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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the relationship between organizational culture and police officer well-being, using an empirical examination of one agency. Culture is important in law enforcement. Previous studies on police culture have typically sought to understand the effect of culture on officer behaviors. This thesis takes a different approach by examining the effects of culture on individual officer well-being. The results of this study indicate that culture is related to well-being, along certain dimensions. Cultural attitudes towards an organization’s administration and the citizens officers interact with are shown to be consistent predictors of well-being. The results of this study provide implications for future research along with police organizational policy.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores the relationship among police culture and well-being in a sample of sworn police officers in an agency located in the Western United States. Police culture has been an area of intense study for decades. Traditional police culture research has been exploratory, aiming to develop clear definitions and variables for measurement (Chan, 1996; Skolnick, 1966; Van Maanen, 1974; Westley, 1953). Modern studies on police culture have analyzed the influence of police culture on officers' behaviors and attitudes (Ingram et al., 2018; Paoline et al., 2000; Paoline & Terrill, 2005; Terrill et al., 2003). Police well-being research looks to understand the various factors related to the perceived quality of life among police officers (Hart et al., 1995, Juniper et al., 2010). Employee well-being is closely related to the overall health of their employing organization, which also influences the organization’s capability of reaching desired outcomes and goals (Cotton & Hart, 2003). Within the realm of law enforcement, it is necessary to understand how an officer’s well-being may influence their ability to carry out their organization’s desired functions. Presently, research has not identified a relationship between culture and well-being. Instead, studies of officer well-being are concerned with individual and organizational level predictors of well-being (Johnson, 2012; 2015; McCarty et al., 2019; McCarty & Skogan, 2012). This study makes a unique contribution to the knowledge of police culture and police well-being literature by examining the effects of police culture on members' well-being.
According to Paoline and Terrill (2005), police culture can be defined as "the widely-shared attitudes, values, and norms that officers use to collectively cope with the strains that originate in their occupational and organizational environments” (p.456). The occupational environment refers to the daily physical nature of police work (Paoline et al., 2000). The organizational environment refers to the occupational member’s interaction and relationship to their organization (Paoline, 2003), these interactions typically occur between occupational members and their supervisors. Police officers develop strategies and behaviors to cope with both of these environmental tensions.

Police culture literature generally takes one of two perspectives. First, the monocultural view posits that one occupational culture is shared amongst all officers in all agencies (Crank, 2004; Paoline, 2003). This view maintains that cultural homogeneity exists among all police officers, due to the similarity in officers' responses to their occupational and organizational environments (Paoline, 2003). Early ethnographies of police officers developed a perspective of the "typical" police officer based on their behaviors and responses to their occupational environment (Skolnick, 1966; Van Maanen, 1974; Westley, 1953). Research around the monocultural view has proposed a police culture where officers share similar attitudes about citizen distrust, aggressive policing, negative views of supervision, selectiveness in enforcing certain laws, and prioritizing law enforcement over other duties (Ingram et al., 2013; Ingram et al., 2018; Paoline, 2003; Paoline & Terrill, 2005;). According to Crank (2004), "culture can be thought of as a confluence of themes of occupational activity" (p.56). From this perspective, it is the combination of these central themes (distrust, aggressive policing, negative views of supervision, selectiveness in enforcing certain laws, and the
prioritization of law enforcement over other duties) that comprise a single culture across policing. These themes are not exclusive but act as pieces that form the visual of police culture as a whole (Crank, 2004). The mono-cultural perspective recognizes the complexity and variation of themes across the occupation of policing, but argues that the overarching commonality of these themes creates a single police culture with influential reach across the whole occupation.

On the other hand, various police culture studies have built a multi-cultural perspective in policing. Findings from studies incorporating officer typologies, demographics, and occupational changes reveal that variations exist in how officers respond to their occupational and organizational environments (Cochran & Bromley, 2003; Paoline, 2003; Paoline & Terrill, 2005). Variations exist not only in officers' responses to their environments, but also in the outlooks and attitudes they have about their environments (Paoline et al., 2000). The multi-cultural perspective acknowledges the presence of a collective culture, but it is a culture that is felt or embraced differently by different groups of police employees. Compared to the mono-cultural perspective which presents a uniform culture across all levels of policing, the multi-cultural view asserts that cultural attitudes vary with organizational levels and among different workgroups (Ingram et al., 2013). This perspective posits that police work is an organizational phenomenon with different subgroups of officers experiencing different environmental strains. Patrol officers may face a similar occupational environment from a task standpoint across all policing, but differences exist in their organizational environment (Crank, 2004; Paoline, 2003). Facets of the organizational environment influence police culture (Cordner, 2017; Ingram et al., 2013; Paoline, 2003). Police
culture is not one broad concept that consistently encompasses a set of central values across all forms of policing, in all organizational environments. Rather, this perspective suggests that culture should be viewed as a concept of collective attitudes and values developed at different levels within an organization, and within various workgroups.

Research on police culture has generally refined its definition of police culture, improved the empirical measurement of the concept, and investigated the attitudes and behaviors that are influenced by culture. To date, research has not considered the relationship between police culture and the well-being of police officers. This is a key omission, because the concepts of police culture and well-being have been given extensive attention specifically on their influence over officer behavior, but research has not looked at how these concepts interact with one another. Officer well-being is a multifaceted concept and an important area of study. Building upon previous literature (Kop et al., 1999; Martinussen et al., 2007; McCarty et al., 2019; McCarty & Skogan, 2012; McCarty et al., 2007), this study uses officer job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and burnout as indicators of well-being among officers within a single agency.

Scholars generally accept that a form of culture exists within the institution of policing; thus, it is necessary to analyze how collective values held within police organizations interact with variables of officer well-being. A large proportion of police culture studies have applied the multi-culture perspective to understand behaviors in the occupational environment of policing, such as the use of force, coercion, and citizen interactions (Paoline & Terrill, 2005; Silver et al., 2017; Terrill et al., 2003). Culture is developed through responses to the occupational and organizational environment. The well-being of employees within an organization is significantly related to the
organization's overall health, which, in turn, influences the organization's productivity and goals (Cotton & Hart, 2003). If a police organization is to be productive and connected to its communities, it is necessary to understand both the well-being of the officers who carry out the organization's functions and the potential effects of culture on that well-being.

The well-being variables of interest are organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and burnout. Commitment is often included as a secondary variable of interest in stress and burnout studies, yet research focusing on commitment is limited. The few studies on organizational commitment among police officers have observed characteristics affecting commitment and how commitment changes over time (Beck & Wilson, 1997; 2000; Johnson, 2015; Metcalfe & Dick, 2001; Van Maanen, 1975). Another variable of interest is job satisfaction which, within policing, is an understudied phenomenon. Existing studies on police job satisfaction have primarily studied predictors of satisfaction, such as officer demographics, work characteristics, and organizational characteristics (Johnson, 2012). Typically, studies on job satisfaction among police officers have been one dimensional in their analysis, yet Johnson (2012) found that police job satisfaction is a multi-dimensional concept influenced by various individual and organizational variables. Studies on stress and burnout receive an elevated amount of attention in officer well-being research. Research has analyzed the various predictors of burnout among employees as well as the relationship between burnout and other factors of well-being (Adams & Mastracci, 2019; McCarty et al., 2019; McCarty & Skogan, 2012).
Chapter Two elaborates the relevant literature surrounding police culture and officer well-being. Chapter Three describes, in detail, the data, methodological decisions, and data analysis strategies of this study. Chapter Four presents the relevant results, followed by a discussion of these findings and their relevance in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This review explores the concepts of police culture and officer well-being. While to date there are no studies that specifically address the relationship between police culture and well-being, numerous studies have examined the concepts of culture and well-being separately. The literature on police culture and officer well-being provides context and clarity to the development of these concepts and how they may possibly interact with one another.

