....	27
Table 19: Descriptive Statistics.....	29

Table 20.....	30
Table 21.....	30
Table 22.....	31
Table 23.....	31
Table 24.....	32
Table 25.....	33
Table 26.....	34
Table 27.....	34
Table 28.....	35
Table 29.....	35
Table 30.....	36
Table 31.....	36
Table 32.....	37
Table 33.....	37
Table 34.....	38
Table 35.....	38
Table 36.....	39
Table 37.....	40
Table 38.....	40
Table 39.....	41
Table 40.....	41
Table 41.....	42
Table 42.....	42

Table 43.....	43
Table 44.....	44
Table 45.....	44
Table 46.....	45
Table 47.....	45
Table 48.....	46
Table 49.....	46
Table 50.....	47
Table 51.....	47
Table 52.....	48
Table 53.....	48
Table 54.....	49
Table 55.....	49
Table 56.....	50
Table 57.....	50
Table 58.....	51
Table 59.....	51
Table 60.....	52
Table 61.....	52
Table 62.....	53
Table 63.....	53
Table 64.....	54
Table 65.....	55

Table 66.....	55
Table 67.....	56
Table 68.....	56
Table 69.....	57
Table 70.....	57
Table 71.....	58
Table 72.....	58
TABLE 73: Correlations with index	62
TABLE 74: ANOVA ^b	63
TABLE 75: Coefficients ^a	64
TABLE 76: ANOVA ^b	64
TABLE 77: Coefficients ^a	64
TABLE 78: ANOVA ^b	65
TABLE 79: Coefficients ^a	65
TABLE 80: ANOVA ^b	66
TABLE 81: Coefficients ^a	66

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1: Map of Hidalgo County.....	4

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the importance of turnover intent as it relates to job satisfaction and organizational commitment for municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, Texas. This topic is important because the “great recession” of 2008-2011? as dubbed by economists (Rose, 2010) has small municipal police departments finding themselves dealing with shrinking budgets and public service mandates that require them to do more with less. Therefore, it is very important to carefully examine police department’s most valuable resource, their personnel.

Sworn officer’s salaries represent the greatest cost for most police departments and mitigating the attrition rate of that resource can save departments the high cost of recruitment, training, and retention. Small municipal police departments along the United States/ Mexico border, particularly in Hidalgo County, find themselves competing against one another and federal police agencies for peace officers to fill vacate positions (Koper 2004). This study seeks to address questions on intent to turnover for the various stakeholders of municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, Texas.

The first chapter of this thesis is the introduction. Chapter I provides a discussion on the proposed research question and hypothesis statements examined in this study. This chapter also addresses the significance of the study, definition of terms used in the relevant literature and finally assumptions made in order to conduct the study, as well as the limitations of the study.

The second chapter of this study is a review of the relevant literature on issues that are closely related to the research question. This section also discusses the high cost of turnover, law enforcement, and job satisfaction. The third section addresses organizational commitment.

The third chapter of this study is the methodology. This chapter includes a description of the subjects, an explanation of all the variables, a description of the techniques of data management and any procedures used. This chapter includes a discussion on the reliability of the data and the data analysis techniques used. This chapter also includes a brief discussion of control variables and provides some preliminary descriptive statistics.

The fourth chapter is the study's analysis of the data including a continuation of descriptive statistics and data correlation. The fifth and final chapter offers some conclusions with regards to the study's findings.

Research question

In the post 9/11 security environment of The United States and the public's perceived threats to the country's national security, the federal government poured a never-before-seen amount of money into securing its borders, especially its southern border with Mexico. According to the United States Government Accountability Office, (March, 2007) federal law enforcement agencies like The United States Border Patrol were mandated by the United States Congress to hire thousands of additional agents. Federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies were forced to compete for the same limited pool of men and women to fill their ranks. Municipal police departments in small jurisdictions along the border must truly understand the cause of attrition to be able to work more effectively to retain their officers. This study seeks to answer the question; does job satisfaction and organizational commitment correlate to officer's

turnover intent? The question guiding this study is: Are job satisfaction and organizational commitment accurate predictors of turnover intent for municipal police officers in Hidalgo County, Texas?

H₀: Job satisfaction is makes no difference in turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

H₁: Job satisfaction is a predictor of turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

H₀: Organizational commitment makes no difference in turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

H₁: Organizational commitment is a predictor of turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

Significance of Study

Many stakeholders have important interests in the conclusions of this study, including the citizens who are served by municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, sworn police officers and their labor representatives and locally elected officials. Citizens and residents of a city have the right to know that the police officers of their communities are highly qualified and well trained. Police officers should be involved in the study because the study may give them a collective voice on an academic scale. Police unions should be interested in the outcomes of the study because the issues that are of particular interest to their constituency, the officers, will be clearly identified to allow for direction with instances such as collective bargaining. Locally elected officials should be interested in the outcomes of this study so that they can campaign for office using evidence based claims of safety rather than ideological slogans.

As a gateway portal from the Republic of Mexico the peace officers of Hidalgo County are a front line of defense used to interdict narcotics, criminals, and abate countless other crimes. Additionally, the first line supervisors, Chief of Police, City Commissioners, and other administrators may be able to apply the findings of this study to reduce the attrition of police officers in their municipality thereby easing the burden of finding qualified police officers to serve their constituency. In the section that follows, a definition of terms will help the reader understand the research and the parameters used to conduct the study.

Definition of terms

In any study there are terms and acronyms that are particular to the area of study that will help the reader understand the research better.

Hidalgo County, Texas. Hidalgo County is one of the south-most counties in Texas. Hidalgo County shares a natural common border, the Rio Grande River, with the Republic of Mexico. It is the 7th largest county in Texas and is predominantly Hispanic. The United States Census Bureau estimates Hidalgo County has a population of 741,152. Hidalgo County is located in red in figure 1.

Figure 1



Source: Wikipedia, map of Texas highlight of Hidalgo County

Municipality. The term *municipality* is typically defined as a political subdivision which is a defined area geographically. It is governed by a city council or mayor and functions under a city charter granted by the state, and provides many services to its constituency including police protection. (United States Census Bureau, 2011)

Job Satisfaction. The social sciences have studied the topic of job satisfaction for decades and differ slightly on how to best define it as it is a variable (Lambert and Hogan, 2009; Dupuy, et al, 2010; Xiao-wei and Liao, 2005; Heshizer, 1994; Rehman, and Waheed, 2011). Job satisfaction is an affect that is not easily counted. The term “job satisfaction” generally refers to the level of content a person feels with their job. For the purposes of this study, Lambert and Hogan’s (2009: 99) definition of job satisfaction, which is “...an affective response by people towards their jobs.” will be used.

Organizational Commitment. Organizational commitment is a concept that is closely correlated to job satisfaction. In fact, the two are almost always researched together (Zainuddin, and Ibrahim, 2010). Organizational commitment is described by many researchers as the level of loyalty that an employee feels with for organization in which they work for (Jans, 1989: 248). This study will use the definition of organizational commitment: the “bond between worker and the organization” as detailed in Lambert and Hogan’s (1999) research.

Peace Officer, Municipal Peace Officer. Commonly referred to as a police officer, a Texas *Peace Officer* is an individual who is licensed by The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Standards and Education (TCLEOSE), which is the agency tasked with the licensing of peace officers, jailers, and telecommunicators, under Texas Occupation Code 1701. The licensing requirements include: the officer must have after having graduated from a recognized police academy and demonstrated proficiency in a written exam (79th Texas Legislature)

Turnover Intent. Turnover intent is a topic that has received much attention in the past decade. It is best described as the likeliness an employee will leave their job of their own volition absent of coercion (Jenkins, 1993). Turnover intent is different from turnover in that turnover may include involuntary separation, voluntary separations, and retirements (Lambert and Hogan, 2009).

Assumptions

As with all research, this study makes certain assumptions. Among the first things this study assumes is that the theoretical framework used in conducting this study is sound. Second, this study assumes that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are in fact good predictors of turnover intent within law enforcement, and that the study is capable of identifying and capturing that information through the instrument used. Third, this study assumes that the instrument used is a valid and reliable survey instrument appropriately applied and capable of capturing the variables necessary to arrive at a valid conclusion. Fourth, this study assumes that the methodology employed is appropriate for answering the research question. Fifth, is that respondents in the study are representative of the population of all municipal peace officers

within Hidalgo County, Texas, and that valid relationships can be derived from their responses. Sixth it is assumed that those surveyed were honest, willing, and unbiased participants. Finally, this study assumes that the findings can be generalized to the population of all municipal peace officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

Limitations

This study has a few limitations. First, the study is limited in that it is only an accurate reflection of the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment being a predictor of turnover intent, if the study accurately measured the variables identified. The study's results are also limited by how well the participant municipal peace officers represent the population of all municipal peace officers in Hidalgo County, Texas. Lastly, because of the study's limited sample size, findings can not be generalizable to a larger USA population; however, it will provide insights to the unique circumstances of the United States/ Mexican border area.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of terms

Turnover Intent

The social sciences abound with studies regarding turnover intent (Beecroft, Dorey, and Wenten, 2008; Lambert and Paoline, 2010; Lambert, Hogan, and Altheimer; Dupuy, et al, 2010). Turnover intent is defined as "...the cognitive process of thinking of quitting, planning on leaving a job, or the desire to leave the job." (Lambert and Hogan 2009: 98). The harsh reality is that the studies on turnover intent are a result of necessity as attrition affects many key high skilled professions from nursing, to accounting, to criminal justice. Often these professions require extensive education or training, involve governmental certifications or licensing and testing and therefore, the market demand for these professionals is high and supply limited.

Turnover can have a devastating effect on any organization, particularly an organization tasked with providing emergency services. The public sector, more so than the private sector, feels the impact of turnover because there is a rigid process that dictates how vacancies may be filled. The process, often times, is lengthy and cumbersome. Vacancies must be publicly advertised in a newspaper, and positions must remain unfilled for a minimum of 30 days to encourage a larger pool of applicants. The cost of advertising and paying for overtime adds to the cost of filling the position. Often times public managers find themselves in a quandary because the work of an unfilled position cannot simply go undone, however the budgetary impact of approving overtime to employees only adds to the fiscal burden of recruitment, retention, and training.

This issue is compounded when the vacant position is a public safety position. The State of Texas has strict requirements for hiring peace officers, (1) the candidate must be licensed by The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards and Education (TCLOSE) which requires all peace officer candidates to attend an accredited police academy, (2) the candidate must pass a state administered exam, (3) the candidate must pass a physical and psychological screening, and (4) the candidate must have on-the-job field training administered by the hiring police agency. Often times, municipalities will choose to forego sponsoring a police cadet through a police academy and hire someone who is already licensed as a Texas peace officer in the interest of expediency. Although hiring a peace officer who is already licensed sounds like it is the best and most practical practice, some departments find they are not able to attract experienced officers and they have to opt into sponsoring a police cadet.

While a police cadet is attending the police academy, departments must pay tuition and fees associated with attending the police academy in addition to salary and benefits to the police cadet. This is a costly and time consuming endeavor for a small municipality as expectations the police cadet will not be a contributing member of that police force for at least 16 weeks. In the interim, the police departments are required to fill in with the peace officers it does have and pay them overtime in order to provide minimal coverage to its constituency.