Defining Police Culture

Studies on police culture have sought to clearly define police culture, how it manifests, and what effects culture has on officer attitudes and behaviors. Modern scholars have defined police culture as the attitudes, values, and norms developed in response to the strains of a police officer's occupational and organizational environment (Campeu, 2015; Paoline, 2003; Paoline et al., 2000; Paoline & Terrill, 2005). Early studies on police culture used ethnographic methodologies to observe and understand the common values and attitudes shared amongst police officers (Ingram et al., 2013; Paoline 2004, 2003; Paoline et al., 2000; Paoline & Terrill, 2005; Loftus, 2010). These studies helped identify responses developed by officers in their occupational and organizational environments and how the responses influenced officer interactions and behaviors (Loftus, 2010). The occupational and organizational environments officers navigate influence culture. Paoline (2003) describes the development of the occupational and organizational environments in policing and the unique norms and values officers create
in responses to each environment. The occupational environment of policing refers to the
daily "on the job" activities of officers, such as patrol, citizen interactions, and crime-
fighting (Paoline, 2003; Silver et al., 2017). The organizational environment is where
officers interact with upper management, workgroups, organizational policy, and
decision-making (Paoline, 2003, Silver et al., 2017). Police officers face unique strains
from both environments, requiring responses that aid in coping with external and internal
stressors (Ingram et al., 2013; Paoline et al., 2000, Paoline, 2003; Silver et al., 2017).

Cultural attitudes and values are developed through responses to certain strains
(e.g., responding to calls for service, citizen interactions, report writing, investigations) in
the officer's work environment. Researchers discovered these by observing police officers
in their work environment. Common attitudes and values that emerged were negative
views toward citizens and supervisors, and tendency toward an aggressive and selective
crime-fighting role (Paoline & Terrill, 2005; Skolnick, 1966; Van Maanen, 1974;
Westley, 1953). These early studies described police culture and the development of
attitudes and beliefs among officers. Over time, two camps emerged in the police culture
literature. First, the mono-cultural view posited a police culture that is widely accepted
and shared amongst officers across the entire occupation of policing (Cordner, 2017;
Ingram et al., 2013; Ingram et al., 2018; Paoline, 2000). The second camp, the
multicultural perspective, posited an organizationally driven police culture with values
and attitudes differing among and within police organizations (Cordner, 2017, Ingram et
al., 2013; Paoline, 2000). These two perspectives or camps deserve further description.
The Mono-Cultural Perspective

According to Paoline and Gau (2018), “despite the academic debate, police leaders and criminal-justice commentators tend to endorse the notion that police culture is monolithic and characterized by a number of undesirable attitudes widely shared across the occupation” (p.671). The mono-cultural perspective posits that officers' attitudes are very similar across all police personnel due to the similarity in their occupational environment (Crank, 2004). Early policing ethnographies describe police officers’ values and norms as homogeneous (Skolnick, 1966; Van Maanen, 1974; Westley, 1953). According to some later scholars, the culture of policing remains uni-dimensional because the occupational environment of policing remains consistent (Crank, 2004; Loftus, 2010). For example, Loftus (2010) sees policing's central cultural themes as being resistant to change and not malleable. According to Loftus (2010), these themes are resistant due to the belief that pressures officers face from their work environment have remained consistent throughout time.

The Multi-Cultural Perspective

The multi-cultural perspective presents police culture as varying across and within organizations. Previous mono-cultural definitions have faced criticism due to the narrow approach to defining a complex construct such as culture (Campeu, 2015; Chan, 1996). Paoline (2003) posits that culture is a complex phenomenon that can differ across organizations and within them. The multi-cultural perspective shifts the view from a single distinct culture founded in the occupational work environment, to a view that includes the influence of factors rooted in the police organizational environment.
Early qualitative studies of officers in their work environment produced different officer typologies, which supports the claim that officers are not uniform culturally (Muir, 1977; Reiner, 1985). Some studies that identified common themes associated with police culture, such as Reiner (1985), cautioned against the assumption of mono-cultural police culture. Reiner (1985) states:

The culture of the police—the values, norms, perspectives and craft rules—which inform their conduct is, of course, neither monolithic, universal, nor unchanging. There are differences of outlook within police forces, according to such individual variables as personality, to rank, assignment and specialization. The organizational styles and cultures of police forces vary between different places and periods. Informal rules are not clear-cut, and articulated, but embedded in situations and the interactional processes of each encounter (p.86).

Modern studies of police culture have moved from qualitative methods to quantitative studies. This quantitative research revealed different officer types based on their occupational and organizational attitudes (Cochran & Bromley, 2003; Cordner, 2017; Jermier et al., 1991; Paoline, 2001; 2004; Paoline et al., 2000). Using survey data that sampled officers with patrol responsibilities from the Indianapolis and St. Petersburg police departments, Paoline et al. (2000) found that officers do not universally adhere to the common attitudes attached to police culture; rather, they identified variations among officers. The same study also found that individual characteristics such as race and sex did not significantly influence cultural variation, and they hypothesized based on their findings that organizational influences may play a larger role than expected. The adherence to culture differs individually and among patrol workgroups. It appears that
multiple sub-cultures, each with its own attitudes and values, can exist within a single organization (Ingram et al., 2013). Using a sample of police officers from 89 different police and sheriff departments, Cordner (2017) tested individual and organizational factors among various police agencies. He found that officer cultural values differ significantly across agencies. His findings that variation did not occur on personal or occupational characteristics indicate that culture is not strictly driven by the strains of a police officer's occupational environment. Instead, culture can be considered an organizational phenomenon (Cordner, 2017).

Cordner (2017) developed a multivariate model of police culture, using seven dimensions that are solid measures of police culture. The seven dimensions measure officer attitudes toward citizens, toughness, solidarity, misconduct, supervision, administration, and community policing. Each dimension of culture used by Cordner (2017) is captured using various question measured on Likert scales. For example, the dimension of supervision is captured using 14 questions each measured on a five-point Likert scale. The other dimensions follow a similar format. Cordner (2017) ran reliability analysis on each of the seven dimensions of culture, and the alphas produced indicated moderate to strong internal consistency for each dimension. The seven dimensions used by Cordner (2017) are a foundational theme in police culture. The combination of these dimensions into one construct is a solid unit for studying police culture. The culture construct developed by Cordner is strong. Organizations are complex with hierarchal

1 Cordner’s (2017) measurement of misconduct does not use a single dimension, therefore it was removed from the analytical process in this thesis.
controls and specialized workgroups with specialized job tasks that engage in diverse interactions with their organizational environment. The presence of a uniform police culture situated in the occupational environment becomes difficult to support when it is evident that organizations influence officer attitudes and values (Cordner, 2017; Ingram et al., 2013; Paoline, 2000; 2003).

Culture is a complicated concept and how culture is measured can vary based on the focus of the research. Previous research has measured the manifestation of culture within a specific unit of analysis, such as an organization or community. Therefore, culture can be studied as a macro-level construct that uses the combination of various attitudes and norms expressed by that unit (e.g., Westley, 1970). Culture can also be studied by measuring the attitudes and norms of individuals within a defined environment, such as a country or organization, and aggregating the scores to measure attitudes and norms (Cordner, 2017). This process can produce an overall measure of the culture within that specific unit of analysis. Using a construct of culture and surveying officers from various police agencies, Cordner (2017) aggregated scores based on his culture construct and compared them across different organizations. This level of study is valuable in developing conclusions on what types of attitudes and values exist within organizations and how they may differ.

This thesis takes an approach that differs from the above examples. It measures how individuals relate to culture and how their acceptance and expression of culture interacts with officer well-being. Previous studies have sought to see if culture exists and how it differs across different units, such as organizations or groups of employees nested within an organization. In this thesis, it is assumed that culture exists. The research
question is, how do individuals adhere to culture, and how does their level of adherence to culture relate to their well-being? This question distinguishes this thesis from previous police culture research.

**Well-Being**

The policing occupation imposes strains and stressors that may affect the well-being of a police officer. How officers respond to stress and perceive their occupational and organizational environments may influence how they carry out their day-to-day tasks. The policing literature has predominantly examined officer behaviors or sought to develop a deeper understanding of police officer decision-making. Little research has engaged with officer well-being and health. The concept of well-being is broad and encompasses several dimensions, such as mental health, physical health, and relationships. Studies of officer well-being analyze concepts of stress and burnout, most likely due to their adverse effects on health and behavior. Given their importance, this study focuses on the concepts of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and burnout as measures of well-being.

**Job Satisfaction**

According to Brady (2017), a single definition of job satisfaction does not exist in the research literature. Some definitions emphasize the emergence of positive emotions. For instance, Locke (1976, p. 1304) defines job satisfaction as, "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." Other definitions analyze the overall outlook towards one's job. Spector (1997, p.2) states that job satisfaction is, "simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs." Weiss (2002) posits job satisfaction is an attitude that emerges through a
psychological evaluation of the job's positive and negative characteristics rooted in the work environment. Hence, an evaluation of these factors produces a sum level of satisfaction based on the weight of positive and negative attitudes towards the job and the organization (Johnson, 2012; Weiss, 2002).

Hopkins (1983) developed a measure of job satisfaction using a five-item scale. Each item was measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The five items asked questions such as “I find work stimulating and challenging”; “I find a sense of worthwhile accomplishment in my work”; “I find opportunities for personal growth and development in my job”; “I enjoy nearly all things I do on my job very much”; The scale has been used in past police research and has shown reliable and accurate measurement of an individual’s satisfaction levels (Brady, 2017; Brady & King, 2018; Johnson, 2012). Brady (2017) measured job satisfaction using Hopkins (1983) scale. The reliability analysis conducted by Brady (2017) produced an alpha of .859. This reliability coefficient indicates the job satisfaction scale developed by Hopkins (1983) has strong internal consistency.

Research surrounding policing and job satisfaction is limited, compared to other occupational fields (Dantzker, 1994; Zhao et al., 1999). The group of studies that do exist have analyzed the various dimensions of job satisfaction among law enforcement personnel (Brady, 2017; Brady & King, 2018; Brough & Frame, 2004; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Buzawa, 1984; Cooper et al., 2010; Dantzker & Kubin, 1998; Forsyth & Copes, 1994; Howard et al., 2004; Johnson, 2012; Paoline & Gau, 2018; Martelli et al., 1989; Miller et al., 2009; Rhodes, 2015; White, 2010; Zhao et al., 1999).
Existing studies on job satisfaction (Brough & Frame, 2004; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Buzawa, 1984; Cooper et al., 2010; Dantzker & Kubin, 1998; Forsyth & Copes, 1994; Howard et al., 2004; Johnson, 2012; Paoline & Gau, 2018; Martelli et al., 1989; Miller et al., 2009; Rhodes, 2015; White et al., 2010; Zhao et al., 1999) within policing have focused on front line officers and only a few studies, such as Brady & King (2018) and Brady (2017), have examined job satisfaction among police chiefs. Even with a narrowed focus on the job of policing, the research on job satisfaction, its causes, and effects lacks consistency (Johnson, 2012; Paoline & Gau 2020). This is understandable because satisfaction is a complex concept lacking uniformity in measurement. Typically, job satisfaction is believed to be related to three dimensions: (1) demographic/individual characteristics, (2) work environment/occupational characteristics, and (3) organizational characteristics (Johnson, 2012).

Job satisfaction studies usually examine the influential nature of demographic and occupational characteristics on satisfaction (Brady & King, 2018; Buzawa, 1984; Cooper et al., 2010; Dantzker, 1994; Dantzker & Kubin, 1998; Forsyth & Copes, 1994; Miller et al., 2009; Rhodes, 2015; White et al., 2010). While these studies are sound methodologically, the findings overall lack consistency regarding the influence of individual characteristics, (sex, race, age, and education) and the occupational environment (job assignment and job tasks) on job satisfaction (Paoline & Gau, 2020). Other studies have taken a multidimensional approach by incorporating work environment (e.g. job assignment and experience) and organizational factors (e.g. interactions with upper management) into the analysis of satisfaction (Brady, 2017; Brough & Frame, 2004; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Johnson, 2012; Martelli et al.,
Findings from multidimensional studies indicate that organizational and work environment factors are more significant predictors of job satisfaction than demographic and occupational factors (Brady, 2017).

A few studies of policing personnel have looked beyond indicators of job satisfaction and analyzed the influence of job satisfaction on other organizational factors (Brough & Frame, 2004; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Howard et al., 2004; Jaramillo et al., 2005; Matz et al., 2014). Job satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment (Jaramillo et al., 2005), job stress (Dowden & Tellier, 2004), turnover (Brough & Frame, 2004; Matz et al., 2014), and work-family conflict (Howard et al., 2004). In sum, job satisfaction is seen as component of employees' well-being and influences other factors of officer well-being such as organizational commitment, stress, and turnover.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is defined as the bond an employee has to their organization or the loyalty and identification they have with their organization and its values and goals (Brady, 2017; Johnson, 2015; Porter et al., 1974; Steers, 1977). Organizational commitment is operationalized as a multidimensional construct measured on three dimensions: (1) affective, (2) continuance, and (3) normative commitment (Brady, 2017; Meyer & Allen, 1984). The three dimensions of organizational commitment act in concert to influence overall commitment to the organization, but each dimension is unique.

Affective commitment is the level of emotional attachment to an organization and strong identification and enjoyment with being a member of the organization (Allen &
Meyer, 1990; Brady; 2017; Meyer & Allen, 1984; Shore & Wayne, 1993). Employees with high affective commitment maintain connections with their organization because they choose to do so (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Continuance commitment is based on the benefit (monetary, social, and status) of membership in the organization and the cost of leaving (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Brady, 2017; Meyer & Allen, 1984; Shore & Wayne, 1993). Continuance commitment is a need-focused concept, where connection to the organization is founded in the perceived need the employee has for the organization.

Normative commitment is the employee’s obligation to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Brady, 2017), such as feeling the organization is owed loyalty because the employee feels they have been treated well by the organization (Jaros, 2007).

Davis and Smith’s (1991) six-item organizational commitment scale is effective in capturing levels of overall organizational commitment among employees. The scale is made up of six items each measured on a seven-point Likert scale. The scale ranges from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The six items asked questions on one’s loyalty to the organization, pride in the organization, and willingness to work hard for the organization. The scale is strong and has achieved successful measurements of commitment in previous studies (Brady, 2017; Brady & King, 2018). Brady (2017) conducted a reliability analysis on the organizational commitment scale developed by Davis and Smith (1991). The analysis produced an alpha of .573. Brady (2017) proceeded to remove several questions from the scale. After removal of several questions two questions surrounding organizational commitment remained and their responses summated. This alteration produced an alpha of .640, which is an increase from the
original scale. The scale developed by Davis and Smith (1991) will be used to measure organizational commitment in this thesis.

To date, organizational commitment has been given little research attention in policing compared to other fields (Brady, 2017; Crow et al., 2012; Dick, 2011; Jaramillo et al., 2005; Johnson, 2012). Most studies focus on factors associated with officer well-being are from an international perspective (Paoline & Gau, 2020). While these studies inform the policing literature, a lack of U.S. based studies limits their applicability due to the significant difference between U.S. law enforcement and international law enforcement (Paoline & Gau, 2020).

Studies have found that organizational factors, primarily supervisor interactions, significantly influence organizational commitment (Beck & Wilson, 1997; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Crow et al., 2012; Currie & Dollery, 2006; Dick, 2011; Johnson, 2012; McElroy et al., 1999). Brunetto & Farr-Wharton (2003), using a sample of Australian State police officers, found commitment among officers is relatively high, especially when they are involved in decision-making processes, have good supervisor support, and receive praise and feedback on their work. Organizational commitment decreased as the rank of the officers increased (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; McElroy et al., 1999). Similar findings in a sample of Australian police officers found that organizational commitment decreased as age, rank, and years of services increased (Currie and Dollery 2006). Using longitudinal survey data of officers in an Arizona regional police academy, Johnson (2012) found that supervisor feedback and organizational support were significant predictors of organizational commitment, similar to previous studies (Beck & Wilson, 1997; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Dick, 2011;
officers on in-service training and findings revealed that organizational justice (how
individuals within an organization are treated) was significantly related to organizational
commitment. Their findings also identified job satisfaction as a mediator on
organizational justice and organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment is a valuable concept that requires increased research
in policing. Not only does organizational commitment provide insight into the overall
well-being of policing personnel, but it can provide details regarding the overall health
and operational nature of the organization.

**Burnout**

Of the three dimensions of well-being presented in this thesis, burnout has
received the most attention in the policing literature (Adams & Mastracci, 2019; Bakker
& Heuven, 2006; Burke, 1993; Dowler, 2005; Goodman, 1990; Hawkins, 2001; Kohan &
Mazmanian, 2003; Kop et al., 1999; Martinussen et al., 2007; McCarty et al., 2019;
McCarty & Skogan, 2012; McCarty et al., 2007; Schaible & Gecas, 2010; Schaible &
Six, 2006). The definition of burnout has undergone various reconceptualizations (Brady,
2017). Original definitions of burnout posited it as a symptom. Maslach et al. (1997)
define burnout as a, "psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion,
depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among
individuals who work with other people in some capacity." (p.192).