Both police cadets and experienced peace officers must be hired in accordance to civil service or collective bargaining contract. This practice is typical of most modern municipal police departments and an expensive endeavor. Once hired, a background investigation on the officer is required. The police department must assign a background investigator to conduct a background check on the candidate for the purpose of employment. This means a full-time investigator must assume those additional duties in order to be compliant with the state's statute.

Once again the overtime budget must be tapped into for the police department to be in compliance in its hiring practices and for the proper police services to be provided to the general public.

Most municipalities require a new hire, experienced or not, take a physical and psychological exam in order for the hiring process to move forward. Once the background investigation, physical and psychological examinations are complete, the process may continue. In some instances, police departments must spend additional budget dollars to equip a new hire because body armor, duty gear, and uniforms vary from person to person.

When new hires are ready to start working, every police department is required to give all police cadets and veteran officers alike on-the-job field training. Field training can take as long as six months to complete and a field training officer must accompany the new hire at all times when on duty. All the while, the municipality must continue to pay other officers overtime in order to not compromise the delivery of services.

In addition to the cost absorbed by the police departments during the training phases of a police recruit, departments are finding they are spending an increased amount of their budget on recruitment. Researchers have attributed other possible reasons for high attrition rates on the exodus of the baby boomer generation and a decrease in a public service career orientation (Woska, 2006; Lewis and Frank, 2002; Smola and Charlotte D. Sutton, 2002; Ortner, 1998). In addition, the previously stated congressional mandate that United States Border Patrol bolster their ranks also attributed to the further depletion of the limited pool of applicants.

Although it is very difficult to place an exact monetary value on turnover as it is depends on the organization and numerous personality factors, agencies weathering the current fiscal crunch find that turnover is one issue that regardless of the cause cannot be ignored. If an entity

can mitigate turnover costs by identifying those factors that can be managed, it can lessen the financial burden to the organization.

Researchers have found that turnover intent is composed of two major components, job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Liang and Liao, 2005; Wagner, 2007; Hershizer, 1994).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is also an area of research within the social sciences that has received much attention (Rehman and Waheed, 2011; Grün, Hauser, and Rhein, 2010; Gordon, Osgood, Phillips; 2010). Job satisfaction is understood by researchers as a component of turnover intent, but the term job satisfaction is further defined as being composed of many distinct items, for example, job ambiguity (Glisson and Durick, 1988), supervisor support (McCalister, et al, 2003) promotion opportunities (Witt and Nye, 1992), ethics (Grady, et al, 1982), communication (Goris, Vaught, and Pettit; 2000), and group cohesion (McCalister, et al, 2003). This multifaceted construct makes researching it complicated.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is a “bond between the worker and the organization” (Lambert and Hogan, 2009). It, like job satisfaction, is a variable difficult to quantify because it deals with an emotional state or feeling and it is not easily captured by a numeric value. Organizational commitment in research is typically mentioned in the same breath as job satisfaction and it is difficult to separate the two as researchers have consistently found a strong positive relationship (Zainuddin, Ibrahim, and Ibrahim, 2010).

Organizational fairness

Compounding the issue of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, organizational fairness is often considered to be a component of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment because of its close relationship to both constructs. The definition of organizational fairness is “justice and fairness a worker perceives within an organization in terms of outcomes and procedures for reaching outcomes” (Lambert and Hogan, 2009). An employee considers how fair the organization is to its employees in dealing with things such as promotion opportunities (Witt and Nye, 1992), recognition of good work (Chory and Kingsley Westerman, 2009), job performance evaluations (Chory and Kingsley Westerman, 2009), and compensation (Porter, Conlon, and Barber, 2004) when evaluating how satisfied they are with their work experience.

Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement

The nature and stresses associated with tasks presented to law Enforcement adds an additional challenge because it incorporates all of the above mentioned nuances of job satisfaction and organizational commitment but is compounded by the issue of rotating shift work (Martin Euwema, et al, 2004), job assignment (Brody, DeMarco, and Lovrich, 2002), all the challenges of being a male dominated field for women (Melchor, Guzman, and James, 2004), and the dangers of particular to law enforcement. Law enforcement has the burden of being a service offered by municipalities regulated by state law. As such hiring practices are regulated at the municipal and state level.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The data for this thesis were collected on Tuesday, March 1, 2011 through Thursday, March 3, 2011, at three unnamed municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, Texas (please see Appendix B- Survey Log). This chapter outlines the steps taken throughout the data collection, the technology used for the study, and important details concerning research design. Where appropriate, each section includes definitions of variables, procedures followed and statistical techniques used in the analysis of the data. This chapter also provides some descriptive statistics on the demographics of the study.

The survey sought to identify the issues that had the greatest impact on turnover intent. As previously stated in chapter I, this study hypothesizes that turnover intent is correlated to job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

In order to conduct the study, the submission of a new study application form to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), at The University of Texas- Pan American, was required. The application packet, which contained a completed new study application form, a copy of the survey instrument, copies of the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) certificate of the completion of the Human Subject Research Curricular Completion Report by both the principal investigator, and faculty advisor, and letters of consent from three chiefs of police were submitted on December 7, 2010. Approval to conduct the study was granted by the IRB on January 31, 2011 and was assigned IRB approval #2010-112-12.

This study used audience response technology that is capable of capturing survey participant's responses for analysis. The software, referred to "Responceware" by Turning Technologies, is one of many products the Youngstown, Ohio Company provides. This technology works in conjunction with "ResponceCards" (clickers). The clickers use radio frequency (RF) or infrared (IR) on small numeric keypads with the dimensions similar to that of a credit card (Dimensions: 3.3" L x 2.1" W x 0.3" H) to transmit each individual's response to an RF receiver that attaches to a computer in the form of a USB drive. The receiver relays the information sent by the individual clicker to the software for analysis. The RF receiver is powered by the universal serial bus (USB) attached to a laptop, which displays the survey questions on PowerPoint slides. The responses are hidden from the view of participants and are saved to an encrypted USB drive for later analysis after each session.

This technology was used for a variety of reasons such as, minimizing inputting errors when transcribing the respondents answers from the completed surveys into an SPSS program, maximizing security over the responses on an encrypted USB drive, and increasing participation of subjects with the novelty of technology.

In the interest of maintaining the highest degree of anonymity the University of Texas Pan American Internal Review Board's (IRB) requirements privacy for human subject research, this study will not publish the names of the police departments surveyed but will reference them by number when necessary, and will only use aggregated data.

Definition of terms

Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis for this study is the individual peace officer. The sample of police officers was drawn from three municipal police departments in Hidalgo County, Texas. State statute requires each individual police department to insure their officers hold a current Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Standards and Education (TCLOSE) peace officer license and is physically fit to serve the community in a police capacity.

UTPA IRB required that all police departments willing to participate in this study provide written permission for the survey to be conducted. Of the 20 possible municipal police departments in Hidalgo County, only three provided written permission. According to TCLEOSE, the three police departments surveyed had a total of 74 sworn law enforcement officers. A sample of convenience was done on the premises at the respective police departments. Each of the police departments were surveyed three times in one twenty-four hour period capturing each of the three shifts. 38 officers participated in this survey representing 100% of the available population on that day.

Instrument

The 64 item survey instrument is a modified version of an instrument for a job satisfaction in a correctional institution by Eric Lambert and Nancy Hogan in 2009. The instrument had four distinct sections and can be found in its entirety in Appendix A. The survey was tested on February 15, 2011 at 4:30 p.m., in a graduate scope and methods course (PUBA 6330) at the University of Texas- Pan American for two reasons. The first reason was to test the mechanical functionality of the clicker technology. The second was to solicit comments from

pre-test participants on the construct validity of the survey (i.e. that the questions were understandable, the response options were appropriate, the language was understandable and appropriate without spelling or grammatical errors.)

Control variables

Items (1-11) of the survey instrument are typical of most survey instruments in that its purpose was to capture demographic information such as gender, age, education, years of service, rank and so forth. These are control variables for this research and can be found in Table 1 below. Where necessary some of the demographic items are redacted in order to insure the anonymity of the participants.

Table 1-Description of survey items- Demographics

TABLE 1		
#	Item	<i>Variable Code</i>
1	Gender	<i>Gender</i>
2	Age	<i>Age</i>
3	Education Attainment Level	<i>Education</i>
4	Ethnicity	<i>Ethnicity</i>
5	Rank	<i>Rank</i>
6	Current Assignment	<i>Assignment</i>
7	Years of Service	<i>Tenure</i>
8	Years as Peace Officer	<i>Experience</i>
9	Hours Worked per Week	<i>Hours Worked</i>
10	Annual Income	<i>Income</i>
11	Second Job	<i>Second Job</i>

The second section of the survey (items 12-45) asked questions designed to measure things such as job satisfaction, perceived supervisor support, and group cohesion. These questions used a seven point Likert Scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Neutral through 7-Strongly Disagree.

The Third section of the survey (items 46-52), which like sections 2 and 4 used a Likert Scale asked four questions (#46-#49) but differed in that the responses ranged from 1-Very Low to 4-Neutral through 7-Very High. Additionally, the third section used a six point Likert-like Scale, in questions #50 and #51 with responses ranging from 1-A Few Times a Year through 6-Everyday. Lastly, question #52 used a seven point Likert Scale which ranged from 1-Very Mild, Barely noticeable to 4- Moderate through 7-Very Strong Major.

The fourth section of the survey (items 53-64) reverted back to the seven point Likert Scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Neutral through 7-Strongly Disagree.

Independent Variables

The study does not attempt to create new meaning or redefine variables, but borrows from existing scholarly literature. The independent variables critical to this study are:

Job Satisfaction which is defined as the non-cognitive or emotional response by an individual towards their job (Lambert and Hogan, 2009). This variable is captured in Table 2, questions 21-23 and 50-52 respectively.

Table 2-Survey Excerpt- Job Satisfaction

TABLE 2
21. Overall I am very satisfied with my job.
22. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.
23. I am very satisfied with the kind of work I do on my job.
50. I feel burned out from my work.
51. I feel frustrated by my job.
52. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.

The second independent variable of importance is group cohesion or the perceived “friendliness, mutual liking, cooperation, and positive feelings about performing a group task.” (Jaramillo, Nixon, and Sams, 2003) This variable is captured in Table 3, questions 44 and 45.

Table 3-Survey Excerpt- Group Cohesion

TABLE 3
44. I feel I am really part of my work group.
45. I look forward to being with the members of my work group each day.

Organizational commitment is the third independent variable. It is bond an employee feels towards an organization (Lambert and Hogan 2009: 99). This variable is captured in Table 4, questions 12-20.

Table 4-Survey Excerpt- Organizational Commitment

TABLE 4
12. I am willing to put in more effort beyond than I normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
13. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
14. I would accept almost any type assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
15. I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar.
16. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
17. This organization really inspires me to give my best performance.
18. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
19. I really care about the fate of this organization.
20. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

Organizational fairness is the fourth independent variable and defined previously will give insight and be a valid predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This variable is captured in Table 5, questions 58-64.

Table 5-Survey Excerpt- Organizational Fairness

TABLE 5
58. I believe there is a fair opportunity to be promoted.
59. I believe my own hard work will lead to recognition as a good performer.
60. I believe the standards used to evaluate my performance in this police department are fair and objective
61. I believe my supervisor is familiar enough with my job to fairly evaluate me.
62. I believe my last annual performance rating presented a fair and accurate picture of my actual job performance.
63. I believe I am fairly rewarded in this department based upon my education level and job skills.
64. I believe I am fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities and work I do at this department.