Three core components of burnout emerge: emotional exhaustion,
depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion
references reduced energy and empathy due to continued stress and a plethora of work
and personal demands (Brady, 2017). According to Maslach et al. (1997), emotional exhaustion is considered the central component of burnout. The concept of emotional exhaustion has been refined by including physical and mental exhaustion (Brady, 2017). Depersonalization is defined as holding negative attitudes and a sense of cynicism towards clients (Maslach et al., 1997). For policing, clients would include citizens, as well as fellow organizational members including other officers and supervisors. Reduced personal accomplishment is defined as the negative evaluative attitudes individuals have towards themselves, specifically in their work accomplishments and interactions (Maslach et al., 1997).

The Maslach Burnout Inventory and other similar scales used to measure burnout are popular in burnout studies but have shown to be limited in their distribution of questions to efficiently measure all facets of burnout equally (Brady, 2017). I measure burnout using the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti et al., 2003), which is a German developed scale, with a version that has been translated into English and has shown reliability and validity in measuring burnout (Brady & King, 2018; Demerouti et al., 2003; Demerouti & Nachreiner, 1996; Brady, 2017; Halbesleben & Demerouti, 2005). Comparing the OLBI to the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Demerouti et al., 2003) ran reliability analyses and produced alphas of .730 for the exhaustion dimension of burnout and .830 for the disengagement dimension of burnout. Brady (2017) produced similar alphas with a .734 for exhaustion and .798 for disengagement. The OLBI measures burnout using 16 variables divided equally into two dimensions. These two dimensions of burnout: disengagement and exhaustion are each captured using eight variables for measurement. Examples of items measuring disengagement ask questions
such as, “Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically”; Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks”. Examples of items measuring exhaustion ask questions such as, “There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work”; “During my work, I often feel emotionally drained Burnout”.

Burnout studies in policing have typically measured burnout on one or all of the three dimensions of burnout presented by Maslach et al. (1997). Studies have examined both the manifestation of burnout among officers and the consequences of burnout. Some demographic characteristics are related to police burnout (Hawkins, 2001; McCarty et al., 2007). For example, Hawkins (2001) found that officers who were married, had longer tenure, and had been working under one job task for an extended period of increased the likelihood of experiencing high emotional exhaustion levels. McCarty et al. (2007) analyzed differences in burnout between male and female police officers and their findings indicate that burnout levels are similar between males and females, but that precursors to burnout differ. Women officers experience unique stressors compared to their male counterparts. African American and female officers were shown to experience the highest burnout levels in the study (McCarty et al., 2007).

Burnout studies in policing have primarily analyzed predictors and consequences of burnout emerging from the occupational and organizational environments. Adams and Mastracci (2019) found that the presence of body-worn cameras significantly increased police officer burnout, although this effect is mediated when perceived organizational support is high. McCarty et al. (2019) analyzed predictors of burnout among officers on the dimensions of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. They found that overall workload and officers’ values or views about the organization’s direction and top
management were significant predictors for emotional exhaustion. Increases in workload and less support for top management and the direction of the organization were associated with greater emotional exhaustion. Depersonalization revealed the same predictors as emotional exhaustion except that community perceptions was the most significant predictor of depersonalization. Community perceptions specifically referred to the lack of public understanding of what it means to be a police officer. Analyzing both civilian and sworn personnel, McCarty and Skogan (2012) found that factors affecting burnout were similar among civilian and sworn employees. They found that work/life balance, organizational support (referring to upper management and coworkers), policy fairness, and various personal characteristics had significant relationships with overall burnout levels. Martinussen et al. (2007) looked at the predictive value burnout has on police officers' outcomes and health. Findings indicated that lacking support and pressures from the work and home environment were significantly related to all three dimensions of burnout. Concerning health outcomes, the dimension of emotional exhaustion had the strongest correlation with health issues amongst police officers when compared to the other two dimensions of burnout. Burnout was a significant predictor of job-related outcomes, such as satisfaction, commitment, and thoughts of leaving the job. The findings also support previous research showing that burnout has personal health and job-related consequences (Burke, 1993; Martinussen, 2007). Examining the relationship between organizational and occupational factors and burnout, Kohan & Mazmanian (2003) found that police officers showed significantly higher levels of distress from organizational strains than occupational strains.
Burnout is an important concept to study among policing personnel. Burnout is a phenomenon that adversely affects both physical health and work-related outcomes. The mediating effect of organizational support found in almost every burnout study indicates the important role organizations play in the manifestation of burnout as well as the consequences.

**Summary of Existing Research**

Culture is an important construct in the field of policing. It is not a unidimensional construct rooted in the police occupational environment. Instead, culture is a multi-dimensional construct with variations in how officers experience and embody it. The multi-cultural perspective of culture as an organizational phenomenon has been rigorously tested and supported. These tests also conclude that culture varies, indicating that organizations may express and embody culture differently, which may lead to different attitudes and norms.

Officer well-being is another construct that is important to the field of policing. Well-being includes overall officer mental, physical, and emotional health and the health of the organization. The various components of well-being show consistent interaction with one another. The dimensions of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and burnout each hold importance in officers' overall health. Each dimension interacts with one another and other factors that influence well-being, such as turnover, stress, and work-family conflict. Research on well-being has generally examined how these dimensions manifest in officers and how they interact with other dimensions of well-being.
To date, police culture and officer well-being have been analyzed separately in the literature. This thesis fills a gap in the literature by assessing the influence of Cordner’s (2017) seven-dimensions of organizational culture on four indicators of well-being.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

This thesis analyzes the relationship between police culture and well-being among police officers in a single, state police agency in the Western United States. This study fills a gap in the police culture and well-being literatures. Studies of police culture have examined the influence of culture on the attitudes and behaviors of officers. Police culture has some influences on officer behavior, yet the extent of that influence is not fully understood. Cultural studies have described officer attitudes and their prevalence, and, in some instances, how officer attitudes are connected to behavior in their occupational environment. To date, however no published study has analyzed how culture is related to officer well-being. I hypothesize that each of the six dimensions of police culture will have a significant predictive relationship with the each of four indicators of officer well-being.

![Figure 1.1 Hypotheses](image-url)
Sample

The sample used in this study is of sworn officers of various rank in one police agency located in the Western United States. The survey and administration processes were approved by the Boise State University Institutional Review Board. All employees in the agency were invited via email from the agency commander to take a web-based survey through the Qualtrics survey platform. As discussed below, only data from sworn officers were included in the final sample. The email included a web-link to the anonymous survey. No incentives were provided to employees for survey completion. The distribution of the email with access to the survey occurred on the morning of July 10, 2020. On July 21, 2020, the agency commander sent a reminder email to employees to complete the survey initiating a second wave of responses. The survey was eventually closed on July 26, 2020.

Survey

The survey was designed to measure employee culture, climate, and well-being. The survey structure used was developed by King and Patterson (2020). The survey was a hybrid of the LEO C survey used by Cordner (2017), along with various questions about employee characteristics and scales measuring well-being such as Davis and Smith (1991) organizational commitment scale, Hopkins (1983) job satisfaction scale, and the Oldenburg Burnout inventory. There were two versions of the survey, one for sworn employees and one for civilian employees. This thesis only uses the data from the sworn employees. All respondents were given the questions surrounding their overall well-being and individual demographic characteristics. The original data file contained pre-tests administered to agency employees before the survey was launched on July 10; pre-tests
that were not completed were deleted. Completed pre-tests that were deemed usable were retained. Individuals who completed a pre-test that were not administered a survey link during the initial survey process. This was done to prevent individuals from completing the survey twice. The progress variable created by Qualtrics was used to determine overall response viewing. The progress variable provides a number indicating the percentage of the survey that was viewed by respondents. All responses with less than 100% progress were deleted from the file. Another examination of the responses revealed four surveys with significant missing data; these responses were removed from the analysis. The agency consisted of 627 employees of which 297 were full-time officers. The number of usable responses totaled 125, producing a completion rate of 42%.

**Dependent Variables**

The study's dependent variables measured four aspects of officer well-being; organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and burnout which is broken down into emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment was measured using Davis and Smith’s (1991) six variable organizational commitment scale. Each variable was measured using a seven-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree; 7= strongly agree). Responses for each variable were summated to create an overall organizational commitment scale (n=123). An example of a question used in the organizational commitment scale was, "I am proud to be working for this agency."
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using Hopkins (1983) five variable job satisfaction scale. Each variable was measured using a five-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree; 5= strongly agree). Each variable response was summated to present an overall job satisfaction scale (n=125). A sample question used to measure job satisfaction was, “I like the kind of work I do very much.”

Burnout

Burnout was measured using the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, and Kantas, 2003). The OLBI measures burnout using the two dimensions of exhaustion and disengagement. Disengagement and exhaustion are captured using eight variables for each concept. Both exhaustion and disengagement were measured using four-point Likert scales (1= strongly disagree; 4= strongly agree). Responses for disengagement and exhaustion were summated into two separate overall scales used to measure the two dimensions of burnout (n=123 each). An example of a question measuring exhaustion is, “During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.” A question measuring disengagement is, "Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work."

Independent Variables

This study's independent variables tap into the construct of police organizational culture, measured with Cordner’s (2017) seven dimensions of culture encompassing attitudes about citizens, officer toughness, solidarity, misconduct, supervision, administration, and community policing. The seven-dimensions used in this study are central to the understanding of police culture (Cordner, 2017). Each dimension, except
for community policing, includes multiple measures which are combined to create scaled variables for each of the seven dimensions.

Citizens

The citizen dimension used three variables to measure officer attitudes towards citizens. Each variable measured attitudes toward citizens using a four-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree; 4= strongly disagree). Responses for each question were then summated to produce an overall citizen scale incorporating scores from each of the three questions (n=125). An example of a question asked on this scale was, “Officers have a reason to be distrustful of most citizens.”

Toughness

Officer toughness refers to the attitudes toward the physicality of police work and the necessity for physical force in police interactions. Three variables are used to measure toughness. Each variable measured officer toughness on a four-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree; 4= strongly disagree). Responses for each variable were then summated to create an overall toughness scale. (n=125). An example of a question asked on this scale was, "Some people can only be brought to reason the hard, physical way."

Solidarity

Solidarity measured officer loyalty and cohesion among one another. Solidarity is measured using two variables. The two variables are measured on a four-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree; 4= strongly disagree). The responses for the two variables were summated to create an overall solidarity scale (n= 123). One of the survey questions on solidarity asked, "Loyalty to other officers should be the highest priority in this agency."
Supervision

The supervision dimension measured officer attitudes toward their supervisors. Fourteen variables are used to measure overall officer attitudes toward their supervisors. The 14 variables were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1= always; 5= never). Each variable was summated to create an overall supervision scale (n= 122). One question concerning the supervisor asked, "Inspires me to work to the best of my abilities."

Administration

Variables also measured officers’ views of their administration. The administration dimension encompasses aspects of upper management and overall perspectives toward the agency as a whole. This dimension is measured using eight variables. Seven variables are measured on a four-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree; 4= strongly disagree). One variable, a question asking overall perspectives of top management is measured on a six-point Likert scale (1= extremely supportive; 6 = I don’t know the direction of top management). Eight of the variables were summated to create an overall administration scale (n= 122). An example asked in the survey is "The department is more interested in measuring activity than the quality of work."

Community Policing

Community policing is seen as a progressive organizational initiative that affects the occupational work of officers. Community policing was measured using one variable on a five-point Likert scale (1= strongly oppose it; 5= strongly support it). The variable asked officers' view of the community policing approach, in terms of support or opposition (n=125).
Control Variables

Several demographic variables are used as controls during analysis. The variables controlled for were: education level, tenure in law enforcement, race/ethnicity, age, and whether or not an officer was an immediate supervisor of one or more officers. Education was measured with an eight category, ordinal level variable. Tenure in law enforcement was measured using the total number of years and months a respondent reported in law enforcement (this includes service outside of the agency). Race and ethnicity were measured using a dichotomous variable asking respondents whether they identified as white (non-Hispanic) or other. Age was measured at the ratio level, asking respondents to report their age in years, and one’s job task as a supervisor was measured dichotomously (Yes or No), asking respondents to answer whether they were an immediate supervisor of one or more employees. Gender was not included as a control variable due to the lack of diversity within the agency of study. The agency is made up of primarily male officers.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Data analysis includes univariate statistics across all independent, dependent, and control variables. Bivariate statistics were run to identify any potential relationships among all variables. Finally, a multivariate model using ordinary least squares regression (OLS) was used with the four indicators of well-being operating as the dependent variables. OLS regression is a useful statistical due to its ability to analyze the effects of each independent variable on the dependent variables of study. An assumption of OLS regression is that the dependent variable is continuous. The dependent variables in this study are not continuous rather they are considered counts-based data. Date (2019), indicates that when compared to other models such as Possion and Negative Binomial Regression, the OLS regression has viability when using counts-based data.

Univariate Statistics

Univariate statistics were run for the independent, dependent, and control variables of interest. Table 1.1 and Table 1.2 present descriptive statistics on survey respondents. Table 1.1 presents the number of respondents for each demographic variable along with the percentage of respondents in each category. A majority of respondents were male, making up 96.7% of respondents (n=118), while females were 3.3% (n=4) of the respondents. For education, 40.7% (n= 50) of respondents indicated that they possessed a bachelor’s degree. The race and/or ethnicity of survey respondents were 96.4% white (n =109), with 3.6% (n= 4) of respondents indicating some other race and/or
ethnicity. Most respondents (61.6%, n=77) indicated they were not an immediate supervisor to one or more employees, while 38.4% (n=48) were.
### Table 1.1 Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Sex, Education, Race and Supervisor Status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-school diploma or GED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, but not a degree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 presents descriptive information on the age and tenure of respondents. The mean age of respondents was 42 years, with a range of 23 years being the minimum and 65 being the maximum. The mean length of time in law enforcement was about 16 years, with 40 years being the longest tenure among respondents.

Table 1.2    Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Age and Tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well-Being

Below, Tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 present descriptive statistics for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and burnout (exhaustion and disengagement). Each scale is an indicator of well-being and consists of multiple questions with responses being summated to create an overall scale that measures the concept.
Table 2.1 provides univariate statistics for the well-being indicator of job satisfaction. Higher scores indicate more job satisfaction, while lower scores indicate dissatisfaction with one’s job. Scores from each variable were summated to create an overall job satisfaction score ranging from 5-25. The theoretical midpoint for the scale is 15. (possible scale response range 5-25). The descriptives show relatively high levels of job satisfaction with the both the mean and median response scores being higher than the midpoint (mean=18.43, median=19.00, SD=3.911). Reliability analysis (alpha =.903) indicates a reliable measure of job satisfaction. This outcome is slightly higher than the reliability coefficient produced by Brady (2017) who found an alpha of .859 when using Hopkins (1983) job satisfaction scale.

Table 2.1 Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find work stimulating and challenging</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find a sense of worthwhile accomplishment in my work</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find opportunities for personal growth and development</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy nearly all the things I do on my job very much</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the kind of work I do very much</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>3.911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient α=.903
Table 2.2 presents descriptive statistics on organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was measured using Davis and Smith’s (1991) six variable organizational commitment scale. Higher responses scores indicate higher levels of organizational commitment, while lower scores show lower levels of commitment. Overall scores ranged from 6-41. The theoretical midpoint for the organizational commitment scale is 24 (possible scale response range 6-42).
Table 2.2   Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to work harder than I</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have to in order to help my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization succeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would turn down another job for</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more pay in order to stay with this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations values are very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be working for this</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to this</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take almost any job to keep</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working for this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.54</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>7.470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient $\alpha=0.842$