The last independent variable is supervisor’s support in which the study which the perceived flexibility, fairness, and positive attitude supervisors conveys to subordinates (Jaramillo, Nixon, and Sams, 2005). This variable is captured in Table 6, questions 24-43.

Table 6-Survey Excerpt- Supervisor Support

TABLE 6
24. I have to do things that should be done differently
25. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.
26. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.
27. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.
28. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
29. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.
30. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.
31. I work on unnecessary things.
32. I work under incompatible policies and guidelines.
33. I have to work under vague directives and orders.
34. My opportunities for promotion in this organization are excellent.
35. I am very satisfied with the promotion opportunities in this organization.
36. The organization has a lot of promotion opportunities for me.
37. I am satisfied with the pay I receive for my job.
38. I am satisfied with the security my job provides me.
39. Supervisors tend to talk down to employees.
40. Supervisors usually give full credit to ideas contributed by employees.
41. Supervisors often criticize employees over minor things.
42. Supervisors expect far too much from employees.
43. Supervisors really stand up for people.

Dependant Variable

Turnover intent or the extent to which an employee, or peace officer actively considers a voluntary separation from his or her current police job where they are currently employed. This variable is captured in Table 7, questions 46-49 and 53-57.

Table 7-Survey Excerpt- Turnover Intent

TABLE 7
46. In the next three months.
47. In the next six months.
48. Sometime in the next year.
49. Sometime in the next two years.
53. In the last 6 months, I have thought about quitting my current job?
54. I frequently think about quitting my job at this police department.
55. It likely that I will be at this job in a year from now?
56. I have actively searched for a job with other employers in the last year?
57. I desire to voluntarily leave/quit my job?

Descriptive Statistics- Control Variables

This following section provides the descriptive statistics for the control variables studied in this research.

Gender

Table 8 illustrates the responses from the participants with regards to gender. Of those surveyed, 92.11% (or 35) were male and 7.89% (or 3) were female. The results shown in the table below are common to law enforcement as it is a male dominated field (Lonsway, 2006), and thereby validity of the results may be assumed to be high.

Table 8- Gender

TABLE 8		
Gender	Responses	
Male	35	92.11%
Female	3	7.89%
Totals	38	100%

Age

Table 9, found below, illustrates the age of the participants. The largest demographic group is the 30 to 39 (36.84%) year olds closely followed by 40-49 (23.68%) year olds. The two largest groups composed about 60% of all of the participants and reflect a common statistic in law enforcement (Terry 1996: 30)

Table 9-Age

TABLE 9		
Age	Responses	
18-23	4	10.53%
24-29	7	18.42%
30-39	14	36.84%
40-49	9	23.68%
50-59	4	10.53%
Over 60	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Education Attainment

Table 10 is the demographic information on the sample population with regard to educational attainment. The majority, or nearly 60% of those surveyed responded that they had some college education but had not completed an Associates degree. The findings differ from the 2000 United States Census Bureau findings in which the majority, in excess of 60%, of the population had attained a high school diploma or less (United States Census 2000).

Table 10-Education

TABLE 10		
Education Attainment	Responses	
High school graduate	12	31.58%
Some college (degree not completed)	22	57.89%
Associates degree	3	7.89%
Bachelor degree	1	2.63%
Graduate degree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Ethnicity

As previously stated, the population of Hidalgo County is predominantly Hispanic and the results of those sampled reflect that with a clear majority of officers, 94.74%, identifying their ethnicity as Mexican American or Hispanic. Only 2 officers of 5.26% of those sampled were Caucasian or White, which is confirmed by observations made during the administration of the survey. Table 11 is represents ethnicity of the participants.

Table 11-Ethnicity

TABLE 11		
Ethnicity	Responses	
African American	0	0%
Caucasian/White	2	5.26%
Mexican American/Hispanic	36	94.74%
Native American	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Rank

Table 12 represents the rank of those surveyed approximately three quarters of those surveyed were officers were at the lowest ranks with that little or no supervisory responsibility. The largest category, 57.89% (or 22) respondents were patrol officers and police detectives or police corporals which made up 18.42% (or 7) of those sampled. Police departments within the United States are paramilitary in nature and as the rank increases so does the level of responsibility and in most cases tenure in that particular department.

Table 12-Rank

TABLE 12		
Rank	Responses	
Patrol officer	22	57.89%
Detective/Corporal	7	18.42%
Sergeant	4	10.53%
Lieutenant	2	5.26%
Captain or above	3	7.89%
Totals	38	100%

Duty Assignment

In typical police departments task are compartmentalized by area of specialization. Table 13 outlines the various assignments and how those surveyed fit into those different areas of specialization. Most of those surveyed fell into one of the three categories of administration, patrol or other (investigations). The overwhelming amount of those surveyed were patrol or traffic enforcement officers representing 60.53% or 23 respondents, the second largest category of those surveyed was administration representing 21.05% or 8 respondents. The final group represented in Table 13 is the other category, which is entirely composed of investigators or detectives representing about 13% of those sampled.

Table 13- Duty Assignment

TABLE 13		
Duty Assignment	Responses	
Administration	8	21.05%
Traffic/Patrol	23	60.53%
Reserve force	1	2.63%
K-9	1	2.63%
Mounted Patrol	0	0%
DUI Unit	0	0%
Marine Patrol	0	0%
Aviation Unit	0	0%
Other	5	13.16%
Totals	38	100%

Tenure

Table 14 represents the number of years those surveyed had worked for their current police agency. As expected the overwhelming number of those surveyed, or 60.53% had 0-5 years at their current police agency supporting the premise of the research conducted. The remaining officers were equally distributed in the 6-10 year category with 13.16%, 11-15 year category with 13.16%, and 16-20 year category with 10.53%. Only 1 officer indicated tenure at a police agency in excess of 21 years and represented on about 3% of those surveyed.

Table 14-Tenure

TABLE 14		
Years of Service at Current Department	Responses	
0-5 yrs	23	60.53%
6-10 yrs	5	13.16%
11-15 yrs	5	13.16%
16-20 yrs	4	10.53%
21-25 yrs	1	2.63%
26-30 yrs	0	0%
31-35 yrs	0	0%
36-40 yrs	0	0%
41+yrs	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Years of Service as a Peace Officer

Table 15 represents the findings long respondents had served as a peace officer during their law enforcement careers. A significant number of those surveyed had been in law enforcement for 5 or less years representing nearly 45% (17 of the 38 surveyed). The subsequent categories of 6-10 years of service and 11-15 years of service both represented 21.05% (or 8) years of service as a peace officer. Of those surveyed only two respondents indicated years of service as a peace officer in excess of 20 years.

Table-15-Years of Service

TABLE 15		
Years of Service as a Peace Officers	Responses	
0-5 yrs	17	44.74%
6-10 yrs	8	21.05%
11-15 yrs	8	21.05%
16-20 yrs	3	7.89%
21-25 yrs	1	2.63%
26-30 yrs	0	0%
31-35 yrs	1	2.63%
36-40 yrs	0	0%
41 + yrs	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Hours Worked per Week

When asked about the number of hours worked per week, all but three respondents, or 92.11%, answered that they work in excess of 39 hours per week. Ten of the 38 responded, or (26%), stated that they worked in excess of 50 hours per week.

Table 16-Hours worked per week

TABLE 16		
Hours Worked per Week	Responses	
Under 39	3	7.89%
40-49	25	65.79%
50-59	8	21.05%
60-69	1	2.63%
70-79	0	0%
Above 80+ hours	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Annual Income

Table 17 represents the responses of those sampled with regards to their annual income. Of those surveyed, only one respondent indicated an annual income of less than \$25,000, and two persons indicated an annual income in excess of \$66,000. The majority of those surveyed, or (70.01%), indicated an annual salary between \$25,000 and \$45,999 annually. According to the

United States Census Bureau, the mean household income for Hidalgo County, Texas is \$35,446.00 which means that most of those surveyed fall on or about the United States Census bureau findings (United States Census Bureau 2000).

Table 17-Annual income

TABLE 17		
Annual Income	Responses	
Under 25,000	1	2.63%
25,000-35,999	14	36.84%
36,000-45,999	13	34.21%
46,000-55,999	4	10.53%
56,000-65,999	4	10.53%
66,000-75,999	2	5.26%
Over 76,000	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Second Job

When asked if the officers had employment outside of their respective police departments, all but two or 94.74% stated they did not have a second job. This statistic may not be a true representation as department policy may restrict or prohibit outside employment. Such is the case with two of the three police departments surveyed.

Table 18-Second job

TABLE 18		
Second Job	Responses	
Yes	2	5.26%
No	36	94.74%
Totals	38	100%

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter outlines the results of the data collected. The first section is the descriptive statistics of the independent and dependant variables. The second section of the chapter is the inferential statistics arrived at using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 19.

Statistics

Descriptive statistics

Tables 19, seen below are the descriptive statistics of the dependant variable, *turnover intent* and five independent variables including (1) job satisfaction, (2) group cohesion, (3) organizational commitment, (4) organizational fairness, and (5) supervisor support.

Turnover intent had a sample size of 38 with a minimum statistic of 20.11 and a maximum statistic of 49.56, with a mean of 29.4327 and a standard deviation of 5.81208. *Job satisfaction* had a sample size of 38 with a minimum statistic of 15.17 and a maximum statistic of 30.33, with a mean of 22.3860 and a standard deviation of 4.16750. Group cohesion had a sample size of 38 with a minimum statistic of 1.50 and a maximum statistic of 9.00, with a mean of 4.1842 and a standard deviation of 1.59145. Organizational commitment had a sample size of 38 with a minimum statistic of 13.11 and a maximum statistic of 43.67, with a mean of 24.4912 and a standard deviation of 8.38575. Organizational fairness had a sample size of 38 with a minimum statistic of 16.57 and a maximum statistic of 40/57, with a mean of 30.1429 and a standard deviation of 5.97707. Supervisor support had a sample size of 38 with a minimum

statistic of 57.15 and a maximum statistic of 106.35, with a mean of 80.9947 and a standard deviation of 12.92689.

Table 19- Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Turnover	38	20.11	49.56	29.4327	5.81208
Job Satisfaction	38	15.17	30.33	22.3860	4.16750
Group Cohesion	38	1.50	9.00	4.1842	1.59145
Org Commitment	38	13.11	43.67	24.4912	8.38575
Org Fairness	38	16.57	40.57	30.1429	5.97707
Supervisor Support	38	57.15	106.35	80.9947	12.92689
Valid N (listwise)	38				

The first independent variable discussed in this chapter is *job satisfaction*. Job satisfaction was measured with survey items 21-23 and 50-52. In items 21 through 23, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Neutral through 7-Strongly Disagree. For the purposes of this discussion, strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree were combined into the general category of agree, neutral was discussed as neutral, and somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree were combined into the category of disagree. Please see appendix A for the complete survey instrument.

Table 20 represents survey question #21 in the administered survey which states: *Overall I am very satisfied with my job*. As seen below, 35 respondents representing 92.10% agreed, 2 persons or 5.26% remained neutral and 1 respondent or 2.63% disagreed.