*Indicates variable was reverse coded

Reliability analysis (alpha = .842) indicates the scale is a reliable indicator of organizational commitment. Comparatively Brady (2017) produced an alpha of .573 when using Davis and Smith (1991) organizational scale. Organizational commitment among respondents is favorable with both the mean and median being above the theoretical midpoint (mean=29.54; median=30.00; SD=7.470).
Table 2.3 and 2.4 present univariate statistics on respondent perceptions of burnout within their organization. Higher scores for both disengagement and exhaustion indicate higher levels of burnout among respondents. Table 2.3 presents statistics on levels of burnout disengagement. Reliability analysis (alpha = .754) indicates the scale is a reliable indicator of burnout disengagement. Brady (2017) produced an alpha of .798 when using the OLBI to measure burnout disengagement. Scores from the eight variables were summed to form an overall disengagement scale ranging from 10-28. The theoretical midpoint for disengagement is 20 (possible scale response range 8-32). Respondents on average indicated lower levels of burnout disengagement with the mean and median scores being below the theoretical midpoint (mean=18.2; median=18.0; SD=3.41).
Table 2.3  Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Burnout Disengagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I always find new and interesting aspects in my work*</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It happens more and more that I talk about my work in a negative way</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find my work to be a positive challenge*</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the only type of work I can imagine myself doing*</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more and more engaged in my work*</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient: $\alpha=.754$

*Indicates variable was reverse coded
Table 2.4 presents descriptive statistics on burnout as exhaustion. This was measured using eight variables. The alpha (.804) indicates a reliable measurement of exhaustion. Brady (2017) produced an alpha of .734 when using the OLBI to measure burnout exhaustion. Similar to above, the scores from the eight variables were summated to form an overall burnout exhaustion scale. Scores from the summated scale ranged from 11-30. The theoretical midpoint for exhaustion is 20 (possible scale response range 8-32). Responses indicated low levels of exhaustion with the mean and median being below the theoretical midpoint (mean=18.78; median=19.00; SD=3.31)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to relax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well*</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my work, I often feel emotionally drained</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well*</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I work, I usually feel energized*</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Average</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient: $\alpha=.804$

*Indicates variable has been reverse coded
Culture

Univariate statistics were also run on the six dimensions of organizational police culture. Below tables 3.1 and 3.2 provide univariate statistics for the cultural dimensions of administration and supervision. Higher scores indicate that the statement was disagreed with compared to lower scores indicating strong agreement with the statements presented to respondents. Higher scores indicate negative attitudes about a respondent’s immediate supervisor, while lower scores reveal positive perceptions of supervision. Reliability analyses were run for both the administration (.886) and supervision (.958) scales with responses producing strong alphas for both indicating that responses are reliable in measuring the desired concepts. Cordner (2017) ran reliability analyses for each of his culture scales as well. For administration and supervision his analysis produced alphas of .860 for administration and .970 for supervision. These reliability coefficients are comparatively similar.
Table 3.1  Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Negative Views Toward Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching and counseling over punishment</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected during disciplinary investigations</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair disciplinary process</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for officers</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity over quality of work*</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and open promotion process</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarded for good work</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for top management</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient  
\( \alpha = .886 \)

*Indicates variable has been reverse coded
Responses to variables were summated to create overall scales for both administration and supervision. Summated scores from the eight questions about administration ranged from 10-37. The theoretical midpoint for the scale is 21 (possible scale response range 8-34). Scores above the midpoint of 21 indicate favorable attitudes toward administration. Respondents indicate that their attitudes toward upper administration are favorable, with the mean and median scores landing the theoretical midpoint (mean=22.56; median=22.00; SD=5.83). Score summation for the 14 questions surrounding supervision ranged from 18-60. The theoretical midpoint for the supervision scale is 42 (scale response range 14-70) Respondent scores indicate favorable attitudes toward their immediate supervisors with the mean and median falling below the theoretical midpoint (mean=32.80; median=31.00; SD=9.38)
Table 3.2  Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Negative Views Toward Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspires me to work to the best of my abilities</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets a good example for everyone in the organization</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes clear what is expected of employees</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages input from employees</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions that are fair and consistent</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands up for his/her employees with management</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats employees with respect</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes when employees are having problems</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to employees’ concerns</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with people to develop their abilities</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does what is good for the organization</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on errors people make</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids dealing with problems</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives inexperienced people direction</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient
\[\alpha=.958\]
Tables 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 provide univariate statistics on the scales measuring cultural attitudes toward citizens, solidarity, and toughness. Reliability analyses were run for each scale with alphas indicating moderate to strong internal consistency in responses surrounding citizens (.672), solidarity (.553), and toughness (.731). The alphas for these scales in Cordner (2017) were .620 for citizens, .540 for solidarity, and .660 for toughness. While the alphas are similar, the internal consistency for the citizen, solidarity, and toughness scales in this study are slightly higher.

Higher scores indicate negative attitudes toward citizens, while lower scores reveal more positive attitudes toward citizens. Responses to three questions surrounding citizens were summated with scores ranging from 3 to 9. The theoretical midpoint for the citizen scale is 7.5 (scale response range 3-12). Attitudes towards citizens were generally favorable and indicated low levels of cynicism from respondents with the mean and median both falling below the midpoint (mean=5.68; median=6.00; SD=1.35).
Table 3.3  Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Negative Views Toward Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people respect the police</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good police and citizen relationship</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason to be distrustful of most citizens</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two questions were asked concerning officer solidarity. Higher scores indicate that solidarity with fellow officers is less of a priority, while lower scores indicate a high priority for solidarity among respondents. Scores were summated and ranged from 2-8. The theoretical midpoint for the solidarity scale is 5 (scale response range 2-8).

Respondents indicate that loyalty or solidarity with other officers is less of a priority with the mean and median scores being above the midpoint (mean=5.57; median=6.00; SD=1.15).
Table 3.4  Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Negative Views Toward

Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers stick together</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty to other officers</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient
\( \alpha = 0.553 \)

Toughness was measured using three questions. Higher scores indicate that statements regarding toughness are less important to respondents compared to lower scores which indicates that toughness is a priority among respondents. Scores were summated and had a range of 3-12. The theoretical midpoint for the toughness scale is 7.5 (score response range 3-12). Respondents indicate that expressions of toughness are towards citizens and one another is not necessarily a priority or of much importance with the mean and median scores being above the midpoint (mean=8.6; median=9.00; SD=1.72).
Table 3.5  Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Negative Views Toward Toughness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical reasoning</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression over courtesy</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical toughness</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Summation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient $\alpha = .731$

Table 3.6 provides univariate descriptive on respondent attitudes toward community policing. Higher scores indicate strong support for community policing while lower scores indicate opposition.

The theoretical midpoint for this scale is 3 (Scale response range 1-5)

Respondents indicate support for community policing with both the mean and median being above the midpoint (mean=4.18; median=4.00; SD= .919).
Table 3.6  
Descriptive Statistics for Survey Respondents’ Views Toward Community Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Policing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward community policing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bivariate Statistics

Bivariate relationships among the four indicators of well-being, six dimensions of culture, and the controls were assessed using Pearson’s R. Results of this analysis are presented below in Table 4.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BO: Disengagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BO: Exhaustion</td>
<td>.568**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Org Commitment</td>
<td>.614**</td>
<td>.382**</td>
<td>- .219*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervision</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Administration</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Citizens</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Toughness</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Solidarity</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Community Policing</td>
<td>-0.180*</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tenure</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.218*</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Education</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.181*</td>
<td>.222*</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Supervisor (Job)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Race</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Multiple significant correlations exist between the indicators of well-being and dimensions of culture. Of the control variables, only tenure and level of education showed any significant correlation with the independent and dependent variables. The results of the bivariate statistics showed consistent relationships between the four indicators of well-being and the cultural dimensions of administration, supervision, and citizens. The relationships between the cultural dimensions of administration, supervision, and citizens ranged from low to moderate in strength. For example, the cultural dimension of administration showed a strong negative relationship to organizational commitment ($R = -.642$). This finding implies that as negative attitudes of administration increase organizational commitment scores decrease. Other significant relationships existed inconsistently throughout the model. For example, the dimension of community policing was significantly related to well-being indicator of burnout disengagement and none of the others.

**Multivariate Models**

Bivariate relationships, such as those displayed in the correlation matrix, cannot control for the effects of other variables. In order to control or hold the other independent and control variables constant, four OLS regression models were calculated. These four OLS models analyze the predictive strength of the dimensions of culture on each indicator of officer well-being. Four models were created, each with a different indicator of well-being acting as the dependent variable paired with the six dimensions of culture, which act as the independent variables, and the various controls.

It is important to first assess the degree of multicollinearity among the predictor variables in each model. The multicollinearity diagnostic function in SPSS when running
regression models provides details into the status of multicollinearity in the model by producing VIF and Tolerance scores. These scores assess the levels of multicollinearity within the models. Research around appropriate VIF and Tolerance scores varies (Allison, 1999; Fisher & Mason, 1981; O’Brien, 2007; Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). Allison (1999) indicates that tolerances should exceed .4 while VIFs should be less than 2.5. Mertler and Vannatta (2013) indicate that tolerances above .1 and VIFs less than 10 are acceptable. The VIF and tolerance scores for each model run meet the standards set by the research presented above. The lowest tolerance score within the four models was .651. The highest VIF score within the four models was 1.5. These scores and the scores within these ranges meet the criteria to move forward with interpreting results produced by the OLS regression models.

Below, Table 5.1 presents results from the first and second regression models with independent variables of culture regressed on the dependent variables of burnout, exhaustion, and disengagement. The culture dimensions of administration, citizens, and solidarity, and the control of tenure, are significant predictors of disengagement. The relationship between disengagement and negative attitudes toward citizens, upper administration, and solidarity is positive. As negative attitudes toward administration, citizens, and solidarity increase so does disengagement. Tenure was shown to be a significant predictor of burnout disengagement as well. The relationship between tenure and burnout shows that officers with less tenure experience higher levels of disengagement. The findings indicate that officers with less tenure are more likely to feel the negative effects of burnout. The culture dimensions of supervision, toughness, and community policing were found to be insignificant in predicting burnout disengagement.
The controls of race, education and job task as a supervisor were also insignificant. The overall findings from this model indicate that cultural attitudes towards upper administration, citizens, and solidarity significantly predict levels of disengagement among respondents.
Table 5.1  Regression Model: Burnout Disengagement and Exhaustion on the Six Dimensions of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Burnout: Disengagement</th>
<th>Burnout: Exhaustion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized B</td>
<td>Standardized b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.612</td>
<td>13.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor (Job)</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (1= white; 0= other)</td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted $R^2 = .211$  
Adjusted $R^2 = .119$

The second model produces similar results with the cultural dimensions of administration and citizens and tenure being significant predictors of exhaustion among
employees. The relationship is positive, as negative attitudes on the dimension of administration and citizens increase, so does exhaustion. The relationship between tenure and exhaustion is also negative and significant. This indicates that less tenure predicts higher levels of exhaustion. The dimension of solidarity is not a significant predictor of exhaustion, as was the case in the disengagement model. The adjusted $R^2$ is .211 for exhaustion and .119 for disengagement. Overall attitudes towards administration, citizens, and a respondent's tenure are significant predictors of exhaustion among respondents.

Below, Table 5.2 presents models with the independent variables of culture regressed on the dependent variables of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Similar to the burnout models, administration and citizens are significant predictors of job satisfaction among respondents. The relationship between negative attitudes toward administration and job satisfaction is negative. This finding indicates that as negative attitudes toward upper administration and citizens increases, levels of job satisfaction are predicted to decrease. The adjusted $R^2$ for the job satisfaction model is.
Table 5.2  Regression Model: Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on the Six Dimensions of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>28.418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>-0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>-0.624</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor (Job)</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (1= white; 0= other)</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R2 = .136

Adjusted R2= .334
The cultural dimensions of administration and citizens were also found to be significant predictors of organizational commitment as well. This relationship is also negative. As negative attitudes toward upper administration and citizens increase it is predicted that levels of organizational commitment will decrease. The adjusted $R^2$ for the organizational commitment model is .334.

**Summary of Findings**

Overall, the findings indicate that some dimensions of culture do have a significant effect on the various indicators of well-being among police officers. While not all dimensions of culture were found to be significant in their relationship to well-being, the dimensions of administration and citizens were consistently found to be significant predictors of well-being across all statistical models. The significance of these findings and what this means moving forward will be discussed in the following section.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The final chapter discusses the study findings, places the findings in the context of the current literature and discusses avenues for future research. This study sought to analyze the relationship between police culture and officer well-being. While these two concepts have garnered attention separately within the police literature, they have not been analyzed in relation to one another.

Police culture is important. Numerous studies have sought to examine the manifestation of culture and its influence on police officers. Various definitions of police culture have been developed and two camps have emerged from the police culture debate. The mono-cultural perspective posits that cultural attitudes and values are uniform across the entire occupation of law enforcement (Crank, 2004, p.57; Paoline, 2003) because police officers share similar job tasks (e.g., patrol, citizen interaction, report writing, and crime-fighting). The second camp posits a multi-cultural police culture, which recognizes the organizational environment as the driving force for cultural development. The multi-cultural perspective recognizes that organizations differ; these differences are not only across other organizations but also internal (Cochran & Bromely, 2003; Paoline, 2003; Paoline & Terrill, 2005). The present thesis builds on the foundations of the multi-cultural camp and hypothesizes that police culture varies within a single organization, and this variation can produce differences in officer attitudes and values.

The second concept, officer well-being, has also received extensive attention in the police literature. Prior studies of well-being among officers generally focus on
constructs such as job satisfaction, burnout, and organizational commitment, and oftentimes associate these constructs with different predictors of well-being (Johnson, 2012; 2015; McCarty et al., 2019; McCarty & Skogan, 2012). The relationship between culture and well-being has not been given attention in the literature. This thesis explores these questions and opens a new avenue for analyzing culture and officer well-being.

A report by King and Patterson (2020) compared the cultural attitudes of officers in the agency examined in this thesis to the nationally representative sample of officers surveyed by Cordner (2017). Using the same sample for this thesis, they found that officers in this single agency showed significantly more favorable attitudes toward administration, supervision, citizens, toughness, solidarity, and community policing compared to national sample.

Overall, the findings reveal relationships between some elements of culture and aspects of well-being. For the organization studied, the multivariate models indicate culture influences the well-being of police officers. I hypothesized that all six dimensions of culture (administration, supervision, citizens, solidarity, toughness, and community policing) would significantly affect the four indicators of well-being (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, burnout disengagement, and burnout exhaustion). The data analyses support three of the hypotheses the cultural dimensions of administration and citizens were significantly related to all four indicators of well-being. Solidarity was significantly related to disengagement. Most notable is that attitudes toward citizens and upper management both consistently predict well-being. More negative attitudes towards citizens and upper management are associated with more negative scores on the four indicators of well-being. Other dimensions of culture are also significant predictors of
well-being, but less consistently. For example, solidarity (loyalty to other officers) was a significant predictor of disengagement but was not a significant predictor for the other well-being indicators. Relatedly, the control variable of tenure (length of time in law enforcement) was negatively and significantly associated with both disengagement and exhaustion.

Why are these findings important? The conclusion that culture matters when it comes to officer well-being is a topic that has not received attention and opens up other avenues for study. It is well established that culture exists and exercises influence over law enforcement personnel (Ingram et al., 2018; Paoline et al., 2000; Paoline & Terrill, 2005; Terrill et al., 2003). Typical studies on the influence of police culture have looked at common topics such as the use of force, citizen interactions, and other officer behaviors (Paoline & Terrill, 2005; Silver et al., 2017; Terrill et al., 2003). Research has not taken an internal look to see what type of influence culture has on officers themselves. While research on officer behavior is necessary, it is also important to understand what factors influence officers' overall well-being. It is clear that an officer's well-being affects an officer's behavior, their individual health, and the overall health of the organizations in which they serve (Cotton & Hart, 2003). These findings introduce a somewhat cyclical relationship between culture and well-being.

Police culture is developed through the creation of values and norms by officers in their responses to various strains within their work environment (Campeu, 2015; Paoline, 2003; Paoline et al., 2000; Paoline & Terrill, 2005). Tenured officers operate under a police organization's cultural values and norms, and new officers are socialized
into these established norms. The findings in this study indicate that cultural values and norms influence well-being.