TABLE 20		
Overall I am very satisfied with my job.		
Strongly Agree	14	36.84%
Agree	13	34.21%
Somewhat Agree	8	21.05%
Neutral	2	5.26%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 21 represents survey question #22 in the administered survey which states: *I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.* As seen below, 38 respondents representing 100% of the respondents agreed.

TABLE 21		
I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.		
Strongly Agree	28	73.68%
Agree	10	26.32%
Somewhat Agree	0	0%
Neutral	0	0%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 22 represents survey question #23 in the administered survey which states: *I am very satisfied with the kind of work I do on my job.* As seen below, 37 respondents representing 97.37% agreed, 1 person or 2.63% remained neutral.

TABLE 22		
I am very satisfied with the kind of work I do on my job		
Strongly Agree	18	47.37%
Agree	16	42.11%
Somewhat Agree	3	7.89%
Neutral	1	2.63%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Survey items 50 and 51 are also indicators of job satisfaction. In items 50 and 51, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement using a Likert scale that ranged from 1- A few times a year to 4-a few times a month to 7- everyday. For the purposes of this discussion, a few times a year was discussed as a few times per year, monthly and a few times a month were combined and reported as a few times per month, and every week, a few times a week, and everyday were combined and reported as weekly through daily.

Table 23 represents survey question #50 in the administered survey which states: *I feel burned out from my job.* As seen below, 14 participants or 36.84% stated they feel that way a few times per year, 9 participants or 23.68% indicated they feel that emotion a few times month, and 15 participants or 39.48% felt burned out anytime ranging from weekly through daily.

TABLE 23		
I feel burned out from my job.		
A few times a year	14	36.84%
Monthly	3	7.89%
A few times a month	6	15.79%
Every week	5	13.16%
A few times a week	6	15.79%
Everyday	4	10.53%
Totals	38	100%

Table 24 represents survey question #51 in the administered survey which states: *I feel frustrated by my job*. As seen below, 14 participants or 36.84% stated they feel that way a few times per year, 9 participants or 23.68% indicated they feel that emotion a few times month, and 15 participants or 39.48% felt burned out anytime ranging from weekly through daily.

TABLE 24		
I feel frustrated by my job.		
A few times a year	14	36.84%
Monthly	4	10.53%
A few times a month	5	13.16%
Every week	6	15.79%
A few times a week	5	13.16%
Everyday	4	10.53%
Totals	38	100%

Survey item 52 is the final question used to measure job satisfaction. In items 52, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement using a Likert scale that ranged from 1- Very mild, barely noticeable to 4- Moderate to 7- Very strong, major. For the purposes of this discussion, very mild and barely noticeable, noticeable, and somewhat noticeable were combined and discussed as noticeable, and moderate was discussed ad moderate, and somewhat strong, strong, and very strong, major were combined and discussed as strong.

Table 25 represents survey question #52 in the administered survey which states: *I feel I'm working too hard on my job*. Respondents use a Likert scale ranging from 1- Very mild, barely noticeable to 4-Moderate to 7- Very strong, major. They survey question yielded the responses: 18 participants or 47.37% that indicated noticeable, 13 participants or 34.21% indicated a moderate sentiment, and 7 participants or 18.42% responded they felt that emotion in a strong way.

TABLE 25		
I feel I'm working too hard on my job.		
Very mild, barely noticeable	11	28.95%
Noticeable	5	13.16%
Somewhat Noticeable	2	5.26%
Moderate	13	34.21%
Somewhat strong	6	15.79%
Strong	1	2.63%
Very strong, major	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

In general terms, more than 80% of the officers responded that they are satisfied with their jobs, all indicated they feel a sense of personal satisfaction for doing a job well done, and nearly all liked the kind of work they do. More than half of the officers indicated that they feel some level of frustration or “burn out” with their work ranging from a few times a month to daily.

The second independent variable discussed in this chapter is *group cohesion*. Group cohesion is a variable of job satisfaction were survey items 44 and 45. In items 44 and 45, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Neutral through 7-Strongly Disagree. For the purposes of this discussion, strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree were combined into the general category of agree, neutral was discussed as neutral, and somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree were combined into the category of disagree.

Table 26 represents survey question #44 in the administered survey which states: *I feel I am really part of my work group*. As seen below, 26 respondents representing 68.42% agreed, 11 persons or 28.95% remained neutral and 1 respondent or 2.63% disagreed.

TABLE 26		
I feel I am really part of my work group.		
Strongly Agree	6	15.79%
Agree	11	28.95%
Somewhat Agree	9	23.68%
Neutral	11	28.95%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 27 represents survey question #45 in the administered survey which states: *I look forward to being with the members of my work group each day.* As seen below, 26 respondents representing 68.42% agreed, 8 persons or 21.05% remained neutral and 4 respondents or 10.52% disagreed.

TABLE 27		
I look forward to being with the members of my work group each day.		
Strongly Agree	6	15.79%
Agree	13	34.21%
Somewhat Agree	7	18.42%
Neutral	8	21.05%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

In summary, generally two-thirds of the officers responded that they feel like a real part of their work group and look forward to working with their coworkers on a daily basis.

The third independent variable discussed in this chapter is *organizational commitment*. Organizational commitment was measured in survey items 12 through 20. In items 12 through 20, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Neutral through 7-Strongly Disagree. For the purposes of this discussion, strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree were combined into the general category

of agree, neutral was discussed as neutral, and somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree were combined into the category of disagree.

Table 28 represents survey question #12 in the administered survey which states: *I am willing to put in more effort beyond what I normally expected to in order to help this organization be successful.* As seen below, 35 respondents representing 92.1% agreed, 2 persons or 5.26% remained neutral and only 1 respondent or 2.63% disagreed.

TABLE 28		
I am willing to put in more effort beyond what I am normally expected too in order to help this organization be successful.		
Strongly Agree	24	63.16%
Agree	9	23.68%
Somewhat Agree	2	5.26%
Neutral	2	5.26%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 29 represents survey question #13 in the administered survey which states: *I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.* As seen below, 32 respondents representing 84.21% agreed, 2 persons or 7.89% remained neutral and 4 respondents or 10.52% disagreed.

TABLE 29		
I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.		
Strongly Agree	20	52.63%
Agree	8	21.05%
Somewhat Agree	4	10.53%
Neutral	2	5.26%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 30 represents survey question #14 in the administered survey which states: *I would accept almost any type assignment in order to keep working for this organization.* As seen below, 33 respondents representing 86.85% agreed, 1 person or 2.63% remained neutral and 4 respondents or 10.53% disagreed.

TABLE 30		
I would accept almost any type assignment in order to keep working for this organization.		
Strongly Agree	16	42.11%
Agree	12	31.58%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.16%
Neutral	1	2.63%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	4	10.53%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 31 represents survey question #15 in the administered survey which states: *I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.* As seen below, 24 respondents representing 78.95% agreed, 4 persons or 10.53% remained neutral and 5 respondents or 10.52% disagreed.

TABLE 31		
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.		
Strongly Agree	10	26.32%
Agree	14	36.84%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	4	10.53%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 32 represents survey question #16 in the administered survey which states: *I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.* As seen below, 34 respondents

representing 89.47% agreed, 1 person or 2.63% remained neutral and 3 respondents or 7.89% disagreed.

TABLE 32		
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.		
Strongly Agree	21	55.26%
Agree	9	23.68%
Somewhat Agree	4	10.53%
Neutral	1	2.63%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2.63%
Disagree	2	5.26%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 33 represents survey question #17 in the administered survey which states: *This organization really inspires me to give my best performance.* As seen below, 32 respondents representing 71.16% agreed, 1 person or 2.63% remained neutral and 5 respondents or 13.15% disagreed.

TABLE 33		
This organization really inspires me to give my best performance.		
Strongly Agree	12	31.58%
Agree	12	31.58%
Somewhat Agree	8	21.05%
Neutral	1	2.63%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	2	5.26%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 34 represents survey question #18 in the administered survey which states: *I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.* As seen below, 33 respondents representing 86.84% agreed, 3 persons or 7.89% remained neutral and 2 respondents or 5.26% disagreed.

TABLE 34		
I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.		
Strongly Agree	14	36.84%
Agree	10	26.32%
Somewhat Agree	9	23.68%
Neutral	3	7.89%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 35 represents survey question #19 in the administered survey which states: *I really care about the fate of this organization.* As seen below, 36 respondents representing 94.73% agreed, 1 person or 2.63% remained neutral and 1 respondent or 2.63% disagreed.

TABLE 35		
I really care about the fate of this organization.		
Strongly Agree	20	52.63%
Agree	13	34.21%
Somewhat Agree	3	7.89%
Neutral	1	2.63%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2.63%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 36 represents survey question #20 in the administered survey which states: *For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.* As seen below, 33 respondents representing 86.84% agreed, 1 persons or 2.63% remained neutral and 4 respondents or 10.52% disagreed.

TABLE 36		
For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.		
Strongly Agree	9	23.68%
Agree	10	26.32%
Somewhat Agree	14	36.84%
Neutral	1	2.63%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2.63%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	2	5.26%
Totals	38	100%

In summery, generally over 90% of respondents agreed that they would be willing to put in more effort than expected of them to help the organization be successful. Nearly 85% stated they talk up their respective police agencies as a great organization to work for, and would likely accept any assignment to keep working for that organization. The majority, nearly 77% find that their organizations values and their own values are very similar, and about 70% stated that their organization inspires them to do their best work. Finally, nearly all of those surveyed, over 90% stated they care about the fate of their respective organizations.

The fourth independent variable discussed in this chapter is *organizational fairness*. Organizational fairness is a variable of job satisfaction were survey items 58 through 64. In items 58 through 64, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Nuetral through 7-Strongly Disagree. For the purposes of this discussion, strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree were combined into the general category of agree, neutral was discussed as neutral, and somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree were combined into the category of disagree.

Table 37 represents survey question #58 in the administered survey which states: *I believe there is a fair opportunity to be promoted*. As seen below, 15 respondents representing 39.47% agreed, 6 persons or 15.79% remained neutral and 17 respondents or 44.74% disagreed.

TABLE 37		
I believe there is a fair opportunity to be promoted.		
Strongly Agree	3	7.89%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	6	15.79%
Somewhat Disagree	6	15.79%
Disagree	5	13.16%
Strongly Disagree	6	15.79%
Totals	38	100%

Table 38 represents survey question #59 in the administered survey which states: *I believe my own hard work will lead to recognition as a good performer.* As seen below, 28 respondents representing 73.68% agreed, and 6 respondents or 26.31% disagreed.

TABLE 38		
I believe my own hard work will lead to recognition as a good performer.		
Strongly Agree	15	39.47%
Agree	9	23.68%
Somewhat Agree	4	10.53%
Neutral	0	0%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	3	7.89%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.53%
Totals	38	100%

Table 39 represents survey question #60 in the administered survey which states: *I believe the standards used to evaluate my performance in this police department are fair and objective.* As seen below, 24 respondents representing 63.16% agreed, 4 persons or 10.53% remained neutral and 10 respondents or 26.32% disagreed.

TABLE 39		
I believe the standards used to evaluate my performance in this police department are fair and objective		
Strongly Agree	2	5.26%
Agree	16	42.11%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	4	10.53%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2.63%
Disagree	5	13.16%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.53%
Not Applicable	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 40 represents survey question #61 in the administered survey which states: *I believe my supervisor is familiar enough with my job to fairly evaluate me.* As seen below, 34 respondents representing 89.48% agreed, 2 persons or 5.26% remained neutral and 2 respondents or 5.26% disagreed.

TABLE 40		
I believe my supervisor is familiar enough with my job to fairly evaluate me.		
Strongly Agree	10	26.32%
Agree	17	44.74%
Somewhat Agree	7	18.42%
Neutral	2	5.26%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2.63%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 41 represents survey question #62 in the administered survey which states: *I believe my last annual performance rating presented a fair and accurate picture of my actual job performance.* As seen below, 25 respondents representing 65.79% agreed, 6 persons or 15.79% remained neutral and 5 respondents or 18.41% disagreed.

TABLE 41		
I believe my last annual performance rating presented a fair and accurate picture of my actual job performance.		
Strongly Agree	6	15.79%
Agree	14	36.84%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.16%
Neutral	6	15.79%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	3	7.89%
Strongly Disagree	2	5.26%
Totals	38	100%

Table 42 represents survey question #63 in the administered survey which states: *I believe I am fairly rewarded in this department based upon my education level and job skills.* As seen below, 21 respondents representing 55.27% agreed, 6 persons or 15.79% remained neutral and 11 respondents or 28.95% disagreed.

TABLE 42		
I believe I am fairly rewarded in this department based upon my education level and job skills.		
Strongly Agree	5	13.16%
Agree	10	26.32%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	6	15.79%
Somewhat Disagree	4	10.53%
Disagree	6	15.79%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 43 represents survey question #64 in the administered survey which states: *I believe I am fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities and work I do at this department.* As seen below, 18 respondents representing 47.37% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 15 respondents or 39.47% disagreed.

TABLE 43		
I believe I am fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities and work I do at this department.		
Strongly Agree	4	10.53%
Agree	7	18.42%
Somewhat Agree	7	18.42%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	4	10.53%
Disagree	8	21.05%
Strongly Disagree	3	7.89%
Totals	38	100%

In general terms, there was disagreement with regards to promotional opportunity. While the majority of the officers surveyed, nearly 45% did not believe they had a fair opportunity to be promoted, the majority (at times nearly 90%) felt that the standards used to evaluate their performance was appropriate, that their supervisors were able to fairly evaluate them objectively, and that in the end, their own good work would win the day with their supervisors.

The fifth independent variable discussed in this chapter is *supervisor support*. Supervisor support is a variable of job satisfaction were survey items 24 through 43. In items 24 through 43, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Neutral through 7-Strongly Disagree. For the purposes of this discussion, strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree were combined into the general category of agree, neutral was discussed as neutral, and somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree were combined into the category of disagree.

Table 44 represents survey question #24 in the administered survey which states: *I have to do things that really should be done differently*. As seen below, 28 respondents representing 73.68% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 5 respondents or 13.15% disagreed.

TABLE 44		
I have to do things that really should be done differently		
Strongly Agree	5	13.16%
Agree	14	36.84%
Somewhat Agree	9	23.68%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	3	7.89%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 45 represents survey question #25 in the administered survey which states: *I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.* As seen below, 26 respondents representing 68.42% agreed, 6 persons or 15.79% remained neutral and 6 respondents or 15.79% disagreed.

TABLE 45		
I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.		
Strongly Agree	11	28.95%
Agree	8	21.05%
Somewhat Agree	7	18.42%
Neutral	6	15.79%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	6	15.79%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 46 represents survey question #26 in the administered survey which states: *I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.* As seen below, 11 respondents representing 28.95% agreed, 6 persons or 15.79% remained neutral and 21 respondents or 55.26% disagreed.

TABLE 46		
I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.		
Strongly Agree	1	2.63%
Agree	4	10.53%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	6	15.79%
Somewhat Disagree	8	21.05%
Disagree	9	23.68%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.53%
Totals	38	100%

Table 47 represents survey question #27 in the administered survey which states: *I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.* As seen below, 28 respondents representing 73.69% agreed, 8 persons or 21.05% remained neutral and 2 respondents or 5.26% disagreed.

TABLE 47		
I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.		
Strongly Agree	12	31.58%
Agree	10	26.32%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	8	21.05%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	38	100%

Table 48 represents survey question #28 in the administered survey which states: *I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.* As seen below, 22 respondents representing 57.90% agreed, 9 persons or 23.68% remained neutral and 7 respondents or 18.42% disagreed.

TABLE 48		
I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.		
Strongly Agree	6	15.79%
Agree	10	26.32%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	9	23.68%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	4	10.53%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 49 represents survey question #29 in the administered survey which states: *I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.* As seen below, 23 respondents representing 60.52% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 10 respondents or 26.31% disagreed.

TABLE 49		
I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.		
Strongly Agree	6	15.79%
Agree	14	36.84%
Somewhat Agree	3	7.89%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	5	13.16%
Strongly Disagree	2	5.26%
Totals	38	100%

Table 50 represents survey question #30 in the administered survey which states: *I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.* As seen below, 21 respondents representing 55.26% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 12 respondents or 31.58% disagreed.

TABLE 50		
I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.		
Strongly Agree	9	23.68%
Agree	8	21.05%
Somewhat Agree	4	10.53%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	5	13.16%
Disagree	5	13.16%
Strongly Disagree	2	5.26%
Totals	38	100%

Table 51 represents survey question #31 in the administered survey which states: *I work on unnecessary things*. As seen below, 14 respondents representing 36.84% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 19 respondents or 50% disagreed.

TABLE 51		
I work on unnecessary things.		
Strongly Agree	6	15.79%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	2	5.26%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	12	31.58%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.53%
Totals	38	100%

Table 52 represents survey question #32 in the administered survey which states: *I work under incompatible policies and guidelines*. As seen below, 13 respondents representing 36.61% agreed, 9 persons or 23.68% remained neutral and 15 respondents or 39.47% disagreed.

TABLE 52		
I work under incompatible policies and guidelines.		
Strongly Agree	7	18.42%
Agree	4	10.53%
Somewhat Agree	3	7.89%
Neutral	9	23.68%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	8	21.05%
Strongly Disagree	5	13.16%
Totals	38	100%

Table 53 represents survey question #33 in the administered survey which states: *I have to work under vague directives and orders.* As seen below, 18 respondents representing 47.37% agreed, 7 persons or 18.42% remained neutral and 13 respondents or 34.21% disagreed.

TABLE 53		
I have to work under vague directives and orders.		
Strongly Agree	4	10.53%
Agree	8	21.05%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	7	18.42%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	10	26.32%
Strongly Disagree	3	7.89%
Totals	38	100%

Table 54 represents survey question #34 in the administered survey which states: *My opportunities for promotion in this organization are excellent.* As seen below, 14 respondents representing 36.84% agreed, 9 persons or 23.68% remained neutral and 15 respondents or 39.48% disagreed.

TABLE 54		
My opportunities for promotion in this organization are excellent.		
Strongly Agree	5	13.16%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	3	7.89%
Neutral	9	23.68%
Somewhat Disagree	4	10.53%
Disagree	6	15.79%
Strongly Disagree	5	13.16%
Totals	38	100%

Table 55 represents survey question #35 in the administered survey which states: *I am very satisfied with the promotion opportunities in this organization.* As seen below, 15 respondents representing 39.47% agreed, 7 persons or 18.42% remained neutral and 16 respondents or 42.11% disagreed.

Table 55		
I am very satisfied with the promotion opportunities in this organization.		
Strongly Agree	4	10.53%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.16%
Neutral	7	18.42%
Somewhat Disagree	5	13.16%
Disagree	5	13.16%
Strongly Disagree	6	15.79%
Totals	38	100%

Table 56 represents survey question #36 in the administered survey which states: *The organization has a lot of promotion opportunities for me.* As seen below, 12 respondents representing 36.48% agreed, 6 persons or 15.79% remained neutral and 18 respondents or 47.37% disagreed.

TABLE 56		
The organization has a lot of promotion opportunities for me.		
Strongly Agree	2	5.26%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	6	15.79%
Somewhat Disagree	6	15.79%
Disagree	4	10.53%
Strongly Disagree	8	21.05%
Totals	38	100%

Table 57 represents survey question #37 in the administered survey which states: *I am satisfied with the pay I receive for my job.* As seen below, 16 respondents representing 42.10% agreed, 7 persons or 18.24% remained neutral and 15 respondents or 39.48% disagreed.

TABLE 57		
I am satisfied with the pay I receive for my job.		
Strongly Agree	3	7.89%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	7	18.42%
Neutral	7	18.42%
Somewhat Disagree	6	15.79%
Disagree	5	13.16%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.53%
Totals	38	100%

Table 58 represents survey question #38 in the administered survey which states: *I am satisfied with the security my job provides me.* As seen below, 23 respondents representing 60.53% agreed, 10 persons or 26.32% remained neutral and 5 respondents or 13.15% disagreed.

TABLE 58		
I am satisfied with the security my job provides me.		
Strongly Agree	5	13.16%
Agree	12	31.58%
Somewhat Agree	6	15.79%
Neutral	10	26.32%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 59 represents survey question #39 in the administered survey which states: *Supervisors tend to talk down to employees.* As seen below, 15 respondents representing 39.47% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 18 respondents or 47.37% disagreed.

TABLE 59		
Supervisors tend to talk down to employees.		
Strongly Agree	3	7.89%
Agree	7	18.42%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.16%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	5	13.16%
Disagree	6	15.79%
Strongly Disagree	7	18.42%
Totals	38	100%

Table 60 represents survey question #40 in the administered survey which states: *Supervisors usually give full credit to ideas contributed by employees.* As seen below, 13 respondents representing 35.13% agreed, 12 persons or 32.43% remained neutral and 12 respondents or 32.43% disagreed.

TABLE 60		
Supervisors usually give full credit to ideas contributed by employees.		
Strongly Agree	1	2.70%
Agree	7	18.92%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.51%
Neutral	12	32.43%
Somewhat Disagree	3	8.11%
Disagree	5	13.51%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.81%
Totals	37	100%

Table 61 represents survey question #41 in the administered survey which states: *Supervisors often criticize employees over minor things.* As seen below, 18 respondents representing 47.37% agreed, 8 persons or 21.05% remained neutral and 15 respondents or 39.47% disagreed.

TABLE 61		
Supervisors often criticize employees over minor things.		
Strongly Agree	5	13.16%
Agree	8	21.05%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.16%
Neutral	8	21.05%
Somewhat Disagree	5	13.16%
Disagree	2	5.26%
Strongly Disagree	5	13.16%
Totals	38	100%

Table 62 represents survey question #42 in the administered survey which states: *Supervisors expect far too much from employees.* As seen below, 13 respondents representing 21.05% agreed, 10 persons or 26.32% remained neutral and 15 respondents or 39.48% disagreed.

TABLE 62		
Supervisors expect far too much from employees.		
Strongly Agree	3	7.89%
Agree	5	13.16%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.16%
Neutral	10	26.32%
Somewhat Disagree	4	10.53%
Disagree	7	18.42%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.53%
Totals	38	100%

Table 63 represents survey question #43 in the administered survey which states: *Supervisors really stand up for people.* As seen below, 20 respondents representing 52.67% agreed, 8 persons or 21.05% remained neutral and 10 respondents or 26.32% disagreed.

TABLE 63		
Supervisors really stand up for people.		
Strongly Agree	4	10.53%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	10	26.32%
Neutral	8	21.05%
Somewhat Disagree	4	10.53%
Disagree	4	10.53%
Strongly Disagree	2	5.26%
Totals	38	100%

In general terms, officers responded favorably to the survey questions concerning job satisfaction, organization commitment, supervisor support, and group cohesion. Promotional opportunities was the exception with a somewhat mixed response. Those surveyed disagreed when asked their sentiment concerning promotional opportunities in their respective departments nearly splitting the survey group in half. There was also a sentiment of job ambiguity and a strong sentiment of not having the appropriate manpower to be able to complete an assignment.

The only dependant variable in the study and discussed in this chapter is *turnover intent*. Turnover intent was survey items 46 through 49 and 53 through 57. In items 46 through 49 and 53 through 57, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale which ranged from 1- Strongly Agree to 4-Nuetral through 7-Strongly Disagree. For the purposes of this discussion, strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree were combined into the general category of agree, neutral was discussed as neutral, and somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree were combined into the category of disagree

Table 64 represents survey question #46 in the administered survey which states: *The chances of quitting my police job in the next three months are high*. As seen below, 2 respondents representing 5.26% agreed, 4 persons or 10.53% remained neutral and 32 respondents or 84.21% disagreed.

TABLE 64		
The chances of quitting my police job in the next three months is high.		
Strongly Agree	0	0%
Agree	1	2.63%
Somewhat Agree	1	2.63%
Neutral	4	10.53%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	11	28.95%
Strongly Disagree	19	50%
Totals	38	100%

Table 65 represents survey question #47 in the administered survey which states: *I rate my chances of quitting my police job? In the next six months*. As seen below, 1 respondent representing 2.63% stated high, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 32 respondents or 84.21% stated low.

TABLE 65		
I rate my chances of quitting my police job? In the next six months.		
Very High	0	0%
High	0	0%
Somewhat High	1	2.63%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Low	3	7.89%
Low	5	13.16%
Very Low	24	63.16%
Totals	38	100%

Table 66 represents survey question #48 in the administered survey which states: *I rate my chances of quitting my police job? Sometime in the next year.* As seen below, 4 respondents representing 10.53% stated high, 3 persons or 7.89% remained neutral and 31 respondent or 81.58% stated low.

TABLE 66		
I rate my chances of quitting my police job? Sometime in the next year.		
Very High	0	0%
High	0	0%
Somewhat High	4	10.53%
Neutral	3	7.89%
Somewhat Low	3	7.89%
Low	5	13.16%
Very Low	23	60.53%
Totals	38	100%

Table 67 represents survey question #49 in the administered survey which states: *I rate my chances of quitting my police job? Sometime in the next two years.* As seen below, 9 respondents representing 21.05% stated high, 4 persons or 10.53% remained neutral and 26 respondents or 68.42% stated low.

TABLE 67		
I rate my chances of quitting my police job? Sometime in the next two years.		
Very High	1	2.63%
High	2	5.26%
Somewhat High	5	13.16%
Neutral	4	10.53%
Somewhat Low	1	2.63%
Low	5	13.16%
Very Low	20	52.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 68 represents survey question #53 in the administered survey which states: *I have thought about quitting my current job.* As seen below, 17 respondents representing 39.48% agreed, 4 persons or 10.53% remained neutral and 19 respondents or 49.99% disagreed.

TABLE 68		
In the last 6 months, I have thought about quitting my current job?		
Strongly Agree	4	10.53%
Agree	4	10.53%
Somewhat Agree	7	18.42%
Neutral	4	10.53%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	8	21.05%
Strongly Disagree	8	21.05%
Totals	38	100%

Table 69 represents survey question #54 in the administered survey which states: *I frequently think about quitting my job at this police department.* As seen below, 10 respondents representing 26.31% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 23 respondents or 60.53% disagreed.

TABLE 69		
I frequently think about quitting my job at this police department.		
Strongly Agree	3	7.89%
Agree	2	5.26%
Somewhat Agree	5	13.16%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	5	13.16%
Disagree	10	26.32%
Strongly Disagree	8	21.05%
Totals	38	100%

Table 70 represents survey question #55 in the administered survey which states: *It is likely that I will be at this job a year from now.* As seen below, 31 respondents representing 81.59% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 2 respondents or 5.26% disagreed.

TABLE 70		
It is likely that I will be at this job a year from now.		
Strongly Agree	16	42.11%
Agree	11	28.95%
Somewhat Agree	4	10.53%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	1	2.63%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.63%
Totals	38	100%

Table 71 represents survey question #56 in the administered survey which states: *I have actively searched for a job with other employers in the last year.* As seen below, 8 respondents representing 21.05% agreed, 2 persons or 5.26% remained neutral and 26 respondent or 68.42% disagreed.

TABLE 71		
I have actively searched for a job with other employers in the last year?		
Strongly Agree	0	0%
Agree	6	15.79%
Somewhat Agree	2	5.26%
Neutral	2	5.26%
Somewhat Disagree	2	5.26%
Disagree	11	28.95%
Strongly Disagree	15	39.47%
Totals	38	100%

Table 72 represents survey question #57 in the administered survey which states: *I desire to voluntarily leave/quit my job.* As seen below, 3 respondents representing 7.89% agreed, 5 persons or 13.16% remained neutral and 30 respondents or 78.94% disagreed.

TABLE 72		
I desire to voluntarily leave/quit my job?		
Strongly Agree	0	0%
Agree	0	0%
Somewhat Agree	3	7.89%
Neutral	5	13.16%
Somewhat Disagree	3	7.89%
Disagree	12	31.58%
Strongly Disagree	15	39.47%
Totals	38	100%

A brief look at the descriptive statistics gives insight in to the mindset of those surveyed. The findings show that overall, most of the participants surveyed are satisfied with their jobs, have a favorable level of organizational commitment, and a strong sentiment of group cohesion. The participants do not overwhelmingly agree on the issues of department policy, and perceived supervisor support with larger numbers of those surveyed showing some level of dissent. Although the levels of turnover intent are not as high as initially expected, there are some officers within those surveyed that did indicate they wished to voluntarily leave their current positions at their respective police department. The descriptive statistics do not paint a clear

picture concerning job satisfaction and organizational commitments role in determining turnover intent for the municipal police officers surveyed. The statistics however can be used to triangulate statistical correlations through the use of inferential statistics and regression analysis.

Inferential Statistics

The second section of this chapter is the inferential statistics section. Inferential statistics are important because it allows logical conclusions about the data collected from a sample, such as those surveyed from the three municipal police departments, and apply them to larger population such as all municipal police departments in Hidalgo County. (Salkind 2008:9)

The use of regression analysis, which is a statistical operation that allows for the analysis of numerous variables, and helps provide insight into the relationships between different variables also known as a correlation. (Salkind 2008:74) The survey items, identified as dependant or independent variables were collapsed into an index to represent the correlation that they share with each other. An analysis of the data collected was conducted and yielded the following results.

Table 73 is a correlation index that includes all the variables previously discussed. There are three groups of correlations that can be drawn from this table. First, is the correlation between turnover intent and two components of job satisfaction which are supervisor support and organizational fairness. Second, is the correlation between job satisfaction and organizational fairness and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The third and final correlation is between group cohesion and organizational commitment and turnover intent and organizational commitment.

The Pearson correlation “examines the relationship between two variables...” (Salkind, 2008: 75). The first relationship examined, turnover intent and supervisor support, shows a .323 statistic. This statistic tells us that according to Salkind’s rule of thumb, there is a weak relationship between turnover intent and supervisor support, and that there is a 32% variance in turnover attributable to a change in perceived supervisor support.

The second relationship examined, turnover intent and organizational fairness, shows a .326 statistic. This statistics also shows a weak relationship between turnover intent and organizational fairness, and that there is a 33% variance in turnover attributable to a change in perceived organizational fairness.

The second groups of correlations examined are the relationships between job satisfaction and organizational fairness, and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The first relationship, of job satisfaction and organizational fairness, shows a statistic of -.339 which is also a weak, inverse relationship between the two. This means that as the perceived organizational fairness goes down by 1 unit, there is a 34% increase in job satisfaction. The second relationship of interest for job satisfaction involves organizational commitment. According to the index, the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is strong. The Pearson correlation of .607 indicates a strong correlation with a direct relationship. As job satisfaction rises, so does organizational commitment. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment has been studied in many ways, and researchers have found the relationship at its weakest organizational commitment is a mediating factor to job satisfaction. (Zainuddin, Ibrahim, and Ibrahim, 2010).

The final correlations examined in table 73 are the relationship between group cohesion and organizational commitment and turnover intent and organizational commitment. Table 73

shows a correlation of $-.359$. This is a weak and indirect relationships. The oddity of it is that unexpectedly, the statistic shows that a perceived drop in group cohesion would result in a rise in organizational commitment. In examining the relationship between turnover intent and organizational commitment, the Pearson correlation shows a stronger relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intent. The table shows a correlation of $-.164$. This is still a weak inverse relationship, however the indication of the relationship is that of an inverse relationship, meaning that as organizational commitment goes down turnover intent goes up (Salkind, 2008: 85).

TABLE 73- Correlations with index

		Sup. Support	Organ. Fairness	Organ. Commitment	Group Cohesion	Job Satis	Turnover
Sup Support	Pearson Correlation	1	.308	.144	.229	.269	.323*
Organ. Fairness	Pearson Correlation	.308	1	-.156	.129	-.339*	.326*
Organ. Commit	Pearson Correlation	.144	-.156	1	-.359*	.607**	-.164
Group Cohesion	Pearson Correlation	.229	.129	-.359*	1	-.143	.219
Job Satisfact	Pearson Correlation	.269	-.339*	.607**	-.143	1	.044
Turnover	Pearson Correlation	.323*	.326*	-.164	.219	.044	1

This study found weak correlations across all variables, with the exception of the correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, though weak they are correlations none-the-less. Numerous other studies have been successful at finding stronger correlations between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as they relate to turnover intent. For example, in a 2005 study of nursing home employees done by Karsh, Booske, and Sainfort found “The results also showed that satisfaction and especially commitment predicted intentions to turnover.” The authors went on to conclude that should an employer, in their case a

nursing home, seek to reduce turnover they should not focus on commitment or satisfaction, but on other factors that are components of satisfaction and commitment.

The preceding discussion on the correlations will be used as the rationale or a regression analysis that will generate some models to help answer the research question. A regression analysis is a statistical procedure used to predict outcomes. The models generated use only the coefficients of correlation that were statistically significant.

Three regression analysis models are examined. The first model examines the correlation between turnover intent and its relationships to organizational fairness and job satisfaction. The second regression model examines the relationships between job satisfaction, as a dependant variable, and organizational commitment and fairness as independent variable. Finally, a comprehensive model will examine the relationship between turnover intent and its relationship between organizational fairness, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction.

Table 74 represents the first model, using turnover intent and it relationship to organizational fairness. The results show a test statistic of 2.070 with a significance level of .046. Using a p-value of .05, it can be discerned that the model has statistical significance, which is supported by the f test shown in Table 75.

TABLE 74- ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	132.917	1	132.917	4.284	.046 ^a
	Residual	1116.955	36	31.027		
	Total	1249.871	37			

a. Predictors: (Constant), organizational fairness

b. **Dependent Variable: turnover**

TABLE 75- Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	19.874	4.706		4.224	.000
	Organ fairness	.317	.153	.326	2.070	.046

a. Dependent Variable: turnover

Table 76 represents the second analysis, using the first model, was on turnover intent and its relationship to job satisfaction. The results show a test statistic of 2.049 with a significance level of .048. Using a p-value of .05, it can be discerned that the model has statistical significance, which is supported by the F test shown in Table 77.

TABLE 76- ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	130.533	1	130.533	4.198	.048 ^a
	Residual	1119.338	36	31.093		
	Total	1249.871	37			

a. Predictors: (Constant), supervisor support

b. Dependent Variable: turnover

TABLE 77- Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17.664	5.814		3.038	.004
	Supervisor support	.145	.071	.323	2.049	.048

a. Dependent Variable: turnover

The second group of regression analysis examines the relationships between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and organizational fairness. The rationale for using job satisfaction as the dependent variable is to examine the data outcomes.

TABLE 78- ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	275.979	2	137.990	13.173	.000 ^a
	Residual	366.638	35	10.475		
	Total	642.617	37			

a. Predictors: (Constant), organizational commitment, organizational fairness

b. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

TABLE 79- Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	20.726	3.386		6.122	.000
	Organ fairness	-.174	.090	-.250	-1.934	.061
	Organ commitment	.282	.064	.568	4.395	.000

a. Dependent Variable: job satisfaction

The final group of variables examined through the use of regression analysis is the comprehensive model. As the Tables 80 and 81 below show, of the two predictors of turnover intent, organizational commitment are highly correlated which confirms the hypothesis that organizational commitment is an indicator of turnover intent. It can be determined from the tables below that when there is a .334 unit change in organizational commitment, there will be a change in turnover intent of 1 unit. This conclusion was a 90% confidence level, meaning that there is only a 10% probability that that is due to chance.

TABLE 80- ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	254.277	3	84.759	2.895	.049 ^a
	Residual	995.594	34	29.282		
	Total	1249.871	37			

a. Predictors: (Constant), job satisfaction, organizational fairness, organizational commitment

b. Dependent Variable: turnover

TABLE 81- Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11.277	8.146		1.384	.175
	Organ fairness	.393	.159	.404	2.478	.018
	Organ commitment	-.231	.134	-.334	-1.729	.093
	Job satisfaction	.535	.283	.384	1.894	.067

a. Dependent Variable: turnover

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The objective of this thesis was to examine the importance of turnover intent as it relates to job satisfaction and organizational commitment for municipal police departments within Hidalgo County, Texas. This topic was of particular interest because of the financial hardship the recession beginning in 2008 brought upon municipal police departments, particularly those in Hidalgo County, Texas. As previously stated the most valuable asset any police department has is its personnel and mitigating the loss of that asset would go a long way financially for police departments. The question that guided this thesis was: does job satisfaction and organizational commitment predict an officer's intent to turnover?

The hypotheses were formulated as:

H₀: Job satisfaction is makes no difference in turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

H₁: Job satisfaction is a predictor of turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

H₀: Organizational commitment makes no difference in turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

H₁: Organizational commitment is a predictor of turnover intent for municipal police officers within Hidalgo County, Texas.

The statistical analysis found weak correlations across all variables with exception to the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intent. The statistics found enough of a correlation and significance in the regression analysis that organizational commitment *can* be determined to be a predictor of turnover intent. However, the data was found to be abnormally distributed (skewed) and the removal of the outlying data and collapsing indexes was necessary to derive a conclusion. Further data manipulation was needed for more specific findings, but was outside the scope of this study. The research on turnover or turnover intent in municipal police departments is limited, and is easily dwarfed by similar studies in other disciplines. Of the research done in the discipline of policing, there is a resounding correlation between turnover, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Lambert and Hogan: 2009, Jaramillo, Nixon, and Sams: 2004, Brunetto and Farr-Wharton: 2003).

The possible causes for the skewed data are: a lack of diversity (gender, age, ethnicity, the lack of tenure or experience as a peace officer), a small sample size, a possible lack of trust towards the researcher, a lack of motivation for participants to be honest as they see no immediate benefits for the honest opinion, and a phenomenon known as external intervening variables.

Of those previously mentioned, the introduction of a larger sample size you probably benefit the study the most, however would pose the greatest challenge. The initial study sought the cooperation of the 20 municipal police departments in Hidalgo County, Texas, however only three departments chose to participate. A large portion of the chiefs who chose not to endorse this study expressed concern for the political implications as the reason they opted to not participate. To mitigate the political implication for future research the decision to participate in such a survey could be taken out of the hands the chief of police and administered in another way

in order to solicit a better response rate. For example, politically sensitive surveys could be administered at police union meetings or functions, at continuing education training academies as officers are required to maintain a particular level of training biannually, or through the endorsement of city managers, mayors, or city commissioner. A larger more diverse sample size would stabilize the skewed data thereby making the results of the research more generalizable.

Additionally, since the study began, United States Border Patrol (USBP) recruited and filled thousands of slots and has currently (as of January 2011) slowed its recruitment efforts. The results of the USBP's staffing-up can be seen as an external intervening variable acting upon the attrition rate of local police forces. It left in its wake a temporary phenomena of attrition, from which municipal departments are presently recovering. This can be seen in the unusually short tenure of most of the participating officers.

Irrespective of the findings, the proposed external intervening variable, the suggested cause of the skewed data, this and future studies on this subject matter could benefit municipal police departments not just in Hidalgo County, Texas, but in a larger and more generalizable way by applying the findings as an academic source to the science of policing. There are numerous stakeholders in the study of public administration, and in particular the study of police and emergency services.

To conclude, this study found organizational commitment to be a predictor of turnover intent and as such it is the hope of this researcher that the findings will be applied through the application of management practices and principals at municipal police departments in Hidalgo County, Texas. It is clear that strategies need to be created and implemented in order to increase the perceived organizational fairness, supervisor support, and group cohesion to increase organizational commitment thereby decreasing turnover intent in order to insure that the citizens

of the municipalities in Hidalgo County, Texas be protected and served by the highest trained and most professional officers.

REFERENCES

- Beecroft, Pauline C., Dorey, Fredrick and Wenten, Madé. "Turnover intention in new graduate nurses: a multivariate analysis." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 62.1 (2008): 41-52. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 23 Dec. 2010.
- Brody, David C., Christianne DeMarco, and Nicholas P. Lovrich. "Community Policing and Job Satisfaction: Suggestive Evidence of Positive Workforce Effects From a Multijurisdictional Comparison in Washington State." *Police Quarterly* 5.2 (2002): 181. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 5 Apr. 2011.
- Brunetto, Yvonne, & Farr-Wharton, Rod. (2003). The commitment and satisfaction of lower-ranked police officers lessons for management. *Policing: An International Journal of Strategy and Management*, 26, 43-63.
- Chory, Rebecca M., and Catherine Y. Kingsley Westerman. "Feedback and Fairness: The Relationship Between Negative Performance Feedback and Organizational Justice." *Western Journal of Communication* 73.2 (2009): 157-181. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.
- Christine Grady, et al. "Ethical climate, ethics stress, and the job satisfaction of nurses and social workers in the United States." *Social Science & Medicine (1982)* 65.8 (2007): 1708-1719. *MEDLINE*. EBSCO. Web. 5 Apr. 2011.
- Glisson, Charles, and Mark Durick. "Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Human Service Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 33.1 (1988): 61-81. *Business Source Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 5 Apr. 2011.
- Gordon, V, Jr., JL Osgood, and J Phillips. "Municipal clerks: examining a model of job satisfaction." *Public Personnel Management* 39.4 (2010): 327-352. *CINAHL Plus with Full Text*. EBSCO. Web. 11 Nov. 2010.
- Goris, Jose R., Bobby C. Vaught, and John D., Jr. Pettit. "Effects of Communication Direction on Job Performance and Satisfaction: A Moderated Regression Analysis." *Journal of Business Communication* 37.4 (2000): 348-68. *ERIC*. EBSCO. Web. 5 Apr. 2011.
- Grün, Carola, Wolfgang Hauser, and Thomas Rhein. "Is Any Job Better than No Job? Life Satisfaction and Re-employment." *Journal of Labor Research* 31.3 (2010): 285-306. *Business Source Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 11 Nov. 2010.

Heshizer, Brian. "The Impact of Flexible Benefits Plans on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions." *Benefits Quarterly* 10.4 (1994): 84-90. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.

Lambert, Eric, and Eugene A. Paoline. "Take this job and shove it: An exploratory study of turnover intent among jail staff." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38.2 (2010): 139-148. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 12 Dec. 2010.

Lambert, Eric, & Hogan, Nancy. (2009). The importance of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Shaping Turnover Intent. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96-118. doi:10.1177/0734016808324230

Lambert, Eric G., Hogan, Nancy L. and Altheimer, Irshad. "An Exploratory Examination of the Consequences of Burnout in Terms of Life Satisfaction, Turnover Intent, and Absenteeism Among Private Correctional Staff." *Prison Journal* 90.1 (2010): 94-114. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 13 Nov. 2010.

Liang, Xiao-wei, and Jian-qiao, Liao. "Grey Relational Analyzing the Employee's Voluntary Turnover Intentions Based on Job Embeddedness Model-oriented." *Journal of Grey System* 17.2 (2005): 167-172. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.

Lonsway, Kimberly A. "Are We There Yet? The Progress of Women in One Large Law Enforcement Agency." *Women & Criminal Justice* 18.1/2 (2006): 1-48. *Criminal Justice Abstracts*. EBSCO. Web. 27 Mar. 2011.

Ortner, Sherry B. "Generation X: Anthropology in a media-saturated world." *Cultural Anthropology* 13.3 (1998): 414. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 11 Nov. 2009.

Ismail, Azman, Noor Fazzura Ain Zainuddin, and Zalina Ibrahim. "LINKING PARTICIPATIVE AND CONSULTATIVE LEADERSHIP STYLES TO ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AS AN ANTECEDENT OF JOB SATISFACTION." *UNITAR e-Journal* 6.1 (2010): 11-26. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 5 Apr. 2011.

Jans, N. A. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*
Vol. 10, No. 3 (Jul., 1989), pp. 247-266

Jaramillo, Fernando, Nixon, Robert, & Sams, Doreen. (2005). The effect of law enforcement stress on organizational commitment. *Policing: An International Journal of Strategy and Management*, 28(2) 32-336. doi: 10.1108/136395105105997933

Jenkins, Michael J., *Journal of Organizational Behavior*
Vol. 14, No. 1 (Jan., 1993), pp. 83-91

Katherine T. McCalister, et al. "The Relationship Between Hardiness, Supervisor Support, Group Cohesion, and Job Stress as Predictors of Job Satisfaction." *American Journal of Health Promotion* 17.6 (2003): 382-389. *PsycINFO*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.

Karsh, B., B. Booske, and F. Sainfort. "Job and organizational determinants of nursing home employee commitment, job satisfaction and intent to turnover." *Ergonomics* 48.10 (2005): 1260-1281. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 13 Apr. 2011

Koper, Christopher S., "Hiring and Keeping Police Officers" *Journal of California Law Enforcement* 38 (2004)

Lewis, Gregory B. and Frank, Sue A. "Who Wants to Work for the Government?" *Public Administration Review*: Vol. 62, No. 4 (Jul. - Aug., 2002), pp. 395-404

Martin Euwema, et al. "The impact of shiftwork on work -home conflict, job attitudes and health." *Ergonomics* 47.9 (2004): 987-1002. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.

Melchor C de, Guzman, and Frank James. "Policewomen and their problems: the Philippine context." *Policing* 27.3 (2004): 396-412. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.

Paula Dupuy, et al. "The relationship among distributive and procedural justice and correctional life satisfaction, burnout, and turnover intent: An exploratory study." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38.1 (2010): 7-16. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 13 Dec. 2010.

Porter, Christopher O. L. H., Donald E. Conlon, and Alison E. Barber. "THE DYNAMICS OF SALARY NEGOTIATIONS: EFFECTS ON APPLICANTS' JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS AND RECRUITMENT DECISIONS." *International Journal of Conflict Management* 15.3 (2004): 273-303. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.

Rehman, Muhammad Safdar, and Ajmal Waheed. "An Empirical Study of Impact of Job Satisfaction on job Performance in the Public Sector Organizations." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 2.9 (2011): 167-181. *Business Source Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 11 Apr. 2010.

Rose, Andrew K. "The International Economic Order in the Aftermath of the Great Recession: A Cautious Case for Optimism." *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 16.2 (2010): 169-178. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 27 Mar. 2011.

Smola, Wey and Sutton, Charlotte D. "Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, No. 4, Special Issue: Brave New Workplace: Organizational Behavior in the Electronic Age (Jun., 2002), pp. 363-382 Published by: John Wiley & Sons Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4093812> Accessed: 11/08/2009 18:48

Terry, Don. "Chicago Prepares and Promises No Repeat of 1968." *New York Times* 25 Aug. 1996: 30. *MasterFILE Premier*. EBSCO. Web. 28 Mar. 2011.

Texas Occupation Code. Title 10. Chap. 1701. Subchapter A. Acts 2005, 79th Leg., Ch. 173, Sec. 2, eff. May 27, 2005. Retrieved March 5, 2011, from <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/OC/htm/OC.1701.htm#1701.001>

Wagner, Cheryl M. "Organizational commitment as a predictor variable in nursing turnover research: literature review." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 60.3 (2007): 235-247. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Jan. 2010.

United States Census Bureau. "*Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Area*". *Allegany County, N.Y.* Retrieved March 5, 2011

United States Census Bureau. "*Profile of selected social characteristics*". *Allegany County, N.Y.* Retrieved January 25, 2007

United States General Accounting Office. *Homeland Security: Information on Training New Border Patrol Agents*. Washington, Mar. 2007. (GAO-07-540R)

Witt, L A, and L G Nye. "Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction." *The Journal Of Applied Psychology* 77.6 (1992): 910-917. *MEDLINE*. EBSCO. Web. 5 Apr. 2011.

Woska, William J. "Police Officer Recruitment: A Public-Sector Crisis." *Police Chief* 73 (2006):10-15

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A
POLICE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SECTION 1. These questions give us basic information about your demographics. This data is collected for statistical purposes only. Below are statements that people use to describe themselves.

1. Gender:
a) Male b) Female

2. Specify the range that best depicts your age.
a) 21-23 b) 24-29 c) 30-39 d) 40-49
e) 50-59 f) Over 60

3. Please indicate your education status
a) High school graduate
b) Some college (degree not completed)
c) Associate degree
d) Bachelor degree
e) Graduate degree

4. Please indicate your Ethnicity
a) African American
b) Caucasian/White
c) Mexican American/Hispanic
d) Native American
e) Other

5. Please indicate your current rank:
a) Police officer
b) Detective/Corporal
c) Sergeant
d) Lieutenant
e) Captain or above

6. Please indicate your current assignment (if applicable):
f) Administration b) Traffic/patrol
c) Reserve Force d) K-9
e) Mounted Patrol f) DUI Unit
g) Marine Patrol h) Aviation unit
i) Other

7. Years employed by department:
a) 0-5 yrs b) 6-10 yrs c) 11-15 yrs d) 16-20 yrs
e) 21-25 yrs f) 26-30 yrs g) 31-35 yrs h) 36-40 yrs
i) 41+yrs

8. How many years have you worked as a sworn peace officer?
 a) 0-5 yrs b) 6-10 yrs c) 11-15 yrs d) 16-20 yrs
 e) 21-25 yrs f) 26-30 yrs g) 31-35 yrs h) 36-40 yrs
 i) 41+yrs
9. How many hours a week do you work?
 a) Under 39 b) 40-49 c) 50-59 d) 60-69
 e) 70-79 f) Above 80+ hours
10. What is your annual income?
 a) Under 25,000 b) 25,000-35,999 c) 36,000-45,999 d) 46,000-55,999
 e) 56,000-65,999 f) 66,000-75,999 g) Over 76,000
11. Do you have a second job (outside of this Police Department)?
 a) No b) Yes

SECTION 2

12. I am willing to put in more effort beyond what I am normally expected to in order to help this organization be successful.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
13. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
14. I would accept almost any type assignment in order to keep working for this organization.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
15. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
16. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
17. This organization really inspires me to give my best performance.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
18. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
19. I really care about the fate of this organization.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
20. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
21. Overall I am very satisfied with my job.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
22. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
23. I am very satisfied with the kind of work I do on my job.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
24. I have to do things that should be done differently	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
25. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
26. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
27. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree

28. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
29. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
30. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
31. I work on unnecessary things.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
32. I work under incompatible policies and guidelines.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
33. I have to work under vague directives and orders.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
34. My opportunities for promotion in this organization are excellent.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
35. I am very satisfied with the promotion opportunities in this organization.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
36. The organization has a lot of promotion opportunities for me.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
37. I am satisfied with the pay I receive for my job.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
38. I am satisfied with the security my job provides me.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
39. Supervisors tend to talk down to employees.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
40. Supervisors usually give full credit to ideas contributed by employees.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
41. Supervisors often criticize employees over minor things.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
42. Supervisors expect far too much from employees.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
43. Supervisors really stand up for people.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
44. I feel I am really part of my work group.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
45. I look forward to being with the members of my work group each day.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree

SECTION 3

I rate my chances of quitting my police job?

46. In the next three months.	Very Low	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very High
47. In the next six months.	Very Low	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very High
48. Sometime in the next year.	Very Low	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very High
49. Sometime in the next two years.	Very Low	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very High

How **frequently** have you had the following emotions?

50. I feel burned out from my job.	A few times a year	Monthly	A few times a month	Every week	A few times a week	Every Day
	1	2	3	4	5	6

51. I feel frustrated by my job.	A few times a year 1	Monthly 2	A few times a month 3	Every week 4	A few times a week 5	Every Day 6
----------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	----------------

How **intense** are the following emotions?

52. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.	Very mild, barely noticeable 1	2	3	Moderate 4	5	6	Very strong, Major 7
--	-----------------------------------	---	---	---------------	---	---	-------------------------

SECTION 4

53. In the last 6 months, I have thought about quitting my current job?	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
54. I frequently think about quitting my job at this police department.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
55. It likely that I will be at this job in a year from now?	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
56. I have actively searched for a job with other employers in the last year?	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
57. I desire to voluntarily leave/quit my job?	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree

58. I believe there is a fair opportunity to be promoted.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
59. I believe my own hard work will lead to recognition as a good performer.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
60. I believe the standards used to evaluate my performance in this police department are fair and objective	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
61. I believe my supervisor is familiar enough with my job to fairly evaluate me.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
62. I believe my last annual performance rating presented a fair and accurate picture of my actual job performance.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
63. I believe I am fairly rewarded in this department based upon my education level and job skills.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree
64. I believe I am fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities and work I do at this department.	Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B- SURVEY LOG

DEPARTMENT 1		
Tuesday, March 1, 2010 at 11:16 P.M.	B Shift	4 participants
Tuesday, March 1, 2010 at 11:44 P.M.	C Shift	6 participants
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 9:28 A.M.	A Shift	5 participants
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 9:54 P.M.	A Shift	4 participants
DEPARTMENT 2		
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 3:24 P.M.	A Shift	6 participants
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 9:24 P.M.	B Shift	2 participants
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 9:54 P.M.	C Shift	1 participant
DEPARTMENT 3		
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 4:37 P.M.	B Shift	5 participants
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 4:54 P.M.	B Shift	3 participants
Thursday, March 3, 2011 at 6:24 A.M.	C and A Shift	2 participants
	TOTAL	38 participants

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

Approved by:
UTPA IRB
Expires:NA
IRB#2010-112-12

Organization Commitment and Job Satisfaction: An Assessment of municipal Police Departments within Hidalgo County

This research survey is being conducted by Joel Rivera from the University of Texas – Pan American/UTPA. We are conducting a research study about organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The following survey should take about 15 minutes to complete.

If you would prefer not to participate, simply return the blank survey. While we aim to collect anonymous data, combinations of demographic data can potentially lead to identifying an individual (e.g. a 50-59 yr old male African American Lieutenant employed 26-30yrs in his department). Because of this, we want to assure you that data will be treated with utmost confidentiality at all times. While we would prefer to collect accurate demographic data on each participant, you always have the option of leaving certain questions blank if you are concerned about your data being individually identifiable because of your unique demographic information.

We ask that you try to answer all questions. However, if there are any questions that you would prefer to skip, simply leave the answer blank. You must be at least 18 years old to participate. *If you are not 18 or older, please inform the researcher and do not complete the survey.*

Researcher contact information:

Name: Joel Rivera
Title: Graduate Student
Dept: Master of Public Administration
The University of Texas –Pan American
Phone: (956)975-6444
Email: JRivera629@aol.com

Research Advisor information:

Name: Dr. Cynthia E. Lynch
Title: Associate Professor
Dept: Master of Public Administration
The University of Texas –Pan American
Phone: (956)665-2545
Email: clynca@utpa.edu

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D
SURVEY ADMINISTRATION OUTLINE

1. Greeting
2. Introduction of researcher
3. Explanation for visit:
 - Administer survey for completion of master's degree in public administration
 - The benefits to the stakeholders (including participants and departments)
4. Provide and read aloud paper copy of Appendix C
 - Allow participants to keep
5. Explanation of technology:
 - what they are
 - how it works
 - what if you change your mind
 - and any questions they may have on clickers
6. How survey will be administered
 - need for clarification on question
 - what if technology does not function properly
 - time allotted
7. Administer survey
8. Conclusion:
 - thank you for participation
 - save results onto encrypted USB drive
 - clear area where survey was administered

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Joel Rivera began his career in public service in 1999 after graduating from the Hidalgo County Sheriff's Academy. Joel then completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Texas- Pan American in May of 2000 by earning a bachelors of science in Criminal Justice. In 2008, Joel once again returned to the University of Texas- Pan American and earned a Masters of Public Administration in May of 2011. As of the date of publication, Joel is a master peace officer, holds the rank of Chief Deputy Constable, and serves as a police instructor for the Texas Justice Court Training Center.

Joel Rivera
P.O. Box 1055
Weslaco, Texas
78599