Policy Implications

The implications of this study provide opportunities for practical solutions for police organizations moving forward. First, this study measured culture using various dimensions of the concept. The value of using multiple dimensions to measure culture overall is that it allows for police organizations to pinpoint what values are held by their officers and the level of adherence to those values. These findings support the belief that culture is not a single dimensional construct. As seen in the result produced by the multivariate models, certain cultural dimensions are significantly more influential than others. The findings consistently revealed that the dimensions of solidarity, community policing, and toughness had little predictive value, if any, on the indicators of well-being, while the dimensions of administration and citizens showed significant predictive value. Second, examining the relationship between different dimensions of culture on indicators of well-being opens up an opportunity for focused application of the findings to develop solutions that may mitigate the negative consequences on officer well-being. For example, the cultural dimension of administration showed consistent predictive value when it comes to well-being. As negative attitudes of administration increased, well-being scores decreased. Police organizations have the ability to interpret these findings and develop tailored solutions to meet the needs of their officers. If officers feel high levels of negative attitudes toward their administration, solutions aimed at fixing problems surrounding the administration are possible. These solutions may then aid in the overall well-being of police officers within their organizations, which in turn aids in the
ability for officers to carry out their organizational duties successfully. Culture has been shown to be influential in officer behavior. These findings show that culture is also influential in the overall well-being of officers. With that being understood, it would be wise for police organizations to be receptive of how their sworn employees adhere to culture and how that adherence affects overall health.

**Limitations**

A few limitations exist in this study. First, the sample is drawn from a single agency. This singular focus limits the findings' generalizability. This agency represents one jurisdiction in the whole U.S. different agencies with different environments such as urban vs. rural, citizen demographics, and how the organization is run may experience different adherence to cultural attitudes and different levels of well-being. An examination of a single agency does not represent the entirety of all police organizations and the differences they might have both environmentally and structurally. As stated above rural and urban agencies may operate differently based on the populations they serve and the quality of their management and organizational structure. These variations could cause differences in adherences to certain cultural attitudes and well-being. Second, the well-being indicators accurately measure overall well-being but are not exhaustive to the construct. Several other factors could be used to encompass the overall well-being of officers. Another limitation is that this study is cross sectional and limits the ability to capture the dynamic nature of officer’s attitudes or their well-being. Finally, the agency used for this study lacks diversity. Cultural attitudes held by officers who are not white males are limited in this study and future research should seek to incorporate agencies that are diverse. Different perspectives are necessary to fully capture the adherence of
cultural values and their relation to well-being. Diverse representation is valuable when analyzing the adherence to cultural attitudes and well-being. Women officers and officers of color may experience unique stressors in both their occupational and organizational environment that can have influence over their cultural attitudes and well-being. Another limitation to this study occurs in the measurement of the control variable of education. Education is measured as an ordinal level variable. For better analytical strength this variable could be changed into various dummy variables based on education levels and included as a control.

**Future Research**

Future research should seek to apply similar methodology and questions to different organizations to compare the significance of the relationship between culture and well-being. A few interesting concepts could emerge. First, a comparison across several organizations would allow for replication of findings, which could reveal cultural differences and their effects across different organizations. For example, from the perspective that culture differs from organization to organization, a comparison study might reveal that different dimensions of culture predict different well-being indicators. As mentioned above this study is cross sectional, which limits the ability to engage with the casual relationship of culture on well-being. Future research could take a longitudinal approach, measuring officer cultural attitudes and well-being over time. There is also the possibility that consistencies may come about in terms of what dimensions of culture have the most predictive power for well-being. Future research may also measure additional or alternative indicators of well-being such as stress, work-family-conflict, and physical health indicators. Overall, this study offers a push for more research focused on
how culture is adhered to within an organization and how that adherence, in turn, affects well-being.
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APPENDIX

Survey Instrument
OLBI (Demorouti et al. (2003) DE = Disengagement; Ex= Exhaustion

Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree

1 = SD; 2=D; 3= A; 4= SA

I always find new and interesting aspects in my work (DE)

Reverse code of “I always find new interesting aspects in my work (DE)

There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work (Ex)

It happens more and more that I talk about my work in a negative way (DE)

After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better (EX)

I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well (EX)

Reverse code of "I can tolerate the pressure (EX)

Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically Burnout OLBI DE

I find my work to be a positive challenge Burnout OLBI DE

Reverse code of "I find work to be a positive" Burnout OLBI DE

During my work, I often feel emotionally drained Burnout OLBI EX

Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work Burnout OLBI DE

After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities Burnout OLBI EX

Reverse code of "After working" Burnout OLBI EX

Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks Burnout OLBI DE
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary Burnout OLBI EX

This is the only type of work I can imagine myself doing Burnout OLBI DE

Reverse code of "This is the only type of work" Burnout OLBI DE

Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well Burnout OLBI EX

Reverse code of "usually, I can manage" Burnout OLBI EX

I feel more and more engaged in my work Burnout OLBI DE

Reverse code of "I feel more and more engaged" Burnout OLBI DE

When I work, I usually feel energized Burnout OLBI EX

Recode of "When I work, I usually feel energized" Burnout OLBI EX

1 = SD; 2=D; 3= A; 4= SA

I find work stimulating and challenging
Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither, Agree, Strongly Agree
1= SD; 2= D; 3=N; 4= A; 5= SA

I find a sense of worthwhile accomplishment in my work
1= SD; 2= D; 3=N; 4= A; 5= SA

I find opportunities for personal growth and development in my job
1= SD; 2= D; 3=N; 4= A; 5= SA

I enjoy nearly all the things I do on my job very much
1= SD; 2= D; 3=N; 4= A; 5= SA

I like the kind of work I do very much
1= SD; 2= D; 3=N; 4= A; 5= SA
Davis & Smith (1991) Org Commitment

I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to help my org. succeed.

I would turn down another job for more pay in order to stay with this org.

I find that my values and my org. values are very similar.

I am proud to be working for this org.

I feel very little loyalty to this org.

Reverse code "I Feel very little loyalty to this org."

I would take almost any job to keep working for this org.

Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Undecided, Slightly Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree

1= SD; 2= D; 3= SLD; 4= U; 5= SLA; 6= A; 7= SA
Supervisor: Cordner (2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspires me to work to the best of my abilities.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does what is good for the organization, not just for himself/herself.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets a good example for everyone in the organization</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes clear what is expected of employees.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on the errors people make.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids dealing with problems.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives inexperienced people sufficient direction and guidance in doing their work.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages input from employees when important decisions must be made.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions that are fair and consistent across people and situations.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands up for his/her employees with management when they have done nothing wrong.</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats employees with respect</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes when employees are having problems on the job</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to employees’ concerns</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with people to develop their abilities</td>
<td>1= A; 2= O; 3= S; 4= R; 5= N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administration: Cordner (2017)

For minor mistakes, ISP helps troopers with coaching and counseling rather than punishment
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

Officers are treated with respect during formal disciplinary investigations.
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

In this agency, the disciplinary process is fair.
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

Officers who consistently do a poor job are held accountable.
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

More interested in measuring the amount of activity by troopers (e.g. number of tickets or arrests) than the quality of their work.
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

Reverse code “More interested in measuring the amount of activity by troopers than the quality of their work
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

The process for getting promoted is open and fair
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

Employees who consistently do a good job are rewarded
1= SA; 2=A; 3=D; 4=SD

How supportive are you of the direction that top management is taking ISP?
1= Extremely; 2= Very; 3= Moderately; 4= Sup.; 5= Not; 6= Not sure
**Citizens: Cordner (2017)**

Most people respect the police.

The relationship between the police and the people of this district is very good.

Officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens.

Reverse Code of "Officers have a reason to be distrustful of most citizens"

**Toughness: Cordner (2017)**

Some people can only be brought to reason the hard, physical way.

In certain areas, it is more useful for a trooper to be aggressive than to be courteous.

If officers don't show that they are physically tough, they will be seen as weak.

**Solidarity: Cordner (2017)**

Officers need to stick together, because police can't count on anyone else to protect them if they get into trouble.

Loyalty to other officers in the agency should be one of the highest priorities.
What is your view of the community policing approach?

1 = SO; 2 = SWO; 3 = Equal; 4 = SWS; 5 = SS

Strongly support
Somewhat support
Someewhat oppose
Strongly oppose
Equally oppose

Community Policing: Cordner (2017)
**Demographic Characteristics**

Age

Years of Education (Please mark only your highest level of education):

Length of Time in Law Enforcement:  Years

Length of Time in Law Enforcement:  Months

Length of Time as a Supervisor (If applicable):  Years

Length of Time as a Supervisor (If applicable):  Months

Length of Time in another Law Enforcement Agency Years

Length of Time in another Law Enforcement Agency Months

Gender:

Prior Military Experience:

Race:

Race: Biracial or Other

Ethnicity:

Marital Status:

Rank: