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Abstract
Law enforcement agencies employ officers who are driven to serving and protecting their communities. However, officers are not only tasked with serving and protecting, but also with dealing with issues of low morale within their law enforcement agencies. The issue of low morale resulting in high turnover rates, and issues with law enforcement agencies struggling with retention rates, is not new, nor is the issue of low morale within law enforcement agencies. This study emphasizes the relationship between leadership and morale, rather than the common factors of stress, pay, benefits, and hours. The study explored 3 factors among law enforcement agencies: (a) leadership and morale, (b) retention rates, and (c) turnover rates. The researcher surveyed 259 law enforcement officers in South Carolina utilizing a Likert-type survey. The officers who participated in the survey came from 4 various law enforcement agencies in 4 varying geographical locations. These agencies ranged in size from small, medium, and large. The data gathered from the survey population were analyzed using a Spearman rho correlation to measure relationships, as well descriptive statistics to further analyze data. Based on the Spearman rho correlations, a strong relationship existed between leadership and morale ($p < 0.01$), and morale and retention rates ($p < 0.01$). No relationship existed between morale and turnover rates within law enforcement agencies. Based on the results of the study, some implications from the study could include introducing and requiring annual leadership courses, offering surveys to measure agency morale, and acknowledging possible issues regarding low morale.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Morale is important to any organization. As a former law enforcement officer, I often wondered why the morale of law enforcement officers at times appeared to be low. My past experience led me to believe that certain leadership practices were suspect. Research findings indicate the common factors of low morale to be low pay, poor job benefits, and so forth (Gillilan, 2017). Schafer (2009) noted that insufficient leadership results in negative consequences for agencies. The negative consequence for the agency would involve officers leaving the department. More often than not, “people do not leave jobs, they leave managers” (Orrick, 2008, p. 8). In fact, Orrick (2008) found “the number one internal factor affecting an employee’s decision to stay or leave a job is the relationship with their immediate supervisor” (p. 8). Leadership appears to have a relationship with morale, regardless of whether or not the leader sees or understands this. The researcher was interested to understand whether leadership has the potential to improve morale issues within law enforcement agencies.

Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework

The issue of low morale resulting in high turnover rates, and issues with law enforcement agencies struggling with retention rates, is not new, nor is the issue of low morale within law enforcement agencies (Wareham, Smith, & Lambert, 2015). In fact, one study found that out of a total of 56 officers who resigned in a department in Vermont that, “3 of the officers resigned on the basis of disability, 2 resigned on the basis of retirement, 4 officers resigned based on departmental controlled dismissal, and 47 officers resigned based on their decision to do so” (Vermont Criminal Justice Center, 1990, p. 4). Another study found “the total turnover rate was 10.8% in both 2003 and 2008” however, “turnover rates were higher in smaller agencies,
municipal agencies, those in southern regions, and those in rural areas” (Wareham et al., 2015, p. 1). Another agency reported,

54% of Dallas officers were not satisfied with their current jobs with the Dallas Police Department. 80% of members rated their morale as low or the lowest it’s ever been. 87% felt that they did not have the support of police leadership to do an effective job. 78% would not recommend the Dallas Police Department to any potential law enforcement recruit (McCalister, 2016, pp. 3–4).

Figuring out what may lead to morale issues within law enforcement agencies is a current challenge.

Leadership impacting morale among police officers is an issue at the forefront of law enforcement. Mintzberg (2004) has forwarded the idea that effective leadership “inspires more than empowers; it connects more than controls; it demonstrates more than it decides” (p. 143). More often than not, leadership determined how a workshift transpired. For instance, starting a shift with a leader positively, versus negatively, may have a negative relationship regarding the morale of the shift. Creating a leadership environment that is positive and that supports high morale will result in an environment where people feel good at work (Brandi, 2014). Research indicated that when poor leadership was employed within police departments, officers tended to feel “dissatisfied with their job environment” noting the subthemes of “lack of respect, lack of excitement or action, and low pay” (Gillilan, 2017, p. 94). On the contrary, Brandi (2014) found that “when leaders create an environment where people feel good about themselves and the part they play in the organization’s larger mission, people feel good at work” (para. 14). Leadership is the central force in this study relating to morale as it pertains to those who fall under leaderships command.
The context of the present study occurs within the state of South Carolina, where this study sought to gain a better understanding of the relationship between leadership and morale within law enforcement agencies. While studies have been done in other states to better understand the impacts of leadership on morale, the problem has not been extensively studied in South Carolina. Many studies identified low morale, high turnover rates, and low retention rates without a clear examination of leadership (McCalister, 2016; Wareham, et al., 2015; Vermont Criminal Justice Center, 1990). The examination of the relationship between leadership and morale is crucial as it compliments past studies of morale, retention, and turnover rates through the lens of leadership directly influencing morale in a law enforcement context.

Departments find it crucial to not just hire police officers, but to retain the officers for years to come. It is reasonable to think that leadership in law enforcement agencies has a relationship with officers who stay within the departments as well as those who leave. Therefore, the critical importance of understanding leadership from both the viewpoint of the leader and the subordinate is vital to solving issues and circumstances of poor leadership and low morale. This study intended to strategically analyze leadership through the lens of law enforcement officers and their personal reflection on leadership and morale.

**Statement of the Problem**

Law enforcement agencies employ officers who are driven to serving and protecting the communities in which they work. As stated by the South Carolina Department of Public Safety (2019), the mission of police officers is to “protect and serve the public with the highest standard of conduct and professionalism.” Therefore, the leadership within any given law enforcement department should be held accountable for their leadership practices in regards to conduct and professionalism. Fullan and Scott (2009) assert, “Leadership is about motivating people to work
together” (p. 97). Leadership is essential to implementing changes within law enforcement agencies. The issue presented is law enforcement officers are displaying in recent studies low morale, high turnover rates, and low retention rates in law enforcement departments. While low pay and other factors may contribute to low morale, one must take into consideration leadership and its relationship with morale. Understanding leadership’s relationship with morale is essential to implementing changes in regards to retention rates, turnover rates, and leadership styles and practices. Additionally, understanding if leadership can potentially promote higher morale is also important to solving the issue of low morale, low retention rates, and high turnover rates in law enforcement agencies.

The main problem to be addressed within this study is to determine the relationship between leadership within the law enforcement agency and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale. This study and potential outcomes may be used to improve law enforcement officers’ morale and the agency’s morale. Additionally, this study sought to positively impact the law enforcement field as the review seeks to understand the retention rates of law enforcement officers within law enforcement agencies as well as workplace morale. The main purpose of this study was to better understand the relationship between police leaders and officer’s morale and workplace morale. Ultimately, this study intended to research and analyze law enforcement agencies to understand whether a relationship existed between leadership and morale.

The research involved examining whether a relationship existed between leadership and morale, this way the researcher can work to increase law enforcement officer's measured morale, as well as the overall department’s morale. This study sought to accomplish impacting police departments through finding areas of leadership faults and generating suggestions based on the
findings to aid in fixing leadership faults in regards to possible low morale. Overall, the study could further help prepare leaders to lead officers within police departments, through understanding leadership and the relationship between leadership and workplace morale and law enforcement officer’s morale.

**Purpose and Significance of the Study**

The main purpose of this study was to correlate whether a relationship existed between what police leaders do and officer’s morale and workplace morale. The goal of researching, studying, and analyzing this problem was see whether a relationship existed between the three important aspects of: (a) leadership, (b) workplace morale, and (c) law enforcement officer’s morale. Through better understanding the relationship between leadership and morale, this study has the potential to boost morale among law enforcement agencies; increase retention rates, and reduce turnover rates. The significance of the study is to improve the law enforcement officer’s morale and the department’s morale. This study and potential outcomes will benefit not just law enforcement agencies, but also officers and leadership. The study will help departments understand the importance of effective leadership through the lens of transformational servant leadership, and leadership’s relationship with morale. Law enforcement officers will also benefit from this study as they will be able to rate their feelings regarding their leadership and their morale.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of the study led to a research question: To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale? To address the main problem and purpose as described above, two aligned research questions were used to collect and analyze data:
a. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?

b. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Leadership.** Fullan and Scott (2009) define leadership as “motivating people, often diverse people, to work together to get results never before obtained” (p. 97). When strategically defining leadership, it is not defined by an authoritarian style of leadership or an individualized leadership style (Globe, 2004). Instead, when defining leadership, leaders should essentially be “guiding, directing and serving” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2018, para. 1) through “motivating diverse people” to “obtain results never before obtained” (Fullan & Scott, 2009, p. 97).

**Morale.** The confidence, enthusiasm, and discipline of a person or group at a particular time (Oxford Dictionary, 2019). Based on how the officers feel; based on how the agency feels.

**Methodology to Guide the Study**

The methodology to guide the study includes a quantitative survey research design. This design places an emphasis on using extensive research, surveying, and evaluating within the dissertation (Grant & Osanloo, 2014). Groves et al. (2004) defined a survey as a way for gathering information from a population for the purpose of identifying common attributes (Wolf, Joye, Smith, & Fu, 2016, p. 4). Wolf et al. (2016) further explain, “the French word for survey, enquête, is the same term used for a criminal inquiry, which denotes well this systematic quest for information” (p. 4). The methodology that guided the study design involves employing a Likert-scale survey to examine law enforcement leadership and morale. The survey methodology
accompanied the framework to assess the current relationship between leadership and morale and whether the leadership is retaining officers or leading to increased officer turnover rates within police departments.

**Assumptions and Delimitations**

This study assumed that a positive relationship existed between leadership and morale and poor leadership was the reason for low morale within law enforcement agencies. This study also assumed that effective leadership was the reason for higher morale within law enforcement agencies. The study assumed that if the morale was high, then the researcher would notice lower turnover rates. Additionally, if the morale was low, then the study would display higher turnover rates. Subsequently, from the retention perspective, higher retention rates would have been associated with higher morale. Throughout the study, the assumptions involved the salient factor of leadership solely having a relationship with morale, and morale having a relationship with turnover and retention rates among law enforcement officers.

The following description aided in limiting the boundaries and served to focus the scope, or boundaries of this study:

1. Law enforcement agencies were made aware that all published results were merged by size with other law enforcement agencies completing the survey which included one small law enforcement agency in South Carolina, one medium law enforcement agency in South Carolina, and two large law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. No department name was given in the study in order to protect anonymity.

2. This study ensured that individual department names were not published, but instead, a much wider study involving four different and diverse departments, in four varying geological locations across the state of South Carolina, were presented.
Within this study, law enforcement officers from the four agencies in South Carolina remained completely anonymous. Anonymity aided in establishing confidence in the results. The agencies did not have to fear a negative or positive result targeting their department or any of their personnel.

The study used a Likert type survey, ranging in scale from 1–4 (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree). In the survey, officers did not have to give their department name, their personal name, or any shift information. Participants in the study were only asked to choose whether their department was classified as a small, medium, or large agency. The participants’ survey responses were highly valued in evaluating leadership and morale. Law enforcement agencies participating in the study were made aware that the goal of this study was to determine to what extent if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale.

**Summary**

Overall, this study analyzed law enforcement leadership in South Carolina among four selected agencies to evaluate the relationship between leadership and morale. The study was intended to positively impact police departments through understanding the relationship between leadership and morale. This study also positively sought to impact the law enforcement field as the study sought to increase retention rates of law enforcement officer’s within law enforcement agencies and boost morale. The survey design was anonymous, which was essential to obtaining objective data to understand and evaluate the relationship between leadership and morale within law enforcement agencies.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the previous literature and research regarding leadership and morale. Chapter 3 presents the methodology that guided the quantitative study. Chapter 4
presents the data analysis and results of this survey research. Within Chapter 4 of the study, the correlational analysis defined whether a relationship existed between leadership and morale. The final chapter of the study discussed the results of the study as well as future implications for the results.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Today’s law enforcement leaders are the driving force within law enforcement agencies. Leaders in the police force have direct and indirect connection to the overall morale of the law enforcement community. A major issue in law enforcement agencies today is officers who leave their careers in law enforcement due to poor leadership (Orrick, 2008). This often results in low workplace morale with officers leaving departments, and seeking other employment opportunities. Schafer (2009) addressed, “Insufficient leadership in policing can result in significant negative consequences for agencies and their personnel. Despite the importance of effective leadership within police organizations little is known about the process of developing effective leaders and leadership behaviors” (p. 238). Continually, understanding morale and the relationship between leaders and morale must be at the heart of leadership in order for leadership to remain successful.

Throughout the study of leadership, it is clear to see how leadership plays an influential role on whether or not a person decides to leave or stay at a job. More often than not, “people do not leave jobs, they leave managers” (Orrick, 2008, p. 8). Orrick (2008) found “the number one internal factor affecting an employee’s decision to stay or leave a job is the relationship with their immediate supervisor” (p. 8). In other words, Orrick understood the importance of leadership and its connection to both retention rates and turnover rates. In the study of leadership, one must examine the relationship between leadership and morale, and how morale often determines if an individual decides to leave or stay within a law enforcement agency. Therefore, the main problem to be understood within this study was to determine to what extent if any does a relationship exist between leadership within the law enforcement agency and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale. This study and potential
outcomes were used to improve and positively correlate law enforcement officer’s morale and law the agency's morale.

**Conceptual-Theoretical Framework**

The conceptual framework, which fits the present study of determining the relationship between leadership and morale, is like a “blueprint of a house” (Grant & Osanloo, 2014). A conceptual-theoretical-framework may be described as the “importance of theory-driven thinking and acting . . . emphasized in relation to the selection of a topic, the development of research questions, the conceptualization of the literature review, the design approach, and the analysis plan for the dissertation study” (Grant & Osanloo, 2014, p. 12). According to Ravitch and Riggan (2012), “a conceptual framework is an argument about why the topic one wishes to study matters, and why the means proposed to study it are appropriate and rigorous” (p. 7). In alignment with Ravitch and Riggan’s (2012) approach, the researcher in this study argues that leadership needs to be examined, understood, and researched more thoroughly in order to understand its relationship with morale. The Globe (2004) study describe a plethora of various leadership styles and when to use the certain styles; however, very little research indicates how leadership is connected to morale especially in the field of law enforcement.

Figure 1 represents the state of the conceptual-theoretical-framework. In the figure, effective leadership practices lead to higher morale, low turnover rates, and high retention rates. In the diagram, effective leadership results in low turnover rates and high retention rates. Contrary to effective leadership is the category of poor leadership. Poor leadership is a reflection of a leadership that does not retain employees, resulting in high turnover rates and low morale (Greenleaf, 1970; Orrick, 2008).
Effective Leadership

Leadership is one of the most important aspects to understand within this study. Leadership is a complicated term with a multi-faceted definition due to a diversity of leadership styles, and while some styles may reflect poor leadership, other leadership styles may reflect effective leadership. Additionally, as is with any dynamic process, what works for one department or leader may not work for another. Fullan and Scott (2009) asserted, “Leadership is about motivating people, diverse people, to work together to get results never before obtained” (p. 97). As presented within the Globe Study (2004), it analyzed periodically the best leadership practices being implemented worldwide. The most common leadership practices found by the global study included the “charismatic/value-based leadership, team-oriented leadership,
humane-oriented leadership, autonomous leadership, and self-protective leadership” (Globe, 2004, para. 5).

Within the charismatic and value-based leadership, a profound leadership style emerged defined as “visionary, inspirational, self-sacrificial, integrity, decisive and performance oriented” (Globe, 2004, para. 5). In the team-oriented leadership style, the leadership qualities are defined as being “collaborative in team orientation, being a team integrator, being diplomatic and administratively competent” (Globe, 2004, para. 5). Additionally, the participative leadership style is a “participative and autocratic” leadership approach (Globe, 2004, para. 5). The humane-oriented leadership is a style of leadership that leads with “modesty and humane orientation” (Globe, 2004, para. 5). The Globe (2004) study further addressed how the autonomous leadership style “referred to independent and individualistic leadership attributes” (para. 5). The final leadership style addressed by the global study involved the leadership style of self-protective leadership, which described a leader who is “self-centered, status conscious, conflict inducer, face saver, and procedural” (Globe, 2004, para. 5). In the general context, the leadership styles presented within the globe study displayed the wide variety of leadership styles utilized by leaders. When reviewing and analyzing the Globe (2004) study, leadership can be described as a leadership style that is brought about by a leader’s preference. Leadership styles can influence not just the leader who is giving the direction and authority, but also those under the leader who follow the leader’s commands. Leaders must know how to effectively lead and use the appropriate leadership style when necessary.

When comparing the Globe (2004) study to that of a more recent leadership study, it is clear how leadership approaches vary drastically, especially in regard to morale. Goleman (2017) thoroughly examined and explained the coercive style of leadership, the authoritative style of
leadership, the affiliative style of leadership, the democratic style of leadership, the pacesetting style, and the coaching style. The coercive style involved a “do what I say approach and can be very effective in a turnaround situation, a natural disaster, or when working with problem employees” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3) Additionally, Goleman (2017) discussed the authoritative style of leadership in which a leader takes a “come with me approach. In this approach, the leader states the overall goal but gives people the freedom to choose their own means of achieving it” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3). In the affiliative leadership style, the leader has a “people come first attitude” and discusses that “this style of leadership is particularly useful for building team harmony or increasing morale” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3). Additionally, the democratic style gave “employees a voice” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3). The next leadership style discussed by Goleman (2017) involved the pacesetting style in which a leader “sets high performance standards and exemplifies them” (p. 3). The final leadership style analyzed by Goleman (2017) was the coaching style, which emphasized personal development (Goleman, 2017, p. 3).

Through understanding the various styles of leadership it was clear to understand that if morale is low, then a new direction of leadership is needed within law enforcement agencies.

As derived from the findings of the Globe (2004) study, and the leadership styles analyzed by Goleman (2017), this study examined leadership’s relationship with morale. Lee, Scheunemann, Hall, and Payne (2012) understood the significance of staff morale being correlated to how staff feel about the organization (p. 9). Orrick (2008) found people being promoted to a supervisor position while not obtaining training on effective leadership. Therefore, the new supervisors treated their subordinates as the previous supervisors did. (p. 8). Sarver and Miller (2014) found the common practice for leading others involved the authoritarian style of leadership, but they noted that in recent years the authoritarian style of leadership has steadily
declined (p. 127). Due to the decline of the authoritarian leadership style, Sarver and Miller (2014) began to see a shift in leadership (Sarver & Miller, 2014, p. 127).

**Poor Leadership**

When analyzing and critiquing the leadership within the police department, the study continually examined the law enforcement agency, in order to fully understand the relationship between leadership and morale. The current study suggested through research that low morale can be improved through understanding the relationship between leadership and morale. This study solely examined the relationship between leadership and morale, rather than taking an emphasis on factors such as low pay, poor benefits, shift hours, and so forth. The studies of Schafer (2009), Milton (2011), Turner (1997), Barker (2017), Globe (2004), and Cote (2017), all sought to understand the importance of effective leadership and its importance to organizations.

Within this study, effective leadership is defined as having high morale and retention rates. Greenleaf (1970) reminded us that unlike traditional leadership which exercises power and authority over others, a leader should be more concerned with the growth, well-being, and the needs of others (para. 2–4). In other words, leadership is more about having concern for others, rather than exercising power and authority over others as is seen in the preferred leadership styles listed by both the Globe (2004) study and Goleman (2017). Through strategically analyzing leadership within police departments, this study sought to define and understand leadership throughout law enforcement agencies to successfully ensure that officers were being retained within the department and have a high morale. This study seeks to address the problem of low law enforcement morale and workplace morale based on leadership.
Review of the Research and Methodological Literature

The purpose of this section is to display a deeper understanding of leadership and the connection leadership can have on not only the law enforcement officer’s morale, but also the department’s moral. Both the conceptual-theoretical framework as well as the research consistently displayed a need to better understand the relationship between leadership and morale among law enforcement agencies. Effective leadership is about leadership that seeks to maintain high morale and officers, rather than lead to low morale and high turnover rates. The study sought to further understand how leadership related to morale; therefore, the researcher outlined defining leadership, the common leadership styles, servant leadership, leadership’s relationship with workplace morale, and law enforcement officer’s morale.

Defining Leadership

Leadership is a broad term to define due to a variety of different styles and types of leadership. Leadership is especially difficult to define when the terminology is applied within law enforcement agencies and to law enforcement officers. Leadership in law enforcement agencies often involves a hierarchy of leadership and a chain of command. Typically at the top of the command would be the Chief of Police, then the Captains, Lieutenants, Sergeants and Corporals. Within law enforcement agencies, there are a plurality of leadership positions that all have different responsibilities within the agency.

However, in defining leadership’s role it is essential to understand the root of leadership through its terminology. Within the word leadership, the words “lead” and “leader” emerge. In defining the terminology of lead, it is clear when a person leads they are essentially “guiding, directing, and serving” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2018). The root word within leadership is “leader;” this word has the connotation that a person will “lead and direct” others. (Merriam-
Webster Dictionary, 2018). Fullan and Scott (2009) derived a similar definition to the term of leadership as they asserted, “Leadership is about motivating people, diverse people, to work together to get results never before obtained” (p. 97). In order to create an atmosphere in which police officers are “motivated to work together and to get results never before obtained” then, leadership needs to be focused on high morale and high retention rates among subordinates (Fullan & Scott, 2009, p. 97). Leadership needs to set the standard of what it was defined to be, which is to “lead, direct, guide, and serve” in order to “motivate” and “get results never before obtained” (Merriam-Webster, 2018; Fullan & Scott, 2009, p. 97).

When defining and making leadership clear, one cannot assume that a hierarchy of leadership means good leadership. Effective leadership is not defined by how well it is organized within an organization or agency, but rather defined by leadership’s relationship with its subordinates. When leadership is strategically defined, as seen through Fullan and Scott (2009), it is not defined singularly by an authoritarian style of leadership or even an individualized or situational leadership style. Instead, research has found that leadership should strive to become more like “transformational leaders that focus their energies on vision, long-term goals, aligning and changing systems, and developing and training others” (Khan, Nawaz, & Khan, 2016, p. 6).

Leadership Styles

Following defining leadership, this section placed an emphasis on understanding the various leadership styles that exist. Many leadership styles exist to show how each leader is unique in their leading style (Globe, 2004; Goleman, 2017; Greenleaf, 1970). Because every individual is different, so is every leadership style. However, leadership style and approach can also vary based on organization and situation. Derived from the findings of the Globe (2004) study and the leadership styles of Goleman (2017), this study examined and analyzed common
leadership styles, including (a) charismatic/value-based leadership, (b) team-oriented leadership, (c) participative leadership, (d) humane-oriented leadership, (e) autonomous leadership, (f) self-protective leadership, (g) coercive leadership, (h) authoritative leadership, (i) affiliative leadership, (j) democratic leadership, (k) the pacesetting style, and (l) the coaching style.

The charismatic and value-based leadership style is defined as being “visionary, inspirational, self-sacrificial, integrity, decisive and performance oriented” (Globe, 2004). Within the team-oriented leadership style, the leadership qualities involved being “collaborative in team orientation, being a team integrator, being diplomatic and administratively competent” (Globe, 2004). Additionally, the participative leadership style involved both a “participative and autocratic” leadership approach (Globe, 2004). The humane-oriented leadership is a style of leadership that leads with “modesty and humane orientation” (Globe, 2004). In addition, the Globe (2004) study addressed the autonomous leadership style “referred to independent and individualistic leadership attributes.” The final leadership style addressed within the globe study involved the leadership style of self-protective leadership. Self-protective leadership described leaders who are “self-centered, status conscious, conflict inducer, face saver, and procedural” (Globe, 2004). The leadership styles presented within the global society displayed the wide variety of leadership styles utilized by leaders. While all of these styles of leadership vary drastically from one style to the next, these leadership styles display the complexity of leadership.

To add to the complexity of leadership styles that exist, Goleman (2017) also thoroughly examined and explained six additional leadership styles that exist. These leadership styles included the coercive style of leadership, the authoritative style of leadership, the affiliative style of leadership, the democratic style of leadership, the pacesetting style, and the coaching style of
leadership (Goleman, 2017). The coercive style involved a “do what I say approach” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3). Goleman (2017) also discussed the authoritative style in which a leader took a “come with me approach” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3). In the affiliative style of leadership, the leader had a “people comes first attitude” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3). Furthermore, “the democratic style gave the employees a voice” (Goleman, 2017, p. 3). The pacesetting style discussed by Goleman (2017) understood that leaders should “set high performance standards and exemplify them” (p. 3). The final leadership style discussed by Goleman (2017) was the coaching style which “focused more on personal development than on immediate work-related tasks” (p. 3).

In relation to the various leadership styles, Farrell (2011) discussed the top traits of a good leader including being: “honest, focused, passionate, respectful, having persuasion abilities, confident, clarifying, caring, having integrity, compassionate, sharing visions and actions, engaging, celebrating, having humility, empowering, collaborating, communicating, being fearless, being genuine, having self-awareness, leveraging team strengths, leadership transitions, and supportive” (p. 1). Wheatcroft (2015) also stressed the importance of a leader who “walks the walk” in which they do what they say they are going to do and not just talk about “change” or the “future.” Wheatcroft recognized “transformational leaders rely on such characteristics as charisma, inspiration, individual consideration and encouraging intellectual growth” (p. 1). Wheatcroft further explained the “leadership challenge model” which discussed the five key principles of leadership which included the categories of “modeling the way; inspiring a shared vision; challenging the process by which the leader seizes the initiative and making improvements in the organization with the active participation of followers; enabling others to act; and encouraging the heart” (Wheatcroft, 2015, p. 1). Milton (2011) also found the
“transformational/value based leadership” to be one of the “most effective” in regard to “effective leadership styles” (p. 82).

**Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership was more than just a leadership style; instead, it “empowers followers and brings about positive changes in the lives of the followers” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 11). Transformational leadership is known to “motivate the followers to pursue higher goals” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 11). When transformational leadership is understood, it is evident this model motivates to inspire positive and productive work. Bass and Riggio (2006) reminded leaders that “transformational leaders motivate and inspire those around them by valuing work . . . and challenging staff to achieve more” (p. 17). Additionally, Fullan (2011) confirmed “the effective change leader actively participates as learners in helping the organization improve” (p. 5). Gozubenli (2010) addressed, “Transformational leadership changes the basic values, beliefs, and awareness of followers, thus raising their consciousness regarding the importance of specific and idealized goals, addressing their higher-level self-actualization needs, and transcending their self-interests for the good of the organization” (p. 15).

Cote (2017) descriptively discussed the importance of transformational leadership. Within Lubin’s (2001) study, the important identified leader characteristics that emerged involved having “awareness of others” and “foresight” as well as being “observant, listening and seeing ahead to the bigger picture” (Lubin, 2001, p. 97). Additionally, Lubin (2001) noted the importance of leaders understanding and displaying the qualities of “stewardship and healing” as well as “making decisions based on long term interests, values and being reflective” (p. 97). Lubin (2001) discussed leaders having a “commitment to other’s growth, building community, and empathy” as well as “dialogue and relationships” (Lubin, 2001, p. 97). Furthermore, Lubin
(2001) discussed the importance of “persuasion and knowing the facts, conceptualization and listening” and being “collaborative, developing relationships, and giving feedback” (Lubin, 2001, p. 97). When analyzing what exactly makes leadership effective, research continually pointed to the transformational leader who is willing to seek out change for the betterment of the organization or position in which the leader serves.

In investigating transformational leadership, research continually reminds us “positive leadership affirms human potential” (Brandi, 2014, para. 6). “Positive leadership doesn’t ignore negativity” instead it placed an emphasis on the fact that “positive leadership builds on negativity to create new positive outcomes. It sees negativity as opportunity and fuel for change” (Brandi, 2014, para. 10–11). Effective and meaningful leadership required transformational leadership (Boateng, 2014). In a study by Boateng (2014), the study concluded that “administrators perceived themselves to have transformational leadership characteristics” (p. 104). Burba (2017) research found that there is a need for transformational leadership, as the author recognized “as leaders of our individual agencies, the challenge begins and ends with us. It is we who must model not only for those we directly lead, but to compound the value and power of our roles and responsibilities to bring agencies closer together, and then closer still alongside our campus and community colleagues, partners, and fellow stakeholders” (Burba, 2017, p. 1). A newspaper article titled, “The Latest” (2015), discussed the need for effective leadership (p. 1). The article recognized “the need for trust between law enforcement and the community, and effective leadership instilled trust” (The Latest, 2015, p. 2).

In order to effectively lead, research consistently agreed that transformational leadership is the way, as it empowers and motivates leaders to lead in a new and profound way. Transformational leadership could be the leadership style that most resembles effective
leadership as this leadership style seeks to “motivate and inspire” their subordinates through understanding their “values, beliefs, goals, and needs” and through continually “understanding the importance of being an active learner” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 17; Fullan, 2011, p. 5; Gozubenli, 2010, p.15; Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 11). Overall, transformational leadership has the potential to increase morale among law enforcement officers.

**Servant Leadership**

Through research, servant leadership has the potential to shift the entire pedagogy and known hierarchy of leadership with police departments as it calls leaders to become servants. The leadership style of servant leadership often coincides with transformational leadership, as the servant leadership style can also empower leaders and subordinates within a work environment. Servant leadership is a style of leadership that is defined as a leader who “listens intently, understands the needs of followers, and are able to empathize with followers in order to connect well with them” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 10). In a leadership questionnaire administered to police managers by Vito, Suresh, and Richards (2011), “Item analysis revealed . . . police managers believe leaders should follow the tenets of servant leadership” (p. 674).

Additionally, servant leadership may reduce the risk of corruption within an agency. A quantitative study found a “relationship between servant leadership and leader immunity to corruption expressed as corruption propensity. The results of the study confirm that a statistically significant relationship existed between followers’ perceptions . . . and servant leadership behaviors” (Muriuki, 2017, iii).

Muthia and Krishnan (2015) discussed the importance of servant leadership and transformational leadership as they both coincided and work together. According to Muthia and Krishnan (2015), “Servant leadership and transformational leadership emphasize showing
concern towards followers. These leadership styles would help in building a bond of trust between the leader and the followers” (p. 10). However, finding servant leaders within police departments is not just a task that can be immediately completed, as Schafer (2009) agreed that leaders need training to become effective leaders. Goleman (2017) claimed that “new research suggests that the most effective executives use a collection of distinct leadership styles—each in the right measure, at just the right time. Such flexibility is tough to put into action, but it pays off in performance. And better yet, it can be learned” (p. 4).

Leadership’s Relationship With Workplace Morale

A qualitative case study administered by McCalister (2016) found through interviewing Detroit police officers the common themes of

(1) the constant changing of chiefs of police/effective chiefs of police (2) racism (3) reduction of pensions and loss of health care benefits, (4) budget, (5) working conditions and resources, (6) negative public perceptions stemming from the recent police brutality incidents, and (7) leadership styles that maintain and encourage high morale. (McCalister, 2016, p. ii)

McCalister (2016) referenced the investigation of a journalist who reported in 2014 to the Dallas Morning News stating, “54% of Dallas officers were not satisfied with their current jobs with the Dallas Police Department. 80% of members rated their morale as low or the lowest it’s ever been” (McCalister, 2016, pp. 3–4). McCalister (2016) displayed the issue of low morale among law enforcement officers throughout the methodical literature.

Orrick (2008) further discussed the importance of “recruiting sufficient numbers of qualified applicants to meet the staffing needs of an agency was the most fundamental human resource process in a police department. The success of the department’s recruitment efforts
impacted every other function in the agency” (Orrick, 2008, p. 1). If law enforcement agencies were not recruiting qualified personnel and leaders, then this could impact morale especially since recruitment efforts impact every function of a law enforcement agency (Orrick, 2008). The research often indicated that internal factors influenced workplace morale, reduced the number of officers retained, and influenced the recruitment of officers. Internal factors that correlated workplace morale included that of “poor salary, poor supervisors and leadership, poor job fit, higher ordered needs, role conflict, dysfunctional organizational cultures, generational differences, lack of career growth/better opportunities, inadequate feedback, inadequate recognition, inadequate training, and equipment” (Orrick, 2008). Espiritu (2017) noted,

While having a diverse workforce cannot ensure fair and effective policing, the benefits outweighed the challenges of not striving for one. Having a comprehensive recruitment and retention plan that promotes and supports diversity is a safe path for the law enforcement future and is a crucial ingredient for building trust and legitimacy in the community. (p. 12)

In a mixed methods case study by Weaver (2017), the study employed an “instrumental single-bounded case approach to explore how a policing executive developed and sustained an ethically performing organization. Weaver (2017) noted that Theodore Roosevelt is credited for the quote, “No one cares how much you know until they know how much you care.” Weaver (2017) found “organizational success is often a function of the relative effectiveness of its communication and is, therefore, important to incorporate into the contextual discussion” (p. 176). In order to fully correlate workplace morale with effective and ineffective leadership, it is important to first come to the understanding of what makes leadership ineffective and effective.
In the relation to workplace morale, ineffective leadership would result in lower workplace morale, while effective leadership would result in higher workplace morale.

One of the main complaints for high turnover rates in police departments was indeed poor leadership (Orrick, 2008). The importance to addressing leadership within police departments is essential to forming better police departments and creating higher retention rates of good officers that want to serve and protect the communities in which they work. Understanding transformational leadership and other leadership styles that can transform police departments to boost morale and create happier employees is of the utmost importance. Hrenchir (2016) discussed the issue of poor leadership and low workplace morale within police departments. In a longitudinal study, the study suggested “to achieve innovation in work groups, certain social and interactional processes were required. It was proposed that the psychological conditions for innovation were met when a group had a transformational leader, high morale, and a positive team leader” (Wilson, Hartel, & Neale, 2001, p. 322). “Innovative performance must focus on leadership and group processes” (Wilson et al., 2001, p. 322). Additionally, the study found positive relationships emerged between transformational leadership, morale, team climate for innovation, and innovation (Wilson et al., 2001). Therefore, Wilson et al. (2001) were stressing the importance of a team climate to boost workplace morale.

McGriff (2018) gave a qualitative exploration of the influence of both ineffective and effective leadership, and communication on employee turnover within agencies. The study found leadership strongly influenced communication and employee turnover rates (McGriff, 2018). Ineffective leadership resulted in higher turnover rates, and effective leadership reduced turnover rates within organizations (McGriff, 2018). The research of workplace morale pointed to the common understanding that “when leaders create an environment where people feel good about
themselves and the part they play in the organization’s larger mission, people feel good at work. Many will feel happy. Happy people focused on creating great customer experiences are the very best competitive advantage you have in the marketplace” (Brandi, 2014, para. 14). The transformation of creating a form of leadership that is continually encouraging and uplifting can prove to be immensely effective in boosting workplace morale.

**Law Enforcement Officer’s Morale**

Johnson (2015) understood that “Many officers have said that morale was low in their departments, explaining that it has been this way for years. However, declining morale is not something that generally occurs overnight. Oftentimes, morale simply slips away. We all get caught up in the mundane, day-to-day tasks associated with work, and we tend to forget about the human component. It becomes each man and woman for his or her self” (para. 4). Lee, Scheunemann, Hall, and Payne (2012) further define “staff burnout as a condition of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with people in some capacity (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996, p. 4)” (p. 4). A study by Millett (2010) listed six reasons why high staff morale was important. These reasons included improved productivity, improved performance and creativity, reduced number of days taken for leave, higher attention to detail, a safer workplace, and an increased quality of work (Lee, Scheunemann, Hall, & Payne, 2012, p. 9). Johnson (2015) and Millet (2010) agree that morale is important to any organization. However, there are many factors when it pertains to low morale.

As discussed by Gillilan (2017) “law enforcement officers are the most observed members within the criminal justice system due to their status of first responders” (p. 13). Gillilan (2017) found common themes among police officers in a recent study. “The themes of
the survey that emerged included campus police officers were: dissatisfied with their job environment, lack of respect, lack of excitement or action, low pay, disrespect, feelings of illegitimacy, and decreased morale” (Gillilan, 2017). Gillilan’s (2017) survey also narrowed down the causes of disrespect such as police officers having “less authority and inferiority.” Within the study of Gillilan (2017), the study noted that in order “to fix these issues, officers suggested that the four themes identified based on participant responses to interview questions were non-police assignments should be given to other personnel, advanced training and community training, increase in pay and benefits, and to be identified as police officers instead of security” (Gillilan, 2017, pp. 114–115). A systematic review by Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, and Bennett (2014), found “community-oriented policing strategies have positive effects on citizen satisfaction, perceptions of disorder, and police legitimacy, but limited effects on crime and fear of crime” (p. 1).

Moore (2016) also recognized,

“No matter how much a law enforcement officer works to be fair and do his or her job with honor and distinction, there’s someone out there ready to paint every cop with the broad brush of public condemnation. Sadly, they’re doing a good job of it. And that constant rhetoric would degrade anyone’s attitude” (Moore, 2016, p. 38).

In a research study by Russell, Cole, and Jones (2014), the results from the research study suggested the behaviors of task focused coping was related to transformational leadership in law enforcement (p. 11). The study found task-focused coping was positively correlated with transformational leader behaviors, as was personal accomplishment (Russell, Cole, & Jones, 2014, p. 11). On the contrary, emotional exhaustion, stress, and emotional focused coping were negatively associated with leader behavior (Russell et al., 2014, p. 11). Emotion-focused coping
and avoidance coping were correlated, and both were correlated with emotional exhaustion (Russell et al., 2014, p. 11). These forms of emotion-focused coping were correlated with the dimensions of burnout (Russell et al., 2014, p. 11). Avoidance coping was also related to the “emotional exhaustion dimension of burnout” (Russell et al., 2014, p. 11).

As research suggests, leadership has impacted the law enforcement officer’s morale; and while morale is low, there are many ways in which low morale can be fixed, especially by leadership. Primarily, Gaul (2017) suggested giving feedback that does not leave room for question because if not, “individuals are confused, high potential employees end up leaving the organization and poor performers go even further downhill” (para. 1). Additionally, Moore (2016) recommended that in order to boost law enforcement officer’s morale, the leadership should “reduce paperwork, encourage more—not less—use of officer discretion, take a look at shifts, examine supervisory staff and reward good behavior.” Ultimately, a form of leadership that understands those who follow them and seeks to increase morale and retention rates among law enforcement agencies is of the utmost importance.

**Review of Methodological Issues**

This section on methodological issues places an emphasis on discussing the study’s instrumentation, validity, reliability, and ethics. Methodological issues refer to the “issues found in the literatures that allow a researcher to understand in a critical way the various methodologies and methods that are being used in the field to investigate a research problem” (Concordia University, 2018b, p. 8). The methodologies presented through research on the topic of leadership and morale, often place emphasis on utilizing surveys to generate statistical data. The common frameworks vary from empirical to theoretical to personal interest. Generally, the reason for any research subject stems from personal interest to study the topic at hand.
Primarily, Milton (2011) utilized a research survey to “study educators’ perceptions of effective/ineffective leadership attributes/behaviors in culturally diverse public and private schools and to determine if these perceptions are culturally contingent” (p. 11). The empirical study presented by Milton (2011) was well supported as the framework focused on examining leadership, and what makes leadership effective in education. The only issue within this study was that it did not seek out an answer to ineffective leadership and how to fix the issue of ineffective leadership within school cultures. In 2016, McCalister completed a qualitative case study and narrative regarding the Detroit Police Department. This qualitative case study analyzed interview data of officers at the Detroit Police Department. McCalister (2016) found from the interviews the common themes causing issues within the department. McCalister (2016) found from the interviews the common themes causing issues within the department included that of “(1) the constant changing of chiefs of police/effective chiefs of police (2) racism (3) reduction of pensions and loss of health care benefits, (4) budget, (5) working conditions and resources, (6) negative public perceptions stemming from the recent police brutality incidents, and (7) leadership styles that maintain and encourage high morale” (McCalister, 2016, p. ii).

McCalister (2016) utilized survey interviews to discuss personally with officers the common themes affecting officer morale. The personal interviews allowed McCalister (2016) to note a pattern in low-morale and to document the common themes that emerged from the interviews.

Muthia and Krishnan (2015) followed a theoretical framework within a journal study as they examined the characteristics of transformational leadership in regard to servant leadership. In the study, Muthia and Krishnan utilized qualitative research and content analysis to form theories on servant leadership and transformational leadership. One theoretical application
asserted stated that “servant leaders have to listen intently, to understand the needs of followers, and they should be able to empathize with followers in order to connect well with them” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 10). Additionally, Muthia and Krishnan (2015) asserted that “transformational leadership empowered followers and brought about a positive change in the lives of the followers. The empowerment and positive climate enhanced by transformational leadership would motivate the followers to pursue higher goals” (p. 11). Each statement and theory within this journal regarding transformational and servant leadership was supported by research analysis and relevant evidence. Additionally, in another study, Wheatcroft (2015) utilized a theoretical framework to discuss the qualities of transformational leaders within police departments.

In the empirical and practical study by Russell et al. (2014), the researchers used a survey that analyzed “the relationship between transformational leadership and the three dimensions of burnout (i.e., emotional, exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) in the high-risk occupation of law enforcement. Furthermore, they explored how stress and coping individually as well as interactively moderate this relationship” (Russell et al., 2014, p. 1). The results from the survey taken within this research study aligned the importance of a transformational leader (Russell et al., 2014, p. 11). As “task-focused coping is positively correlated with transformational leader behaviors, as is personal accomplishment” (Russell et al., 2014, p. 11). The empirical and practical study allowed for Russell, Cole and Jones to effectively measure burnout among law enforcement officers. Additionally, Barker (2017) used a theoretical and practical framework to strategically support the research methods. The research methods by Barker (2017) were well supported through survey questionnaires and organizing the research into the categories of servant leadership and the measurements of servant leadership in the
The hypothesis of having correlations to the extent of demonstrating humility to servant leadership, and the extent of the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) measuring humility in police managers for promotions was strategic. These variables analyzed by Barker (2017) had positive correlations when applied in a research study and survey.

Marquez, Ramon, and Livingston (2015) used progressive action research and a series of meetings to create a working synthesis project framework to help build relationships between law enforcement leadership and line workers. This study was well supported through collaborative inquiry and action research; however, the research did not present statistical data. Therefore, the study would have been stronger had Marquez et al. (2015) displayed data to indicate how police officers responded to their leaders and their kind, compassionate, considerate, respectful, and supportive gestures. Edwards (2017) performed a study to see how educational degree obtainment among officers was valued. However, the study did display the percentage of leadership that was educated with a post-secondary degree. While the study does utilize descriptive statistics, independent samples $t$ tests, variance tests, and Spearman rho coefficients, the study did not provide a breakdown of the sample based on the level of postsecondary degree attainment. In the study we do not know if officers with degrees are paid more in salary or if officers with degrees are paid the same as those without degrees.

Another study performed by Downing (2015) placed an emphasis on narrative writing accompanied by research to present the importance of rewarding all for things achieved. However, the study did not include any data to support the claims being made. In the study by the International Association of Police Chiefs (1999), the data is presented on the basis of personal experience in regard to what they believed as effective police leadership. This article was well organized, but again would have had a stronger argument had the claims been
supported with more research and data. Weaver (2017) presented a mix methods case study in a survey format to understand policing power and trust. The survey format helped Weaver (2017) present data by an anonymous survey in which ranking officers gathered and imputed data. Muriuki (2017) utilized extensive research to form statistical data. This proved to be beneficial with supporting claims with evidence; however, Muriuki (2017) only had a limited number of sources. More sources could have made the argument stronger.

McGriff (2018) utilized surveys and interviews to study the influence of both ineffective and effective leadership and lack of communication, and the influence those leaders have on employee turnover. This study was very strong as the surveys and interviews helped to conclude McGriff’s (2018) argument that leadership influenced employee turnover. Boateng (2014) also utilized survey questionnaires to understand why finding a transformational leader is so difficult. Brandi (2014) presented a narrative format to discuss the importance of leadership and positive leadership. Qualitative analysis and content analysis was utilized to support the theoretical frameworks of “leadership” within the studies of Cote (2017), Gaul (2017), Johnson (2015), Farrell (2011), Moore (2016), and Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2013). Contrary to the qualitative and content analysis methodology is that of Goleman (2017), which utilized both qualitative and quantitative data within the study. Goleman (2017) strategically used research to form a theory that “new research suggests that the most effective executives use a collection of distinct leadership styles—each in the right measure, at just the right time. Such flexibility is tough to put into action, but it pays off in performance. And better yet, it can be learned” (Goleman, 2017, p. 4). Therefore, Goleman (2017) strategically used research, organized research, and inferred theories based on research within the study.
Espiritu (2017) utilized a wide variety of research methodologies to measure the importance of diversity in regard to community morale, and trust of law enforcement officers and officials. Within the study, Espiritu (2017) used qualitative research combined with qualitative data, quantitative studies, content analysis, and personal interest to create a theoretical framework. Gillilan (2017) used a qualitative multiple case study design to understand job dissatisfaction and retention. In this study, the study utilized qualitative analysis, content analysis and surveys with open ended questions to develop data that was relevant and well presented. Generally, the claims were well supported as the goal of the survey was to find why officers were dissatisfied and the reason behind the low retention rates of officers. Hrenchir (2016) organized a journal on morale and leadership through taking an emphasis on a narrative methodology and focusing on specifically qualitative data. However, the weakness to only using qualitative data was there was no statistical data or qualitative analysis to back up the claims being presented within the study.

The Globe Project (2004) was another well-organized study that involved defining the most commonly used leadership styles around the world. This extensive study utilized various research methodologies to formulate the study and to support argumentative proses for claims and theories regarding leadership styles. The Globe (2004) project used qualitative and quantitative research methods, as well as numerical and statistical data. Additionally, Telep and Weisburd (2014) formulated a case study to bring forth an understanding of the National Policing Improvement Agency. Telep and Weisburd (2014) used qualitative and quantitative data to better understand the agency and its funding practices. While the qualitative data within this study was well organized, the study lacked quantitative data to support where funding goes and
why the funding goes to the areas in which it was given. Quantitative and qualitative data would have made this case study stronger and more argumentative.

Furthermore, Schafer (2009) presented a strong study as it utilized both qualitative and quantitative data as well as open ended surveys to understand how to develop effective leadership in policing. Additionally, Vito et al. (2011) utilized a questionnaire and qualitative research that examined leadership and what leaders in law enforcement believed in regard to leadership. This practical framework correlated the questionnaire to strategically align with the leadership theories of Vito et al. (2011). Orrick (2008) performed a study based on personal interest to understand the recruitment, retention, and turnover of law enforcement personnel. Orrick (2008) utilized both qualitative and quantitative data to support personal experience in order to create a strong argument regarding the importance of leadership to retain and recruit officers.

While there are a large set of studies within the methodological review, it is evident that different studies yielded results from a variety of platforms. While some studies placed an emphasis on interviews, other studies placed an emphasis on surveying, numerical statistics, qualitative research and so forth. Within the various research frameworks, it is clear to see the importance of utilizing extensive research to support any claims and theories within one’s study. Surveys and questionnaires proved to be immensely effective within each of the studies in which they were presented. Surveys and questionnaires helped to further understand the opinions of leadership as well as officers within law enforcement agencies. Utilizing a plethora of relevant literatures as well as data helped to yield stronger research studies.

Synthesis of Research Findings
The purpose of the synthesis is to bring together and merge the research together (Concordia University, 2018b, p. 10). Current research findings support that leadership can be a relative factor of morale. In fact, law enforcement agencies find it crucial to not just hire police officers, but to retain and maintain these officers for years to come. Retaining law enforcement officers ultimately can lead to less turnover rates among agencies. Leadership in law enforcement agencies can influence officers who stay within the departments and those who leave agencies citing their reasons for leaving as “poor leadership” (Orrick, 2008). Russell, Cole, and Jones (2014) placed an emphasis on understanding “how leaders influence burnout in the high-risk occupation of law enforcement, and how stress and coping skills interact to influence this relationship” (Russell et al., 2014, p. 1). Therefore, the critical importance of understanding leadership from both the viewpoint of the leader and the subordinate is vital to solving the issues and circumstances of poor leadership.

Tomazevic, Seljak, and Aristovnik (2014) understood the importance of a satisfied employee. Tomazevic et al. (2014) stated “a satisfied employee works more and better . . . a positive correlation between employee satisfaction and an organization’s effectiveness has often been proven” (p. 4). According to Muthia and Krishnan (2015), “Leadership styles have been found to impact followers’ affective and normative commitment” (p. 10). However, Milton (2011) also noted that “leaders who may be effective in one setting may not be in another” (p. 3). In other words, some leaders may strive in one agency and have satisfied employees: “Servant leadership and transformational leadership emphasize showing concern towards followers. These leadership styles would help in building a bond of trust between the leader and the followers” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 10). “Servant leaders have to listen intently, to understand the needs of followers, and they should be able to empathize with followers in order to connect well
“Transformational leadership empowers followers and brings about a positive change in the lives of the followers. The empowerment and positive climate enhanced by transformational leadership would motivate the followers to pursue higher goals” (Krishnan, 2015, p. 11).

Goleman (2017) understood that “many managers mistakenly assume that leadership style is a function of personality rather than strategic choice. Instead of choosing the one style that suits their temperament, they should ask which style best addresses the demands of a particular situation” (p. 3). Northouse (2016) would agree with Goleman (2017) as Northouse (2016) understood that “leadership is a process, leadership involves influence, leadership occurs in groups, and leadership involves common goals” (p. 6). In understanding leadership, it is about being a leader who seeks the best for employees. Leaders who are servant leaders serve others first, rather than the needs of their own. “Servant leadership and transformational leadership emphasize showing concern towards followers” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 10). As previously noted, Orrick (2008) found “the number one internal factor affecting an employee’s decision to stay or leave at a job is the relationship with their immediate supervisor” (p. 8). The research findings indicated that leadership affects both the morale of the law enforcement officer and the agency. Additionally, research regarding both leadership and morale support the importance and need for understanding whether a relationship exists between leadership and morale within law enforcement agencies.

**Critique of Previous Research**

A long term hope of the researcher would be that the findings might support improvements in workplace morale and law enforcement officer’s morale. The research sought to positively impact the law enforcement field through increasing retention rates of law enforcement officers.
enforcement officers within law enforcement agencies and to boost workplace morale as well as the law enforcement officer’s morale. This literature review strategically analyzed leadership styles through comparing and contrasting the styles that law enforcement leaders are employing today. Many researchers have attempted to already increase workplace morale and law enforcement morale through understanding leadership effectiveness, but to no extent has the issue ever been fully resolved.

Gillian (2017) noted that “police officers are stressed” and due to this there is a “need to retain officers” within law enforcement agencies (p. 11). Hrenchir (2016) noted “low morale and a lack of confidence in leadership within the Shawnee County Sheriff’s Office” (Hrenchir, 2016, p. 1). The reality of low morale within law enforcement agencies on the basis of leadership is an issue that needs to be further studied and investigated due to its prevalence. Another issue being addressed within law enforcement agencies was burnout among officers influencing retention rates and morale. Lee, Scheunemann, Hall, and Payne (2012) defined “staff burnout as a condition of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with people in some capacity (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996, p. 4)” (p. 4). Tomazevic et al. (2014) recognized that officers who “work in the police service are characterized by many particularities that mostly negatively impact the satisfaction and morale of the employees. When dealing with criminal offences, police officers encounter violence, cruelty and indifference to the welfare of others. On one hand, they struggle to meet the conflicting demands of the public and, on the other, within their own organizations they face bureaucracy, internal politics and a militarist style of management (Blum, 2000; Crank, 1998)” (p. 6).
While the issues within law enforcement agencies are a reflection of leadership and the leadership styles and decisions, other factors may lead to low morale among officers. Some internal factors that leadership can work to change include that of “poor salary, poor supervisors and leadership, poor job fits, higher ordered needs, role conflict, dysfunctional organizational cultures, generational differences, lack of career growth/better opportunities, inadequate feedback, inadequate recognition, inadequate training, and inadequate equipment” (Orrick, 2008, pp. 1–15). However, leadership can also influence factors that impact morale such as discussing and working to raise pay of officers, training leadership more effectively, recognizing the needs of officers, creating more growth and advancement opportunities for officers, and working to equip and fund officers better.

The issue facing law enforcement agencies is getting leadership to make changes to boost morale by understanding the needs of officers and the department. It is the hope of the researcher that a correlational analysis would aid in understanding and implementing changes where necessary; as leadership needs to prioritize becoming understanding of officers needs as this would aid in boosting morale and help leaders understand officer’s needs and desires within the agency. Changes need to be made to transform and improve the morale of law enforcement agencies, and these changes begin with leadership.

**Chapter 2 Summary**

Research consistently indicated that law enforcement leaders are the driving force within law enforcement agencies. The issue in law enforcement agencies today involves officers noting low morale and leaving their careers in law enforcement. The study sought to further help prepare leaders to lead officers within police departments, through understanding leadership and
its relationship with law enforcement officer’s morale. Throughout this review of literature, I strategically examined the common themes of leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale.

The research consistently displayed a need for understanding the relationship between leadership and morale. The literature review descriptively outlined the topics of leadership styles, defining leadership, transformational leadership, servant leadership, training leaders, leadership’s relationship with workplace morale, and law enforcement officer’s morale. This study and potential outcomes may be used to improve and positively impact workplace morale and law enforcement officer’s morale. Additionally, this study sought to positively impact the law enforcement field as the review sought to boost workplace morale, as well as the law enforcement officer’s morale. The main purpose within this study was to understand the importance of leadership and its relationship with morale.

The question to be addressed was to what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership with the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale. Based on the review of literatures, which developed a unique conceptual-theoretical framework using leadership to understand morale, there was sufficient reason for thinking that an investigation examining the relationship between leadership and morale would yield significant findings for law enforcement agencies. Overall, the literature review has provided substantially strong support for pursuing a research project to answer the following research question: To what extent if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale. The sub-questions involve determining the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments; and the
relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

In the study of leadership, the law enforcement officer’s opinion was highly valued. As detailed in Chapter 2, many law enforcement officers seemed to be unhappy in their career choice, and have often cited their reasons for leaving law enforcement agencies on the basis of poor leadership (Orrick, 2008). Research indicated that law enforcement leaders are the driving force within law enforcement agencies. Poor leadership often resulted in low workplace morale and officers leaving departments and seeking other employment opportunities (Schafer, 2009 & Orrick, 2008). Turner (1997) recognized how, “Effective organizational leadership was the ingredient that seemed to be missing from many traditional law enforcement developmental programs and professional work” (p. 64). The research question addressed by this study was to determine the extent to which a relationship existed between leadership within the law enforcement agency and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale. A quantitative survey was utilized to analyze law enforcement leadership by evaluating the extent to which a relationship existed between leadership and morale.

The literature review provided substantially strong support for pursuing a research project to answer the following multi-part research question: What is the nature of leadership and its relationship with morale, and what is the relationship between leadership in regards to morale, retention rates, and turnover rates? The goals of the study were to (a) understand the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments; and (b) understand the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments. Ultimately, the study investigated the relationship between leadership and morale.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the survey was to determine whether a relationship existed between leadership and morale among law enforcement officers. The chosen design of the research study was correlational as the study “explored the relationship between variables using statistical analyses” (Grand Canyon, 2018). In relation to morale, the components that were tested within the morale questions involved retention rates and turnover rates. The theory or concept tested throughout the study was related to how leadership may have a relationship with law enforcement officer’s morale within law enforcement agencies. More specifically, this study intended to determine whether a relationship existed between leadership and morale. The variables evaluated throughout this study are recorded in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Study Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Officer’s Morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement Agency’s Morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Morale is a reflection of Retention Rates and Turnover Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>Law enforcement agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The connection between the variables and the theory were all relational as each variable sought to establish a relationship with the other variables presented within the study. Within the variables, as displayed in Table 1, leadership related to morale, turnover and retention rates. Additionally, morale, turnover and retention rates related to leadership. The participants within the study included law enforcement officers currently enrolled in active duty law enforcement capacities within in the state of South Carolina. While a specific department was not targeted, the
survey was sent out to a variety of law enforcement agencies within South Carolina to gain a larger knowledge and view of leadership, workplace morale, and law enforcement officer’s morale.

**Research Questions**

Research Question:

1. To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?

Subquestions:

(a) What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?

(b) What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

**Hypotheses**

Null Hypothesis $H_01$: There is no relationship between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale.

Directional Hypothesis $H_a1$: There is a positive relationship between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale.

Non-Directional Hypothesis $H_b1$: There is a relationship between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale.

Null Hypothesis $H_o2$: There is no relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments.
**Directional Hypothesis H2:** There is a positive relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments.

**Non-Directional Hypothesis Hb2:** There is a relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments.

**Null Hypothesis H03:** There is no relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments.

**Directional Hypothesis H3:** There is a positive relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments.

**Non-Directional Hypothesis Hb3:** There is a relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments.

**Research Design**

Based on the main research question, the examination of the relationship between leadership and morale indicated the need to employ a correlational research design. While other methodologies such as the descriptive quantitative research design placed an emphasis on providing a description, this study sought to test a relationship (Bhat, 2019). Additionally, the experimental quantitative research design would not fit the present study as there was no intervention being applied and the independent variable of leadership was not altered throughout the study (Grand Canyon, 2018). Therefore, a correlational design would aid in understanding the extent to which a relationship exists between leadership and morale. The design of this present study emphasized the research approach of a correlational research design that utilized a Likert-type survey within the study.

A quantitative survey research design aided in analyzing and understanding how leadership practices typically found within law enforcement agencies related to morale. As
Trochim (2008) asserted “Survey research is one of the most important areas of measurement in applied social research.” This study brought forth understanding regarding law enforcement officers opinions of leadership, low morale, high morale, turnover rates, and retention rates. The information from the study was used to improve and positively correlate workplace morale and law enforcement officer’s morale. The study was designed to be a direct reflection of law enforcement officer’s opinions regarding leadership.

**Target Population, Sampling Method, and Related Procedures**

The target population for this study involved law enforcement agencies, which entailed law enforcement officers as well as the leadership within these agencies. Within the present study, the population included approximately 650 officers from four law enforcement agencies across the state of South Carolina for officers and leaders to complete. The target population of the law enforcement officers included within the study included that of one small department with less than 50 law enforcement officers but no fewer than five officers, one medium department with 50–200 law enforcement officers, and two large departments employing more than 200 law enforcement officers. In regards to the sampling method, the four agencies that participated in the study chose to be a part of the study. Geographically, emails were sent to various agencies within South Carolina asking if they would like to participate in the study. These departments included within the survey were all within the state of South Carolina, and varied in geographical location. The maximum number of respondents in the population, as calculated in Table 2, included over 650 law enforcement officers within four law enforcement agencies.
Table 2

*Maximum # of Respondents in Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Sizes</th>
<th>Number of Officers</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Small Department</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Medium Department</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Large Departments</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>400+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>650+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, as calculated in Table 3, the minimum number of respondents in the population included 455 law enforcement officers within four law enforcement agencies.

Table 3

*Minimum # of Respondents in Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Sizes</th>
<th>Number of Officers</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Small Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Medium Department</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Large Department</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the minimum and maximum number of respondents within 1 small law enforcement agency, the calculated mean was 27.5. In 1 medium law enforcement agency, the calculated mean was 125 respondents. In the 2 large law enforcement agencies, the calculated mean was 400 based on the minimum and maximum number of respondents. These calculated means referred to the averages in the population of officers. These means were calculated based on the parameters set forth in the study regarding the target population of sampling one small (5–50 officers per department), one medium (50–200 officers per department), and two large law enforcement agencies (200 or more officers). In the G-Power calculation shown in Figure 2, the small law enforcement agency effect size measured 0.1, the medium law enforcement agency effect size measured 0.3, and the large law enforcement agency effect size measured 0.5
respectively. In order to calculate the total sample size based on G-Power, a t-test was performed to display a linear multiple regression: fixed model, single regression coefficient (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner & Lang, 2009). The graph displayed the number of tails in the study being one-tailed as this is a total calculation of all officers who participated in the study (Faul et al., 2009). Additionally, the number of predictors was two as the correlational study measured two dependent variables, which are the law enforcement officer’s morale and the agency’s morale. The common error of probability was 0.05 and the effect size is 0.15 (Faul et al., 2009). When calculated, the G-Power for the total sample size was 43. In order for the study to yield reliable data, then 43 respondents were needed from all four law enforcement agencies.

![G-Power Calculation](image)

*Figure 2. G-power calculation.*

Overall, questions that addressed leadership and questions pertaining to morale were of the utmost importance within the survey to the target population. In order to answer the research questions set forth in the study, the relationship between leadership and morale was measured on the basis of law enforcement officer’s opinions and rating the Likert-scale set forth in the survey.
Instrumentation

Conducting a Likert-type survey was the most effective instrumentation to successfully examine the potential relationship between law enforcement leadership and morale. The Likert-type survey was named after psychologist Rensis Likert (McLeod, 1970). Likert (1932) “proposed a summated scale for the assessment of survey respondent’s attitudes. Individual items in Likert’s sample scale had five response alternatives: Strongly approve, Approve, Undecided, Disapprove, and Strongly Disapprove” (Clason & Dormody, 1994, p. 31). Groves et al. (2004) defined a survey as a “systematic method for gathering information from, a sample of, entities for the purpose of constructing quantitative descriptors of the attributes of the large population of which the entities are members” (Wolf et al., 2016, p. 4). The instrumentation used involved surveying law enforcement agencies through conducting a Likert-type survey in Qualtrics to inquire about the leadership and morale of the law enforcement agencies being surveyed.

The North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) survey conducted a Law Enforcement Retention Study that utilized a Likert-type survey to have officers rank their opinions based on a series of statements and questions. The North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) survey utilized multiple choice yes/no questions, as well as fill in the blank questions. Within the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) survey, “the survey was created using Survey Monkey electronic survey. The link to the survey was sent to Chiefs of the selected police departments enclosed with a letter” (p. 1). The letter along with the attached survey had the sole purpose of “informing the Chiefs of the study’s purpose and to encourage officers to participate” (North Carolina Department of Justice, 2016, p. 1). The adapted survey questions from the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) utilized within the study are located in Appendix B.
Additionally, Appendix F displays where the full list of published survey results can be found that were tested from the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016). The North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) survey was adapted as the researcher only pulled questions that pertained to the present study. The researcher adapted from the North Carolina Department of Justice survey questions 3, 4, 9, 17, and 20 as these survey questions directly answered the essential questions pertaining to morale and turnover rates. This 2016 survey produced content related evidence as relevant statistical data proved to be beneficial in understanding retention rates regarding, why officers leave departments and why officers remain. Additionally, the study generated numerical data through documenting on each question in a chart the number of responses to each question, as well as the percentage to how many respondents chose each answer. In Table 4, is a sample of the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) documentation post data collection to display the results from the study.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Rank</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Desire to Serve</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>55.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Excitement</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Adventure</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>34.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Family/Friend’s Influence</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>24.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Pay</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>27.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Shift work (nontraditional)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another study conducted for the Commerce City Police Department by Anders, Poston, Jahnke and Haddock (n.d.) utilized a Likert-type Survey to have officers rank questions
regarding administration and leadership, and morale and job satisfaction. The Likert survey placed emphasis on providing a “summary of descriptive statistics from the morale survey” in its data collection methods (Anders et al., n.d., p. 3). The Commerce City Police Department survey was prepared for the Fraternal Order of Police and the data were collected and sent to researchers at the “Center for Fire, Rescue and EMS Health Research National Development and Research Institutes, LLC” to evaluate and provide data (Anders et al., n.d., p. 1). The adapted survey questions of the Commerce City Police Department by Anders et al. (n.d.) are located in Appendix C. Appendix G displays a link to the full list of published survey results that were tested by Anders et al. (n.d.) regarding the Commerce City Police Department Morale Survey Summary. The survey questions from the Commerce City Police Department were adapted as the researcher did not use all of the survey questions in the original survey by Anders et al., (n.d.). Instead, the researcher only adapted the survey questions pertaining to the present study on pages 10–37 as they related to topics of morale and job satisfaction, and administration and leadership (Anders et al., n.d.). This Likert-type survey yielded numerical data through creating bar charts for each question to document how many respondents answered “strongly disagree (1), 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (strongly agree)” (Anders et al., n.d., p. 10). This method of presenting and documenting the data collected from the Likert-type survey produced content related evidence. Anders et al. (n.d.) created an effective visual to clearly understand and interpret the percentages of respondents who strongly disagreed to those respondents who strongly agreed with the questions or statements being asked. Figure 3 is a sample of Anders et al. (n.d.) documentation post data collection to display the results from the study:
Figure 3. Data chart example for results.

Located on the y axis was the number of respondents, and on the x axis was the Likert-type scaling.

The instruments utilized in this study involved adapting survey questions from the two above aforementioned studies by the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) and the Commerce City Police Department Morale Survey Summary (Anders et al., n.d.). In both adapted and pre-existing studies, the data collection methods were electronic and utilized Likert-type surveys in addition to multiple choice questions to establish demographic data (Anders et al., n.d.; North Carolina Department of Justice, 2016). The adapted survey questions were administered and collected through using Qualtrics, and data were analyzed through using SPSS, which is a software that statistically analyzes variables. The survey method to the target population involved straight forward Likert-type questions that addressed leadership and morale. Measuring morale based on law enforcement officer’s opinions regarding leadership was of the utmost importance to answering the research questions of this study.
Validity and reliability were established as the adapted questions have already been distributed to police departments in other states, and both adapted surveys yielded reliable data (Anders et al., n.d.; North Carolina Department of Justice, 2016). The adapted survey questions were reliable as they have been tested on a law enforcement agency population. Additionally, the adapted survey questions had pre-existing established validity as both aforementioned surveys have established content related evidence and predictive validity regarding law enforcement leadership, morale, and retention and turnover rates. Links to the studies and the published findings can be found in Appendixes F and G. In replica of the adapted survey questions, the adapted questions were placed into Qualtrics (an online surveying platform) in a Likert-type scaling format so the data were generated to display on the x-axis the number of respondents and on the y-axis the Likert-type scaling or answer choices. An overall calculation for each likert scale was provided for each question as seen in the bar graph above. All data were then organized based on the aligned research questions to the survey question as displayed in Appendix B and Appendix C.

Statistical data were developed through using Qualtrics to analyze the results provided from the respondents. Each question or statement asked in the survey was aligned to each research question and subquestion as displayed in Appendix B and C. Data were developed though using SPSS to input the Variable (question) and the Data (Likert-type scaling 1–4).
Figure 4. Qualtrics survey question analysis

As shown in Figure 4, data were recorded in Qualtrics to display on the y-axis the Likert-type scaling (1–4), and on the x-axis the number of respondents. Statistical data displayed the Likert-type scaling and the number of respondents for each question, and was then associated with the research question. Each survey question was consistently recorded using a bar graph, and then properly documented with the Research Question/Hypothesis the survey question supports.

Data Collection and Procedures

The study used stratified sampling to analyze four departments in South Carolina ranging in size from small, medium and large law enforcement agencies. The surveying of officers within South Carolina was completed through Qualtrics. Qualtrics distributed the survey and collected the data. “Qualtrics is a cloud-based application that allows users to create surveys and generate powerful reports. Qualtrics software enables users to perform many kinds of online data collection” (Concordia University, n.d.). A Qualtrics link to the survey was sent out to law enforcement agencies for law enforcement officers to complete.

The Likert type survey took about 15 minutes for officers to complete and Qualtrics recorded the answers and computed the data regarding the number of responses to each question. Within Qualtrics, the respondents were allowed to skip over any questions they did not want to answer. Once all of the responses were collected, gathered, and analyzed; the results from the
data were then recorded. The law enforcement officers remained anonymous as well as their respected department throughout the study. The collected data were analyzed using Qualtrics to generate Bar-Graphs to display the number of respondents to each question (x-axis) in comparison with the Likert-type scaling (y-axis). The variables to be examined in the study are recorded in Table 5.

Table 5

Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Level of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>Way in which a person guides and leads others; Authority (Fullan &amp; Scott, 2009 &amp; Globe, 2004)</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers morale</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>How an officer feels about their job.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement agency morale</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>How the agency feels.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1–4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the surveying program, Qualtrics, the adapted survey questions pertaining to morale and leadership were placed into the surveying program and then distributed to four law enforcement agencies in South Carolina (Anders et al., n.d.; North Carolina Department of Justice, 2016). Appendix E contains the permission to use the published surveys. All data in the study that was collected, was stored, and secured for three years. The study recorded data using bar graphs in Qualtrics to visually display the scaling values that officers were asked to rank from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The combination of using two published surveys that
have generated and yielded reliable statistical data, as well as the Qualtrics software to create, distribute and analyze surveys strategically enabled this quantitative correlation survey research design to accurately survey and record reliable data.

**Operationalization of Variables**

Within the study, the variables included leadership, morale, retention and turnover rates. Fowler (2014) stated that the “purpose of the survey is to produce statistics, that is quantitative or numerical descriptions about some aspects of the survey population” (p. 1). Throughout the quantitative correlational research design, the independent variable being represented involved leadership. Additionally, the dependent variable involved morale, as morale is dependent on leadership throughout the study. Other dependent variables involved retention rates and turnover rates as these variables aided in successfully measuring morale. Typically if the morale was high, then the turnover rates reflected a significantly low numerical number and retention rates reflected a high numerical number. With the variables of turnover and retention rates being represented throughout the quantitative study, the study depicted higher turnover rates as a representation and result of low morale occurring within the agency.

Research consistently displayed that people just do not leave a job for no reason (Orrick 2008). “When leaders create an environment where people feel good about themselves and the part they play in the organization’s larger mission, people feel good at work. Many will feel happy. Happy people focused on creating great experiences” (Brandi, 2014, para. 14). As seen within the survey conducted by the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) regarding a law enforcement retention study, the numerical data and variables recorded noted the significance that “over half of the officers said the overall job satisfaction (morale) within their police department is low. Contributing factors to the low morale were poor leadership and management,
rotating shifts, and low pay. Officers who experience high morale within their agency identified great leadership and camaraderie as contributing factors” (p. 4).

Furthermore, throughout the survey research design, the control variables included the law enforcement agencies and the law enforcement officers, as both will continue to exist and stay the same as they are their own entity. The control variables remained the same and consistent throughout the study as the agencies and the officers will always exist without alterations. The opinions from these variables were essential to this study and overall research design. Throughout the course of the study, the law enforcement agency and the police officers who participated in the survey remained constant and unchanged as both exist simultaneously regardless of the survey and the survey results.

**Data Analysis and Procedures**

In the present study, the data analysis procedure was ordinal. The survey was adapted and combined from two previously published surveys; permission to use the survey questions was granted prior to use (see Appendix E). The survey questions adapted for data analysis were published by the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) and the Commerce City Police Department Morale Survey Summary (Anders et al., n.d.). The adapted survey questions can be found in Appendix B and Appendix C. In the questions adapted from the Commerce City Police Department, the measurement of the Likert scale was ordinal as the responses were based on respondents raking the questions/statements as strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neither agree nor disagree (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5) (Anders et al., pp. 10–37). According to Laerd Statistics (2018), “A Likert scale that contains five values, strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree, is ordinal” (p. 1). In the present study, the neutral
was taken away and only the 4 scaling factors of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree were used.

Additionally, in the questions adapted from the North Carolina Department of Justice, the measurement of the Likert-scale was continuous as the survey questions/statements required respondents to rank in order from 1–6 the options given (North Carolina Department of Justice, 2016, p. 3). “Continuous variables are also known as quantitative variables” (Laerd Statistics, 2018, p. 1). The North Carolina Department of Justice (n.d.) also utilized a dichotomous measurement through asking yes/no questions and asking two answer questions. Laerd Statistics (2018) classified dichotomous measure as “variables which have only two categories or levels” (p. 1). The North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) data were also collected through having respondents rank questions/statements as “strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree” (North Carolina Department of Justice, n.d., p. 5).

Throughout the present study, the data were prepared for analysis through scoring each Likert-scale set forth in each question. All data analysis was ordinal and displayed in a bar graph. As previously noted, the bar graph displayed on the y-axis the likert-scale numbers 1–4 or the answer choices and on the x-axis the number of respondents. Each question or statement asked in the survey were aligned and coded to the research question (1) and subquestions (a,b) as displayed in Appendix B and Appendix C. Table 6 is a coding key which aligned each survey question with the research questions as found in Appendix B and Appendix C.
Table 6

**Coding for the Alignment of Survey Questions to Research Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment of Survey Questions to Research Questions:</th>
<th>Key*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Research Question:**

1 = To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?

**Subquestions:**

a = What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?

b = What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

Data were developed through using Qualtrics to input the Variable (question) and the Data (Likert-type scaling 1–4). The descriptive statistics for the data are as follows: The Mean for the 1 small department’s population was about 27 officers. The Mean for 1 medium department’s population was about 125 officers. The Mean for 2 large department’s populations was about 400 officers. Additionally, the minimum number in the population was about 455 officers, and the maximum number in the population was about 650 officers. The Range for the population from the 1 small, 1 medium and 2 large law enforcement agencies was 195 officers. At the end of the study, once all data were collected, a Spearman rho correlation was used to “measure the degree of relationship between” leadership and morale (Statistics Solutions, 2019, para. 1). The Spearman rho correlation measured the strength of relationship between leadership and morale. “A value of ± 1 indicates a perfect degree of association between the two variables. As the correlation coefficient value goes towards 0, the relationship between the two variables will be weaker” (Statistics Solutions, 2019, para. 1).
Limitations of the Research Design

Key limitations may be found in this quantitative study. The first limitation involved how some law enforcement agencies may not want to have their law enforcement officers participate in a survey regarding leadership and morale due to leadership coming under scrutiny, which may create fear of a negative result. If officers were to report low morale, then the leadership at the particular department may feel targeted and their position in leadership may be challenged by upper command staff and politics. In order to prevent leadership from feeling as though they will come under scrutiny during the study and survey, all published results were recorded with other law enforcement agencies completing the survey which included one small law enforcement agency in South Carolina, one medium law enforcement agency in South Carolina, and two large law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. Additionally, only the general geographical location of South Carolina law enforcement agencies was included within the study. No department name was listed in the study in order to protect anonymity.

The second limitation may have involved officers/departments not wanting a survey to be administered on the basis of revealing possible low morale and ensuring job security. This limitation would have impacted the survey population. Additionally, the third limitation to this study involved lawyers representing particular law enforcement agencies, as the lawyers may not want a particular department to participate in a survey especially if the results are going to be published. The fourth limitation that presented itself throughout the quantitative study involved officers not wanting to take the survey out of fear that leadership would find out their answers, especially if they were intending on leaving the department or if they reported low morale and poor leadership in the survey. Many aspects of the law enforcement agency are political, especially when it pertains to leadership. In order to alleviate poor morale statistics targeting a
specific law enforcement agency, this study ensured that individual results were not published, but instead a much wider study involving four different and diverse departments in four varying geological locations across the state of South Carolina.

Additionally, when the survey was completed, the results were calculated and separated by small, medium and large agency size. However, all Spearman \( \rho \) correlations were a combined total of all departments that participated. In the study, the question regarding the department size was only to analyze how leadership may vary based on department sizes. Law enforcement officers were assured that their answers remain anonymous as no name was asked in the survey, and their survey responses were highly valued in evaluating leadership and morale. Law enforcement agencies participating in the study were made aware that the goal of this study was to determine to what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale. This study or survey did not target a specific law enforcement agency within the state of South Carolina.

**Internal and External Validity**

Internal and external validity claims aided in understanding the measurable variables within the study. Internal validity referred to the “accuracy of statements made about the causal relationship between two variables, namely, the independent variable and the dependent variable” (Salkind, 2010, p. 2). Throughout the study, in order for internal validity to be high, then independent variable, which was leadership, was responsible for the changes in the dependent variable (Concordia University, 2018). The dependent variables in the study involved morale, retention and turnover rates. Therefore, the internal validity of leadership throughout the
study was responsible for the relationship with morale, retention rates and turnover rates within the quantitative study.

External validity was concerned with the ability to generalize results or apply findings outside the parameters of the quantitative research design (Concordia University, 2018). “Concerns about external validity often focus on the characteristics of the persons who served as participants in a study, asking whether these participants were good representatives of the population under study” (Frey, 2018, p. 3). The study utilized active duty law enforcement officers from four varying agencies across the state of South Carolina. These agencies varied in size from one small law enforcement agency, one medium law enforcement agency, and two large law enforcement agencies. The external validity in the study was strong as the participants were good representations of the population under study. Often “external validity refers to the degree to which the relations among variables observed in one sample of observations in one population will hold for other samples of observations within the same population or in other populations” (Frey, 2018, p. 2). The study strategically chose four varying agencies across the state of South Carolina to access the general population of law enforcement leadership and officers across the state of South Carolina.

The correlational relationship between two variables, the independent variable leadership, and the dependent variable involving morale, retention rates and turnover rates was all measured throughout the quantitative survey through Qualtrics (Salkind, 2010). Within the relationship of the internal validity, the study displayed how the independent variable of leadership was related to the dependent variables of the morale of law enforcement officers, the retention rates, and the turnover rates within law enforcement agencies. Throughout the study, the researcher developed
a relationship built between internal and external validity as law enforcement officers were asked to answer sets of Likert-type scaling questions.

**Expected Findings**

Higher morale was expected from effective leadership which may be a reflection of high retention rates and low turnover rates. However, if low morale was an issue, then this would have likely been a reflection of poor leadership. The Likert-scale questions assessed effective leadership through asking law enforcement officers if they felt “valued, respected, praised, communicated” and whether the “command staff exemplified the values of integrity, belief systems, and strong value systems” (Anders et al., n.d.). Muthia and Krishnan (2015) understood that effective leadership “emphasized showing concern towards followers” (p. 10). Effective leadership must seek to “listen intently, to understand the needs of followers, and they should be able to empathize with followers in order to connect well with them” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 10).

Additionally, dichotomous questions asking law enforcement officers if they “are considering leaving their agency” yielded an accurate percentage of turnover rates and retention rates among participants within the study (North Carolina Department of Justice, 2016, p. 3). Another dichotomous question that assessed morale involved asking officers to “rate the overall job satisfaction (morale) within your police department” as “high” or “low” (North Carolina Department of Justice, 2016, p. 4). Turner (1997) addressed “without a clear vision and direction, police organizations and leaders can never fulfill their potential” (p. 128). Overall, the researcher expected to find that if morale was low, then turnover rates would be high. However, if morale was high, then turnover rates would be low and retention rates would be high.
Ethical Issues

For the present study, ethical issues were addressed through establishing specific parameters within the study and quantitative survey research design. “The Ethics Code is intended to provide guidance . . . and standards of professional conduct that can be applied by the APA and by other bodies that choose to adopt them” (American Psychological Association, n.d., para. 5). Ethics were highly valued as the researcher took the necessary measures to ensure no codes of ethics were violated within the study. Before surveying, Concordia University required all researchers to submit a Research Description form, and Internal Review Board (IRB) forms for approval. Additionally, before administering the quantitative survey, consent was obtained from the police departments to survey their law enforcement officers within their agency.

The researcher also obtained approval to use the adapted surveys that were utilized within this study from both the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) and the Commerce City Police Department Morale Survey by Anders, Poston, Jahnke, and Haddock (n.d.). Both surveys have already been tested and yielded positive results within law enforcement agencies. The four law enforcement agencies to be used within the study were sent an email asking for consent to survey the agency population in addition with a copy of the survey for review. The consent form for surveying is found in Appendix D. The principal investigator of the study surveyed one small, one medium, and two large law enforcement agencies in order to survey a larger population and to reduce the risk of targeting one department with fewer responses.

Law enforcement officers that participated in the study were made aware that their individual results were not published. The ethical standards within the present study were held to a high standard as the research design surveyed law enforcement agencies that were held to already pre-existing high public standards. It would be a conflict of anonymity for law
enforcement agencies to be individually targeted. Therefore, law enforcement agencies results were separated only by the agency sizes and were not targeting particular agency department names, leadership, or officers individually. Participants in the study were informed of the survey through emails sent out by the researcher through the Command Staff, and leadership encouraging officers within the agency to complete the survey. Leadership, officers, and law enforcement agencies were assured that the survey was not out to cause deception, but to rather understand the relationship between leadership and morale.

Chapter 3 Summary

The research question and goal of the present study was to understand to what extent if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale. This study examined two subquestions regarding: (a) the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments; and (b) the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments. All participants in the study included only law enforcement agencies and their officers. Throughout the study, the internal validity of leadership was related to morale, retention, and turnover rates. Additionally, the external validity in the study was strong as the participants (law enforcement officers) were good representations of the population under study.

Overall, this study answered the research questions through strategically employing and administering a quantitative correlational survey research design through conducting a Likert-type survey in Qualtrics. Qualtrics allowed the researcher to organize and analyze all data based on survey question responses. Once all data was collected, the data was organized in SPSS. SPSS allowed the researcher to run statistical analysis for the Spearman \( \rho \) correlations. Spearman \( \rho \)
correlational analysis allowed the researcher to examine whether a relationship existed between leadership and morale, morale and retention rates, and morale and turnover rates. Based on the review of literatures, conceptual-theoretical framework, and quantitative survey design, there was sufficient reason for administering an investigation examining the relationship between leadership and morale, especially in regard to retention rates, and turnover rates.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

In order to better understand the relationship between leadership and morale within law enforcement agencies, this quantitative correlational study examined whether police leaders had a correlational relationship with officer’s morale. The goal of researching, studying, and analyzing this problem was to improve the independent variable of leadership, and the dependent variables of workplace morale, and law enforcement officer’s morale. As previously discussed, the following research question (1) addressed the purpose of this study in accompaniment with the two subquestions (a.–b).

1. To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?
   a. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?
   b. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

Law enforcement officers from four law enforcement agencies agreed to participate in an online survey. The participants within the study included law enforcement officers currently enrolled in active duty law enforcement capacities within in the state of South Carolina. A specific department was not targeted, instead the survey was sent to multiple South Carolina law enforcement agencies to gain a larger knowledge and view of leadership, workplace morale, and law enforcement officer’s morale. The law enforcement agencies in the study chose to be a part of the study. In all, the study population included one small law enforcement agency, one medium law enforcement agency, and two large law enforcement agencies. Once all
departmental approvals were gained, the survey was available to participants for approximately two weeks. The survey questions were adapted from the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016) and the Commerce City Police Department Morale Survey Summary (Anders et al., n.d.). The following chapter discusses the sample, results, and analysis of the study.

**Description of the Sample**

In order to answer the research question, the sample for the study included only law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. In order to maintain confidence levels within the study, the researcher surveyed small, medium, and large law enforcement agencies in South Carolina from a variety of geographical locations. Due to time constraints in the study, the study participant sample population included one small law enforcement agency (17 officers participated), one medium law enforcement agency (15 officers participated), and two large law enforcement agencies (227 officers participated). In the study, approximately 259 officers participated out of 455 expected based on the minimum recruit numbers. The present study observed a 56% response rate based on the expected minimum recruit numbers. The response rate exceeded the G-Power calculation of 43 officer participants. At minimum, 43 officer participants were needed to ensure an 80% confidence level, and an effect size of 15% to ensure a valid and reliable study.

Table 7 displayed that within the full survey population, who chose to answer the question. Out of 259 participants, 14 officers were in law enforcement less than one year, 42 officers were in law enforcement 1–5 years, 51 officers were in law enforcement 5–10 years, 73 officers were in law enforcement 10–20 years, and 61 officers were in law enforcement over 20 years.
Table 7

**Years in Law Enforcement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 years</td>
<td>17.43%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10 years</td>
<td>21.16%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–20 years</td>
<td>30.29%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>25.31%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the participants were over the age of 21; in order to be a law enforcement officer in the state of South Carolina, an individual must be 21 years of age or older. In the surveying population, 193 of the respondents or 79.75% in the survey population were male, while 44 of the respondents or 18.18% in the survey population were female. Table 8 displays the ethnicity of the population. As indicated in Table 8, one participant classified themselves as American Indian or Alaskan Native, two participants classified themselves as Asian, 27 participants classified themselves as African American, seven participants classified themselves as Hispanic or Latino, two participants classified themselves as Native Hawaiian or other specific, 197 classified themselves as White or Caucasian, and 18 participants preferred not to respond.

Table 8

**Ethnicity of Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11.16%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Specific</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian or White</td>
<td>76.45%</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>7.44%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of the Results**

The dependent variables in the study involved morale, retention and turnover rates. The internal validity of leadership throughout the study was responsible for the relationship between morale, retention rates and turnover rates within the quantitative study. In regards to the external validity, the external validity was strong as the participants were good representations of the population under study. The population were good participants for examining morale within law enforcement agencies, as the population included law enforcement officers. Throughout the study, the researcher developed a relationship built between internal and external validity as law enforcement officers were asked to answer sets of Likert-type scaling questions.

In replica of the adapted survey questions, the adapted questions were placed into Qualtrics (an online surveying platform) in a Likert-type scaling format. The data were generated to display on the x-axis the number of respondents and on the y-axis the Likert-type scaling or answer choices. All data were organized based on the aligned research question to the survey question as displayed in Table 9.

**Table 9**

*Alignment of Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this study, the adapted survey questions were administered, collected and organized through using Qualtrics, and data were analyzed for statistical analysis through using SPSS, which is a software used to statistically analyze variables. The survey method to the target population involved Likert-type questions that addressed leadership and morale. Measuring morale based on law enforcement officer’s opinions regarding leadership was essential in answering the research question of this study.

Based on the Likert-type survey questions, the study understood how leadership related to morale, retention rates, and turnover rates from the viewpoint of law enforcement officers. The results of the study proved a positive relationship existed between leadership and morale. In turn, morale displayed a relationship with the retention and turnover rates within law enforcement agencies. Understanding the relationship between leadership and morale in regards to retention and turnover rates was the main goal throughout the study. The researcher wanted to understand if leadership related to morale, and based on the Spearman rho correlational analysis, leadership had a relationship with morale. The correlational analysis for leadership's relationship to morale, retention and turnover rates are detailed below.

**Detailed Analysis**

This section placed an emphasis on outlining the main research question (1) and subquestions (2 and 3), hypothesis, Spearman rho correlational data, Spearman rho descriptive statistics data and the Survey Question analysis. The detailed analysis displayed the descriptive results for the study and aided in visually understanding the relationships of (a) leadership and morale, (b) morale and retention rates, and (c) morale and turnover rates within law enforcement agencies in South Carolina.
Research Question 1

To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?

Null Hypothesis H₀₁: There is no relationship between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale.

Directional Hypothesis H₁: There is a positive relationship between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale.

Non-Directional Hypothesis H₀: There is a relationship between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale.

Survey Question 1 of rating morale, and Survey Questions 25–28 regarding the leadership of the sergeants, captains, majors, and chiefs were essential to answering the first research question.

Survey Question 1 was entered into SPSS to identify high and low morale; then Survey Questions 25–28 data were combined in order to analyze whether there was faith in leadership or not. In SPSS, as seen in Table 10, the following data were entered:

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Morale</th>
<th>Low Morale</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree+</th>
<th>Strongly Agree+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree+</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Spearman ρ correlation, as shown, was performed to test the significance between low morale, and low faith in leadership (Disagree Population). According to the Spearman ρ correlation, low morale and low faith have a statistically positive correlation. The significance
level was 0.01. The significance value \((p)\) of this correlation was 0.00. The results of the correlation were significant at \((r(1,3) = +1, p < 0.01)\).

**Correlation - Research Question 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Low Morale</th>
<th>Disagreeable Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable Population</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As displayed, the descriptive statistics for the Spearman rho correlation also displayed that on average approximately 42 officers noted low morale, and approximately 80 of the officers noted low faith in leadership.

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Morale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>62.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable Population</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>80.67</td>
<td>124.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the positive correlation, the \(H_1\) non-directional hypothesis was accepted. Additionally, the descriptive statistics displayed a mean of 42 officers having low morale and 80 officers having a lack of faith in their leadership. The following survey questions outlined displayed the extent to which leadership related to morale among four law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. As displayed in the Likert scaling graphs from Qualtrics located in Appendix I, the following tables in the Survey Question Analysis analyzed the frequencies of survey question
answers regarding how small, medium and large law enforcement agencies differed in their opinions.

Table 11

*Survey Question 1 Analysis: Please Rate the Overall Job Satisfaction (Morale) Within Your Police Department.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Morale Frequency</th>
<th>Low Morale Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

*Survey Question 2 Analysis: I’m Asked for my Input on Decisions That Affect me at Work*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

*Survey Question 3 Analysis: The Agency Fosters a Culture Which Supports Employees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Survey Question 4 Analysis: Pressure From my job Originates Primarily From Within the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

Survey Question 5 Analysis: The Department Management Values Quality of Work Over Quantity of Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

Survey Question 6 Analysis: I am Confident That my Voice is Heard Within the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 17**

*Survey Question 7 Analysis: When Possible my Opinion is Taken Into Account by Management*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18**

*Survey Question 8 Analysis: Promotions are Based Primarily on Merit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19**

*Survey Question 9 Analysis: Special Unit Assignments are Based Primarily on Merit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20**

*Survey Question 10 Analysis: Morale is Important to my Daily Performance of Duties in This Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

*Survey Question 11 Analysis: I am Satisfied With the Morale Within This Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*Survey Question 12 Analysis: Operating Procedures are Communicated in a Clear and Timely Manner*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

*Question 13 Analysis: Management Clearly Communicates What is Expected of me*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

*Survey Question 14 Analysis: I Feel Valued by the Police Department Command Staff*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

**Survey Question 15 Analysis: I Feel Respected by the Department Command Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

**Survey Question 16 Analysis: The Praise That I Receive From the Command Staff is Genuine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

**Survey Question 17 Analysis: The Command Staff Exemplifies the Values and Integrity it Expects of the Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

**Survey Question 18 Analysis: The Department Operates From a Belief System That Values Doing the Right Thing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

**Survey Question 19 Analysis: The Department Functions From a Strong Value System Rather than a “Gotcha” Mentality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30

**Survey Question 20 Analysis: Double Standards are Used by the Administration in the Disciplinary action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31

*Survey Question 21 Analysis: I Feel Confident in the Leadership of This Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32

*Survey Question 22 Analysis: I am Satisfied With the Amount of Praise That I Receive*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

*Survey Question 23 Analysis: I Often Feel Micromanaged*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34

*Survey Question 24 Analysis: Management Trusts in my Ability to do my job Effectively Without Constant Direction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35

*Survey Question 25 Analysis: I Have Faith in the Leadership of the Sergeants of This Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36

*Survey Question 26 Analysis: I Have Faith in the Leadership of the Captains of This Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37

*Survey Question 27 Analysis: I Have Faith in the Majors of This Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38

Survey Question 28 Analysis: I Have Faith in the Leadership of the Chief of This Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Question a

What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?

Null Hypothesis \( H_0 \): There is no relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments.

Directional Hypothesis \( H_a \): There is a positive relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments.

Non-Directional Hypothesis \( H_{b2} \): There is a relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments.

To test the relationship between morale and retention rates, Table 39 displays the data that was entered into SPSS to test a bivariate correlational analysis.

Table 39

SPSS Data Table for Morale and Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Morale</th>
<th>Low Morale</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the correlation, low morale was compared to yes (the officer was considering leaving their agency). The significance value \((p)\) was 0.667. SPSS did not flag a signifant correlation existing between low morale and the officer considering leaving an agency.

### Correlation 1- Sub-Question a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Low Morale</th>
<th>Yes: The officer was considering leaving their agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as shown, the descriptive statistics for the Spearman \(rho\) correlation also displayed that on average approximately 42 officers noted low morale, and approximately 22 of the officers noted that they were considering leaving their agency.

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Morale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>62.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: The officer was considering leaving their agency.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>34.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, high morale was compared with no (the officer was not considering leaving their agency). As displayed in the correlation, significance value \((p)\) was 0.000. The correlation was positive as \(r = +1\) and \((r(1, 3) = +1, p < 0.01)\). This correlation proves a relationship between high morale and retention rates.
As shown, the descriptive statistics for the Spearman rho correlation also displayed that on average approximately 63 of the officers noted that they were not considering leaving their agency, and approximately 42 officers noted high morale.

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The following survey questions outlined displayed the relationships between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regard to retention rates among 4 law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. As displayed in the Likert scaling graphs from Qualtrics located in Appendix I, the following tables in the Survey Question Analysis listed the frequencies of how small, medium and large law enforcement agencies differed in their opinions.
Table 40

Survey Question 1 Analysis: Are you Considering Leaving Your Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Size</th>
<th>Yes Frequency</th>
<th>No Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41

Survey Question 2 Analysis: I Feel That the Department Values Longevity in the Workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Size</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42

Survey Question 3 Analysis: I Would Recommend This Department to Friends as a Good Place to Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Size</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43

Survey Question 4 Analysis: I am Satisfied With the Relationships I Have With my Coworkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Size</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44

Survey Question 5 Analysis: A Spirit of Cooperation and Teamwork Exists in my Work Group (Unit or Shift)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45

Survey Question 6 Analysis: People Treat Each Other With Respect in my Work Group (Unit or Shift)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46

Survey Question 7 Analysis: I am Satisfied With Opportunities for Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47

Survey Question 8 Analysis: I am Satisfied With my Coworkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Question 9 Analysis: My Current Overall Level of Satisfaction With my job Here is High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Question b

What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

**Null Hypothesis H₀₃:** There is no relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments.

**Directional Hypothesis Hₐ₃:** There is a positive relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments.

**Non-Directional Hypothesis Hₜ₃:** There is a relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments.

The first research question statistical correlation established a positive relationship between leadership and morale as \( p < 0.01 \). The second research question established a relationship between high morale increasing retention rates as \( p < 0.01 \). The third research question tested the relationship between morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement agencies.

Table 49 was entered into SPSS to run a Spearman rho correlation, based on morale in Research Question 1: Survey Question 1, and Sub-Question b: Survey Question 5. Survey question 5 asked participants the following question which stated: Taking everything into consideration, are you planning on making a serious effort to find a new job within the next year.
The disagree population (strongly disagree + disagree) and the agree population (strongly agree + agree) are recorded in the data.

Table 49

SPSS Data Table for Morale and Turnover Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Morale</th>
<th>Low Morale</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In SPSS, a Spearman rho correlation was performed between low morale, and the officer’s decision to leave a law enforcement agency (agree). The correlation chart displayed the correlation between low morale and the decision to leave a law enforcement agency. In the Spearman rho correlation, the significance value ($p$) was 0.667. However, SPSS did not flag that a significant correlation existed between low morale and turnover rates.

**Correlation- Sub-Question b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Morale</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Agree: Officer's decision to leave a law enforcement agency.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Low Morale</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree: Officer's decision to leave a law enforcement agency.</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the descriptive statistics for the Spearman rho correlation also displayed that average approximately 42 officers noted low morale, and approximately 14 of the officers noted that they were making a serious effort to find a new job within the next year.
The following survey questions outlined displayed the relationships between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates among 4 law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. As displayed in the Likert scaling graphs from Qualtrics located in Appendix I, the following tables in the Survey Question Analysis listed the frequencies of how small, medium and large law enforcement agencies differed in their opinions.

Table 50

**Survey Question 1 Analysis: If you Considered Leaving Your Agency was it to go to a Different Law Enforcement Agency or a Different job Industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Different Agency Frequency</th>
<th>Different Job Industry Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51

**Survey Question 2 Analysis: I am Satisfied With my job at This Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52

Survey Question 3 Analysis: I Have Seriously Considered Looking for a job With Another Police Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53

Survey Question 4 Analysis: I Have Seriously Considered Looking for Another job Outside of Law Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54

Survey Question 5 Analysis: Taking Everything Into Consideration, I Plan on Making a Serious Effort to Find a new job Within the Next Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 55

Survey Question 6 Analysis: I do not Have the Level of job Security That I Feel I Should Have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree Frequency</th>
<th>Agree Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 4 Summary

Based on the Spearman rho correlations, there was substantial evidence to prove a relationship existed between leadership and morale as \( p < 0.01 \) and morale and retention rates \( p < 0.01 \). However, in regards to morale and turnover rates within law enforcement agencies SPSS did not find a significant correlation existing between the variables. The Null Hypotheses \( H_0 \) was rejected for Research Question 1 and subquestion a based on the Spearman rho correlations as a statistically positive relationship existed between leadership and morale and morale and retention rates. However, the Null Hypothesis was accepted for subquestion b as no statistically significant relationship existed between morale and turnover rates. In regards to morale, the data found that in a small law enforcement agency 64.71% of the respondents rated the morale as high, in a medium law enforcement agency 50% of the respondents rated the morale as high, and in a large law enforcement agency 48% of the respondents rated the morale as being high.

In a small law enforcement agency 23.53% of the respondents stated they were considering leaving their law enforcement agency, in a medium law enforcement agency 14.29% of the respondents stated they were considering leaving their law enforcement agency, and in a large law enforcement agency 27.43% of the respondents stated they were considering leaving their law enforcement agency. As displayed in Table 54, out of the 245 law enforcement officers...
who answered the survey question, 43 officers stated they were considering leaving their law enforcement agency within the next year. In other words, 17% of law enforcement officers within four law enforcement agencies will be finding new employment within the next year. Overall, the correlational data established valuable relationships and understanding into the leadership, morale, turnover, and retention rates of law enforcement officers in South Carolina.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

Law enforcement agencies employ officers who are driven to serve and protect the communities in which they work “with the highest standard of conduct and professionalism” (South Carolina Department of Public Safety, 2019). The issue presented in this study involved how law enforcement officers may display low morale, high turnover rates, and low retention rates in law enforcement departments. While studies have been done in other states to better understand the relationship between leadership and morale, it has not been extensively studied in South Carolina. Many studies identified low morale, high turnover rates, and low retention rates without a clear examination of leadership (McCalister, 2016; Wareham, Smith & Lambert, 2015; Vermont Criminal Justice Center, 1990). The scope of this study focused on the examination of the relationship between leadership and morale.

This correlational study examined the relationship between leadership and morale. The researcher used survey questions that were adapted, administered, collected and organized through using the Qualtrics surveying tool. The population surveyed included 259 law enforcement officers from four law enforcement agencies of three different sizes in South Carolina. Data from the survey was analyzed statistically using SPSS to develop relationships among variables. The survey method involved Likert-type questions that addressed leadership and morale. Measuring morale based on law enforcement officer’s opinions regarding leadership was essential for addressing the research questions of this study. Based on the Spearman \( \rho \) correlations conducted in SPSS, evidence indicated a relationship between leadership and morale with \( p < 0.01 \), and morale and retention rates with a \( p \) value of \(<0.01\). However, in regards to morale and turnover rates within law enforcement agencies SPSS did not find a significant
correlation existing between the variables. This chapter outlined a summary of the results, as well as a discussion of the results in relation to past studies, the implications of the results, and the possible recommendations for further research.

**Summary of the Results**

This study sought to provide law enforcement agencies with better information regarding retention and turnover rates regarding leadership’s relationship with morale. The purpose of the study was to examine whether a relationship existed between the independent variable of leadership and the dependent variables of officer’s morale in reflection of retention and turnover rates. Based on these purposes, this study was conducted to answer the following research question and subquestions:

1. To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?
   
   a. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?
   
   b. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

**Research Question 1**

To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?

The purpose of this research question was to understand whether a relationship existed between leadership and morale within law enforcement agencies. A Spearman *rho* correlation was performed to test the significance between low morale, and low faith in leadership. Faith, in
this study, was defined as having complete trust/confidence in leadership. Based on the Spearman rho correlation, low morale and low faith had a statistically strong positive correlation and relationship. The significance level was 0.01. The significance value \((p)\) of this correlation was 0.000, and the \((r)\) value was 1. The results of the correlation were significant at \((r (1, 3) = +1, p < 0.01)\).

Additionally, the descriptive statistics for the Spearman rho correlation displayed that on average approximately 42 officers noted low morale, and approximately 80 of the officers noted low faith in leadership. Based on the positive correlation, the \(H_a\) and the \(H_b\) hypothesis were both accepted as a relationship existed between leadership and morale and the relationship was positive. The Null Hypothesis, which stated that there was no relationship, was rejected.

**Sub-Question a**

What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?

The purpose of this research question was to understand whether a relationship existed between morale and retention rates within law enforcement agencies. In the Spearman rho correlation, low morale was compared to yes (the officer was considering leaving their agency). The significance value was 0.667. SPSS did not flag a significant coreloration existing between officers who have low morale and those who consider leadving their law enforcement agency. The descriptive statistics for the Spearman rho correlation also displayed that on average approximately 42 officers noted low morale, and approximately 22 of the officers noted that they were considering leaving their agency.

Additionally, high morale was compared with no (the officer was not considering leaving their agency). The significance level of this correlation was set at 0.01, and the significance value
was 0.000. The correlation was positive as \( r = +1 \) and \( (r(1, 3) = +1, p < 0.01) \). This correlation proved a significant relationship existed between high morale and retention rates. The descriptive statistics for the Spearman \( \rho \) correlation also displayed that on average approximately 63 of the officers noted that they were not considering leaving their agency, and approximately 42 officers noted high morale.

Based on the positive correlations, the \( H_a2 \) and the \( H_b2 \) hypothesis were both accepted as there was a relationship between leadership and morale, and retention rates with law enforcement agencies, and the relationship was positive. The Null Hypothesis, which stated that there was no relationship, was rejected.

**Sub-Question b**

What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

The purpose of this research question was to examine the relationship between morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement agencies. In SPSS a Spearman \( \rho \) correlation subquestion b was performed between low morale, and the officer’s decision to leave a law enforcement agency (agree). In the Spearman \( \rho \) correlation, the significance value \( (p) \) was at 0.667. SPSS did not flag a significant correlation existing between morale and turnover rates. Just because an officer notes that their morale is low does not mean that they will leave the law enforcement agency. The descriptive statistics for the Spearman \( \rho \) correlation also displayed that on average approximately 42 officers noted low morale, and approximately 14 of the officers noted that they were making a serious effort to find a new job within the next year. Due to there being no statistically significant correlation, the \( H_a2 \) and the \( H_b2 \) hypothesis were both rejected as there is not a relationship existing between leadership’s and morale and turnover rates.
with law enforcement agencies, and the relationship is positive. The Null Hypothesis, which stated that there was no relationship, was accepted.

**Discussion of the Results**

In Research Question 1, a relationship between low morale and low faith was positively correlated as $p<0.01$. This positive correlation proved low morale in law enforcement agencies was a direct reflection of leadership and officers not having full confidence and trust in their leadership. In subquestion a, the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s high morale in regards to retention rates was positively correlated as $p < 0.01$. In the relationship, high morale often resulted in the officer staying with the law enforcement agency. A positive relationship existed between high morale and increased retention rates within law enforcement agencies. In subquestion b, the data displayed the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates was not statistically correlated. This nonstatistical correlation displayed that just because an officer’s morale was low does not mean they will leave the law enforcement agency. Within the three research questions, the alternative hypothesis were accepted for Research Question 1 and 2 as a positive relationship existed between leadership and morale, and morale and retention rates. However the null hypothesis was accepted in subquestion b as no statistically significant relationship existed between morale and turnover rates.

**Research Question 1**

In Research Question 1, a relationship between low morale and low faith was positively correlated as $p < 0.01$. The $H_a1$ hypothesis was accepted as a positive relationship existed. This positive correlation displayed that low morale in law enforcement agencies can be a direct reflection of leadership and officers not having full confidence and trust in their leadership.
Statistically in a small law enforcement agency the study population noted that 64.71% of law enforcement officers noted high morale, while 35.29% noted low morale. In medium law enforcement agency, 50% of the population rated morale as high and the other 50% of the survey population rated morale as low. In large law enforcement agencies, 48.88% of the survey population rated morale as high, while 51.12% of the population rated morale as low. In addition to understanding the morale rates, the researcher placed an emphasis to fully examine small, medium and large law enforcement agencies in regard to the common plurality of leadership rankings within an agency. These specific questions asked participants about their faith in the leadership of their sergeants, captains, majors, and chiefs.

In regard to the Sergeants, the surveying population noted in a small law enforcement agency 42.86% of the law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in the leadership of their Sergeants, 50% of the law enforcement officers agreed, and 7.14% disagreed with the leadership of their Sergeants. In a medium law enforcement agency, 7.14% of the law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in the leadership of their Sergeants, 64.29% of the law enforcement officers agreed, and 28.57% disagreed with the leadership of their Sergeants. In 2 large law enforcement agencies, 15.38% of the population of law enforcement officers agreed that they had faith in the leadership of the Sergeants of their department, 60.58% agreed, 17.31% disagreed, and 6.73% strongly disagreed. In ranking order small law enforcement agencies lead in faith with their Sergeants with 92.86%, second were large agencies coming in at 75.96%, and third was 71.43% for the medium agency.

In regard to the Captains, in a small law enforcement agency 42.86% of the law enforcement officers strongly agreed they had faith in their Captains of their law enforcement agency, 50% agreed, 7.14% disagreed. In medium law enforcement agency 28.57% of the law enforcement officers
enforcement population strongly agreed that they had faith in their Sergeants, 50% agreed, and 21.43% of law enforcement officers disagreed. In 2 large law enforcement agencies, 17.46% of law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in their Captains at their department, 52.43% agreed, 19.90% disagreed, and 9.71% strongly disagreed. Overall, small law enforcement agencies had the most faith in their Captains as 92.86% noted that they agreed, in medium law enforcement agencies 78.57% of officers had faith in their Captains, in large law enforcement agencies 69.89% had faith in their Captains.

Another survey question examined the Majors of law enforcement agencies. In a small agency, 46.15% of law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in the majors of their department, 46.15% agreed, and 7.69% disagreed. In a medium law enforcement agency, 18.18% of law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in the majors of their department, 45.45% agreed, 27.27% disagreed, and 9.09% strongly disagreed. In two large law enforcement agencies 18% of law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in the majors of their department, 49.50% agreed, 17.50% disagreed, and 50% strongly disagreed. Overall, small law enforcement agencies had the most faith in their Majors as 92.30%. Large law enforcement agencies had 67.50% of law enforcement officers having faith in their Captains. Medium law enforcement agencies had 63.63% of officers having faith in their Captains.

The final examination was on the Chiefs of law enforcement agencies. In a small law enforcement agency, 50% of law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in the leadership of their Chief, 28.57% agreed, and 21.43% disagreed. In a medium law enforcement agency, 28.57% of law enforcement officers strongly agreed that they had faith in the leadership of their Chief, 57.14% agreed, and 14.29% disagreed. In 2 large law enforcement agencies, 32.85% of law enforcement officers strongly agreed with the leadership of their Chief, 43.96%
agreed, 14.49% disagreed, and 8.70% agreed. Overall, medium law enforcement agencies had
the most faith in their Chiefs as 85.71% noted that they agreed, in small law enforcement
agencies 78.57% of officers had faith in their Chiefs, and in large law enforcement agencies
76.81% had faith in their Chiefs.

Sub-Question a

In sub question a, the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s
morale in regards to retention rates was positively correlated as $p < 0.01$. The $H_{a2}$ hypothesis
was accepted as a strong positive relationship existed. In the first correlation to test a
relationship, low morale was compared to the officer considering leaving their law enforcement
agency. This correlation was not statistically significant in SPSS as it displayed that there was no
correlation between low morale and the officers decision to leave a law enforcement agency. The
second correlation was essential to understanding whether a relationship existed between morale
and the decision on whether an officer decides to remain or leave a law enforcement agency.
This correlation was statistically significant as $p<0.01$. In a small law enforcement agency,
23.53% of law enforcement officers were considering leaving their law enforcement agency, and
35.29% of the law enforcement officers noted low morale. In a medium law enforcement agency
14.29% of law enforcement officers were considering leaving their law enforcement agency, and
50% of the survey population noted low morale. In 2 large law enforcement agencies, 27.43% of
law enforcement officers were considering leaving their law enforcement agency, and 51.12% of
the survey population noted low morale.

Additionally, in a small law enforcement agency 76.47% of law enforcement officers
noted that they were not considering leaving their agency, and 64.71% of law enforcement
officers in the small agency noted high morale. In a medium law enforcement agency 85.71% of
law enforcement officers noted that they were not considering leaving their agency, and 50% of the survey population for a medium agency noted the morale as high. In 2 large law enforcement agencies 72.57% of law enforcement officers noted that they were not considering leaving their agency, and 48.88% of the survey population in large agencies rated the morale as high. Statistically, a law enforcement officer’s morale influenced the officer’s decision to remain within a law enforcement agency. Higher morale influenced higher retention rates and lower morale influenced lower retention rates.

Sub-Question b

In subquestion b, the data displayed the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates was not statistically significant as the p value was 0.667. The correlation tested to see if a relationship existed between low morale and the officer considering to leave their agency and to find a new job within the next year. This correlation was essential to understanding whether a relationship existed between morale and the decision on whether an officer decides to leave a law enforcement agency. Based on the correlational analysis, the alternative hypotheses were rejected, and the null hypothesis was accepted as no relationship existed between low morale and an officers decision to leave the law enforcement agency. In a small law enforcement agency, 13.34% of law enforcement officers were considering leaving their law enforcement agency within the next year, and 35.29% of the small agency survey population noted low morale. In a medium law enforcement agency, 7.14% of law enforcement officers in the survey population noted they were considering leaving their law enforcement agency within the next year, and 50% of law enforcement officers noted low morale. In 2 large law enforcement agencies, 18.52% of law enforcement officers in the survey population noted that they were considering leaving their law enforcement agency within the
next year and 51.12% of the survey population noted morale as low. Statistically, low morale influenced an officer’s decision to leave a law enforcement agency.

The results of the study established a strong positive relationship between leadership and morale, and retention and turnover rates within law enforcement agencies. Statistically, research question 1 established a strong positive relationship regarding leadership and morale as p<0.01, subquestion a established a strong positive relationship between high law enforcement officer’s morale and retention rates as p<0.01, and subquestion a established that no statistically significant relationship existed between low morale and turnover rates within law enforcement agencies.

**Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature**

The researcher focused the scope of the study on the examination of leadership’s relationship with morale, which was crucial as it complimented past studies of morale, retention, and turnover rates through the lens of leadership directly relating to morale in a law enforcement context. The methodological literature review set the foundation for defining leadership, leadership styles, transformational leadership, servant leadership, leaderships relationship with workplace morale, and law enforcement officer’s morale. Foundationally, it was imperative to understand how leadership was defined and the various types of leadership styles that exist. At the heart of leadership, one cannot assume that a hierarchy of leadership means good leadership. Effective leadership was not defined by how well it was organized within an organization or agency, but rather defined by leadership’s correlational relationship with its subordinates. When leadership was strategically defined, as seen through Fullan and Scott (2009), it was not defined singularly by an authoritarian style of leadership or even an individualized or situational leadership style.
Instead, research concluded leadership should strive to become more like transformational leaders who focus their energies on vision, long-term goals, aligning and changing systems, and developing and training others” (Khan, Nawaz, & Khan, 2016, p. 6). Essentially, leadership was not only defined by one’s ability to lead and guide others, but also by “leadership motivating diverse people, to work together to get results never before obtained” (p. 97). The results obtained through this study included the examination of how leadership relates to morale, retention and turnover rates.

Previous research found through creating a leadership environment that was positive and supported high morale resulted in an environment where people feel good at work (Brandi, 2014). Research also indicated when poor leadership was employed within police departments; officers tended to feel “dissatisfied with their job environment, a lack of excitement, disrespect, less authority and inferiority” (Gillilan, 2017, pp. 152–153). Many leadership styles exist to show how each leader is unique in their leading style (Globe, 2004; Goleman, 2017; Greenleaf, 1970). Because every individual is different, so is every leadership style. However, leadership style and approach can also vary based on organization and situation (Globe, 2004). While this study did not find a preferred method of leadership, it was clear that an understanding of the complexity of leadership needed to be examined. While some leadership styles may lead to higher morale at some law enforcement agencies, this is not a guarantee for all law enforcement agencies. Therefore, this study sought to solely examine if a relationship existed between leadership and morale through the main research question that guided the study.

However, Milton (2011) led the researcher to further examine the methodological literatures regarding the leadership styles of transformational leadership and servant leadership. Transformational leadership was more than just a leadership style; instead, it “empowers
followers and brings about positive changes in the lives of the followers” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 11). Transformational leadership is known to “motivate the followers to pursue higher goals” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 11). When transformational leadership is understood, it was evident this model motivates to inspire positive and productive work. Bass and Riggio (2006) reminded leaders that “transformational leaders motivate and inspire those around them by valuing work . . . and challenging staff to achieve more” (p. 17). The leadership style of servant leadership often coincided with transformational leadership, as the servant leadership style also empowered leaders and subordinates within a work environment. Through research, servant leadership has the potential to shift the entire pedagogy and known hierarchy of leadership within police departments as it calls leaders to become servants. Servant leadership is a style of leadership that is defined as a leader who “listens intently, understands the needs of followers, and empathizes with followers in order to connect well with them” (Muthia & Krishnan, 2015, p. 10). The survey questions to the law enforcement officers did address some of the components of transformational-servant leadership.

As previously displayed in the Detailed Analysis of Chapter 4 regarding the main research question of the extent to which a relationship existed between leadership and morale among law enforcement officers, this section outlined some questions regarding transformational servant leadership. The tables that briefly aided in assessing transformational servant leadership practices through asking officers if law enforcement officers were asked for their input on decisions (Table 12), if officers felt that they were in an environment that supported their employees (Table 13), confident that their voices were heard (Table 16), whether their options mattered (Table 17), felt valued (Table 24), respected (Table 25), genuine praise from leadership
(Table 26), values of integrity (Table 27), and if officers are satisfied with the amount of praise that they receive (Table 32).

Table 12 revealed that overall out of the four law enforcement agencies that 118 law enforcement officers disagreed that they are asked for their input on decisions that affect them at work, while 138 officers agreed. Table 13 revealed 84 officers within the 4 agencies overall did not agree that the agency fostered a culture that supported employees, while 172 officers agreed. Table 16 revealed that overall 124 officers disagreed that they were confident in their voice being heard within their department, while 120 officers agreed that they were confident their voice was being heard. Table 17 displayed that 140 officers agreed that their opinions are taken into account by management, but 105 officers disagreed. Table 24 revealed 95 officers in the study did not feel valued by police department command staff, while 141 officers felt valued. Table 25 displayed overall that 164 officers felt respected by their command staff, while 73 officers did not feel respected. Table 26 displayed 86 officers felt their praise from command staff was not genuine, while 149 officers felt their command staff praise was genuine. Table 27 displayed 104 officers felt their command staff did not exemplify the values and integrity they expected from the officers, while 129 officers felt their command staff does exemplify the values and integrity they expect. Table 32 revealed 89 officers were not satisfied with the amount of praise that they received, while 146 were satisfied. While this study did not address whether transformational leadership improved morale, it was essential to understanding how officers felt about their leadership. This study sought to understand the relationship between leadership and morale.

In accompaniment with the literature review resources, the researcher found a strong positive relationship existed between low morale and low faith in leadership. The researcher also
found a strong positive relationship existed between high morale, retention rates, and faith in leadership within the Spearman rho correlation. Additionally, while other studies focused the scope of their research on the factors of morale and what influences low morale, this study placed an emphasis on specifically understanding the relationship between leadership and morale within law enforcement agencies. Hrenchir (2016) noted “low morale and a lack of confidence in leadership within the Shawnee County Sheriff’s Office” (Hrenchir, 2016, p. 1). In the current study, the researcher’s Spearman rho correlation displayed a strong positive correlation existed between low morale and low faith among law enforcement officers in Research Question 1. The researcher found within the descriptive statistics for the correlation of Research Question 1 that on average approximately 80 of the officers noted low faith in leadership and 42 officers noted low morale.

The researcher also examined literatures regarding leadership and morale, and law enforcement officers’ morale. Other studies noted low morale within law enforcement agencies (McCalister, 2016). However, Orrick (2008) clarified the main complaint for high turnover rates in police departments was indeed poor leadership. Hrenchir (2016) further discussed the issue of poor leadership and low workplace morale within police departments. In relation to the literature, this study found that not only does leadership relate to morale, but morale also related to retention rates within the study. The descriptive statistics for the Spearman rho correlations displayed on average approximately 42 officers noted low morale, and approximately 14 of the officers noted that they were making a serious effort to find a new job within the next year. The descriptive statistics for the Spearman rho correlations also displayed that on average approximately 63 officers noted that they were not considering leaving their agency, and approximately 42 officers noted high morale.
My study concurred with previous studies which found that morale is often low in law enforcement agencies. However, my data pointed to leadership as the salient factor for the relationship with morale. The researcher found leadership strongly influenced not only law enforcement officer’s morale, but also retention rates. High morale among law enforcement officers resulted in statistically lower turnover rates. In the community of scholars, investigating issues of low morale in relation to leadership is a priority to addressing cases of low morale. In the law enforcement community of leadership, the results of the study can be valuable as law enforcement agencies seek to retain more law enforcement officers, and have fewer officer turnover rates. Law enforcement agencies, companies, schools, and even businesses now have a scope to review as it pertains to issues of low morale.

**Limitations**

Throughout the study, the researcher attempted to eliminate limitations throughout the study. However, as with any study, limitations can arise at any point during the research. The first limitation arose during the process of data collection and analysis. The researcher noticed some officers were classifying themselves as being a part of a small law enforcement agency. This issue noticeably impacted the medium size law enforcement agency by resulting in fewer participants and impacted the small size law enforcement agency by resulting in more participants. In the parameters of the study, the researcher classified a small agency as being 5–50 law enforcement officers, a medium agency as being 50–200 law enforcement officers, and a large law enforcement agency as being over 200 law enforcement officers. Based on the results in Qualtrics, some officer participants classified themselves as being a part of a small law enforcement agency, when the small agency survey population only contained about 6 law enforcement officers, and not 17 officers as is recorded within the survey population count of
Qualtrics. The study could have been improved by merging all law enforcement agencies into one grouping rather than attempting to measure small, medium and large law enforcement agencies separately.

Additionally, allotting more time to allow more law enforcement agencies to contribute to the study would have strengthened the study. Time constraints constantly posed an issue throughout the study for the researcher. The researcher spent numerous hours reaching out to law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. From the time emails were sent out to law enforcement agencies, calls made, and consent forms sent out, the researcher found it took days to weeks for an agency to decide whether or not the agency wanted to participate in the study. The study could have been improved by reaching out to law enforcement agencies months before the quantitative research began by obtaining earlier approval from the Internal Review Board.

**Implications of the Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory**

The practice, policy and theory of the study were essential to understanding the relationship between leadership and morale. The practical part of the study aligned the issue of morale and the relationship of morale within law enforcement agencies. Understanding the results of the study were important to understanding not only the implications for the policies of the study, but also the theories formulated based upon previous literatures and the research results. In practice, a relationship exists between leadership and morale, and high morale and retention rates based on the Spearman rho correlations and descriptive statistics. Based on the implications, both the policies and theories surrounding the study need to be further understood and implemented.
Practice

My study essentially found that morale appeared to be an issue among law enforcement agencies, and that leadership appeared to have a relationship with morale. Morale, in turn, appeared to establish a relationship with a law enforcement officer’s decision on whether or not to remain with a law enforcement agency. Statistically, in a small law enforcement agency, 64.71% of law enforcement officers noted high morale, while 35.29% noted low morale. In a medium law enforcement agency, 50% of the population rated morale as high and the other 50% of the survey population rated morale as low. In large law enforcement agencies, 48.88 % of the survey population rated morale as high, while 51.12% of the population rated morale as low. In practice, any percentage of a population within a law enforcement agency that rates morale as low is not a good statistic. The majority of law enforcement officers noted that morale was low within their law enforcement agency. Out of a 259 officer population, about 127 law enforcement officers noted low morale within their law enforcement agency.

In practice, the calculated means of the descriptive statistics in the study noted on average that out of every 80 officers having a lack of faith in their leadership, 42 officers displayed low morale. Out of the 42 officers with low morale, 22 of those law enforcement officers were considering leaving their law enforcement agency, and another 14 officers were considering finding a new job within the next year. On the contrary, based on the calculated means of the descriptive statistics, on average, out of every 63 officers who were not considering leaving their law enforcement agency, 42 of those officers noted high morale. Hence, it appeared that not only does a relationship exist between leadership and morale, but also between morale greatly influencing the officer’s decision to remain with an agency or leave an agency. In practice, if morale is low within law enforcement agencies, then agencies could immediately survey officers
to identify areas of low morale in order to address the reasons for the low morale. Additionally, if turnover rates are high within a law enforcement agency, then the departmental Chief or commanding officer could offer a confidential exit interview to examine why the law enforcement officer is leaving the agency.

Policy

At the beginning of the study, I expected to find a mixed amount of law enforcement officers noting morale as both high and low. I also expected to find low morale as a reflection of low faith in leadership, and if morale was high, then officers would have had high faith in their leadership. As indicated throughout this research study, “many officers have said that morale is low in their departments, explaining that it has been this way for years. However, declining morale was not something that generally occurred overnight. Oftentimes, morale simply slipped away” (Johnson, 2015, para. 4). Low morale did not occur over-night and not just with one or a few officers within the law enforcement agencies. Instead, this study found that low morale was a much larger issue than expected, especially in regard to the strong positive cor relational relationship between leadership and morale.

If law enforcement agencies are struggling with low morale, then agencies should implement policies to leadership to actively encourage high morale. Some implications for policy can include:

1. Law enforcement agencies introducing leadership courses for present leadership and new leadership recruits.

2. The South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy requiring annual leadership courses for all law enforcement agencies in South Carolina.
3. Law enforcement agencies offering annual anonymous morale surveys to law enforcement officers.

4. Agencies command staff acknowledging issues of low morale among law enforcement officers and addressing issues of low morale accordingly.

While these implications may be out of the scope of the study, law enforcement agencies should actively play a role in leadership and encouraging morale. Leadership can aid in factors that relate to morale such as discussing and working to raise pay of officers, training leadership more effectively, recognizing the needs of officers, creating more growth and advancement opportunities for officers, and working to equip and fund officers better. Schafer (2009) understood the importance for “developing effective leaders and leadership behaviors” (Schafer, 2009, p. 238). Law enforcement agencies should consider implementing leadership courses to help train leaders on effective leadership and to recognize possible negative styles of leadership.

The South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy could also require leadership personnel at law enforcement agencies to complete annual leadership courses for leadership recertification. Law enforcement agencies could also periodically survey officers anonymously to test morale among law enforcement officers within the agency. Overall, this study found morale was an issue at the heart of leadership, and thus it is imperative for leadership to take more proactive roles to encourage high morale, faith and confidence among law enforcement officers.

Theory

The conceptual-theoretical framework for the study set the foundation for the relationship between leadership practices, morale, turnover rates, and retention rates. All theories regarding the relationship between leadership and morale derived from the theory of the researcher that there has to be more to low morale issues than just pay, benefits, stress, work hours, and so forth.
The four common theories that emerged within this study involved leadership, morale, retention, and turnover rates. Thus, a relationship existed between leadership and morale, and in result a relationship existed between morale and retention rates within law enforcement agencies.

In the first theory of leadership, two theories emerged between effective leadership and poor leadership. Effective leadership practices could be said to lead to higher morale and high retention rates. However, contrary to effective leadership was the category of poor leadership. In theory, poor leadership tactics can be a reflection of a leadership that does not retain employees, resulting in high turnover rates and low morale (Greenleaf 1970 & Orrick, 2008). Schafer (2009) addressed how: “Insufficient leadership in policing can result in significant negative consequences for agencies and their personnel” (Schafer, 2009, p. 238).

In the second theory of morale, leadership was the independent variable that influenced morale. A vast majority of research understood that today’s law enforcement leaders are the driving force within law enforcement agencies. Leaders in the police force have a direct and indirect relationship with the morale of the law enforcement community. A major issue identified within law enforcement agencies today involved officers who leave their careers in law enforcement due to low faith in their leadership. Therefore, because a relationship existed between leadership and morale, a relationship also existed between the other theory of retention rates. Theoretically, if leadership resulted in law enforcement officers having high morale, then a law enforcement agency will see high retention rates. However, the statistical analysis displayed that even though an officer’s morale may be low, it does not mean that they will leave the law enforcement agency.
Overall, the results of this study indicated that the theories applied to the relationship between leadership and morale. Law enforcement officers who have complete trust and confidence in their leaders, on average had higher morale. On the contrary, officers who do not have complete trust and confidence in their leaders, on average had lower morale. A positive correlational relationship existing between leadership and morale is no longer a theory to be tested and proven. Instead, the theory of a relationship existing between leadership and morale was proven through quantitative data analysis. The data analysis strongly and positively correlated a relationship between leadership and morale, and retention rates.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

In the event this study was to be replicated, a few recommendations would be necessary. The first recommendation would be to survey law enforcement agencies of all the same size or law enforcement officers from a plurality of agencies rather than individual agencies. This would allow the researcher to survey a larger sample size. The current study found a positive relationship existed between leadership and morale; and morale establishing a relationship with retention rates among the four law enforcement agencies. Another recommendation would be to survey law enforcement officers from the scope of examining leadership. Law enforcement officers could be asked to identify their preferred method of leadership in one survey question, and then in another survey question law enforcement officers could be asked to identify their current leadership’s leading method. This would allow a future researcher to examine whether a certain leadership style leads to low morale and whether other leadership styles influence higher morale.

Other methodologies should also be considered in future research. A researcher could use interviews and observations to gain a personal account of law enforcement officer’s morale in
relation to leadership. Additionally, a future researcher could seek to use a qualitative methodology to identify a preferred method of leadership that would increase morale and retention rates among law enforcement agencies. The study of leadership is a topic that can be investigated from a plurality of viewpoints within a law enforcement agency. Future researchers could examine through a study group how one leadership style impacts employees in comparison with another study group. Study groups would allow a researcher to identify not only a preferred method of leadership, but also how participants respond to various leadership styles.

**Conclusion**

The overall impact of this study was to understand that leadership does statistically have a relationship with morale, as well as retention rates. The study showed that if morale is high, then retention rates were high. Morale is important to any organization, whether it is a law enforcement agency, a corporation, a school, or even a small town business. Orrick (2008) found “the number one internal factor affecting an employee’s decision to stay or leave a job is the relationship with their immediate supervisor” (p. 8). Law enforcement officers are employed to serve and protect the communities in which they serve. While there are many stresses of being a law enforcement officer, an officer’s stress should result primarily from their daily tasks. However, low morale is an issue at the heart of many law enforcement officers. Leadership related to morale, regardless of whether or not the leader noticed this occurring. The purpose of the study was to examine whether a relationship existed between the independent variable of leadership and the dependent variables of officer’s morale and law enforcement agencies morale in reflection of retention and turnover rates. Based on these purposes, this study was conducted to answer the following research question and subquestions (a–b):
1. To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?

   a. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?

   b. What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

In order to answer the research questions, the researcher conducted a 49 question Likert-type survey in Qualtrics to survey law enforcement officers from four varying law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. The law enforcement agencies varied in size (small, medium, large) and in geographical location. The questions addressed demographics of the population, leadership, morale, retention and turnover rates. Respondents were allowed to skip over any questions that they did not want to answer, and the respondents were allowed to stop the survey at any time. Once all officers had about a 2-week time period to complete the survey, the data collection process ended. All data were analyzed using Qualtrics, and SPSS to perform the Spearman rho correlations.

In Research Question 1, the relationship between low morale and low faith was positively correlated in the Spearman rho correlation as $p < 0.01$. This strong positive correlation displayed that low morale in law enforcement agencies was a direct reflection of leadership and officers not having full confidence and trust in their leadership. In subquestion a, the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regard to retention rates was positively correlated as $p < 0.01$. This strong positive correlation displayed a positive relationship existed between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to
retention rates within law enforcement departments. In subquestion b, the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates was not statistically significant. subquestion b displayed that even if an officer’s morale is low, it does not necessarily mean that they will leave the law enforcement agency. The researcher accepted the alternative hypotheses for research question 1 and 2 (H\textsubscript{a1}, H\textsubscript{a2}). However, the researcher rejected the alternative hypothesis for subquestion b, and accepted the null hypothesis (H\textsubscript{03}).

Based on the positive correlations, law enforcement agencies should understand that leadership influences morale. Morale may also be measured using the factor of leadership, alongside of the common factors of stress, work hours, pay, benefits, and so forth. Additionally, law enforcement agencies should become more aware that morale influenced a law enforcement agency’s retention and turnover rates. The study results may positively impact law enforcement agencies through understanding the relationship between leadership and morale. Overall, this study hoped to provide valuable insight regarding leadership, morale, retention rates, and turnover rates among law enforcement agencies and their law enforcement officers.
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Appendix A: Demographic Survey Questions

Question 1: Would you classify your department as being a small, medium, or large agency?
   a. small (5–50 officers)
   b. medium (50–200 officers)
   c. large (200 or more officers)

Question 2: How many years have you been a law enforcement officer?
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1–5 years
   c. 5–10 years
   d. 10–20 years
   e. 20 years+
   f. Prefer not to answer

Question 3: How much time have you worked for this department?
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1–5 years
   c. 5–10 years
   d. 10–20 years
   e. 20+ years
   f. Prefer not to answer

Question 4: What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Prefer not to answer

Question 5: What is your ethnicity?
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native
   b. Asian
   c. African American
   d. Hispanic or Latino
   e. Native Hawaiian or Other Specific
   f. Caucasian or White
   g. Prefer not to answer
Appendix B: Adapted North Carolina Department of Justice (2016): Law Enforcement
Retention Study Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment of Survey Questions to Research Questions: Key*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a= What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b= What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1:** Are you considering leaving your agency? Relates to Research Question a
- A) yes
- B) no

**Question 2:** If you considered leaving your agency was it to go to a different law enforcement agency or a different job industry Relates to Research Question b
- A) Different agency
- B) Different job industry

**Question 3:** Please rate the overall job satisfaction (morale) within your police department? Relates to Research Question 1
- A) High
- B) Low

**Question 4:** I’m asked for my input on decisions that affect me at work.
- A) Strongly Disagree Relates to Research Question 1
- B) Disagree
- C) Agree
- D) Strongly Agree

**Question 5:** The agency fosters a culture which supports employees.
- A) Strongly Disagree Relates to Research Question 1
- B) Disagree
- C) Agree
- D) Strongly Agree

### Alignment of Survey Questions to Research Questions:

**Key**

- 1= To what extent, if any, does a relationship exist between leadership within the police department and the morale of law enforcement officers and the overall workplace morale?
- **Sub Questions:**
  - a= What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?
  - b= What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale and Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>Aligns with Research Questions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my job at this department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my job originates primarily from within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the department values longevity in the workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department management values quality of work over quantity of statistics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that my voice is heard within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When possible my opinion is taken into account by management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seriously considered looking for a job with another police department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seriously considered looking for another job outside of law enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking everything into consideration, I plan on making a serious effort to find a new job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within the next year.

Promotions are based primarily on merit. 1

Special unit assignments are based primarily on merit. 1

Morale is important to my daily performance of duties in this department. 1

I would recommend this department to friends as a good place to work. a

I am satisfied with the relationships I have with my coworkers. a

A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my work group (unit or shift). a

People treat each other with respect in my work group (unit or shift). a

I am satisfied with promotional opportunities. a

I am satisfied with my coworkers. a

I do not have the level of job security that I feel I should have. b

I am satisfied with the morale within this department. 1

My current overall level of satisfaction with my job here is high. a

### Administration and Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating procedures are communicated in a clear and timely manner.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>Aligns with Research Question*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management clearly communicates what is expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued by the police department Command Staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected by the department Command Staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise that I receive from the command staff is genuine.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Command Staff exemplifies the values and integrity it expects of the officers.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department operates from a belief system that values doing the right thing.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department functions from a strong value system rather than a “gotcha” mentality.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double standards are used by the administration in the disciplinary action.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in the leadership of this department.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the amount of praise that I receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel micromanaged.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management trusts in my ability to do my job effectively without constant direction.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have faith in leadership of the Sergeants of this department.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have faith in the leadership of the Captains of this department.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have faith in the Majors of this department.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have faith in leadership of the Chief of this department.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Consent for Surveying

**Research Study Title:** A Correlational Study: Understanding the Relationship Between Leadership and Morale within Law Enforcement Agencies  
**Principal Investigator:** Michael C. Minto  
**Research Institution:** Concordia University  
**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. James Therrell

**Purpose and what you will be doing:**  
The purpose of the survey will be to determine whether leadership relates to morale among law enforcement officers within law enforcement agencies. To be in the study, you can complete this online survey. Completing the survey should take less than 20 minutes of your time. The online survey is anonymous. We will not ask you any personal identifying information and we will have no record of who completes this survey.

**Risks/Benefits:**  
There are no risks to participating in this study other than the everyday risk of you being on your computer as you take this survey. The benefit to this survey is all answers provided are invaluable, as it will aid in assessing and evaluating leadership’s relation to morale especially in the regard to the relationship between morale, retention and turnover rates.

**Confidentiality:**  
The information, regarding specific individualized answers from the survey, will not be distributed to any other agency or principal investigator and will be kept private and confidential. All data is collected anonymously. If you were to write something that made it to where we predict that someone could possibly deduce your identity, we would not include this information in any publication or report. Additionally, in order to protect anonymity, the department name will not be included within the present study, only the geographical location being South Carolina and the agency size being classified as either a small, medium or large agency. And data you provide would be held privately. All data will be destroyed three years after the study ends. You can get a copy of this form by printing or emailing the investigator.

**Right to Withdraw:**  
The participant’s participation is greatly appreciated, but the principal investigator also acknowledges that the questions the survey is asking are somewhat personal in nature. The participant is free at any point to choose not to engage with or stop the study at any time. The participant may skip any questions in which they do not wish to answer. This study is not required and there is no penalty nor repercussions for not participating.
Contact Information:
You will receive a copy of this consent form. If you have any questions you may write the principal investigator, Michael Minto, at [redacted]. If you want to talk with a participant advocate other than the principal investigator, please fill free to write or call the director of our institutional review board, Dr. OraLee Branch (email obranch@cu-portland.edu or call: 503-493-6390).

Your Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. I asked questions if I had them, and my questions were answered. I volunteer my consent for the department to participate in this quantitative survey study.

_______________________________  _____________
Department Name  Date

_______________________________  _____________
Department Representative Signature  Date

_______________________________  _____________
Investigator Name  Date

_______________________________  _____________
Investigator Signature  Date
Appendix E: Permissions (2) to Use Surveys


   Good Morning Mr. Minto,
   You have permission to use the law enforcement retention study completed by the North Carolina Criminal Justice Training and Standards Division on November 18, 2016. If I can be of any further assistance please let me know.
   Thank you,
   Steven

   Steven G. Combs  
   Director  
   Criminal Justice Standards Division  
   1700 Tryon Park Drive  
   Raleigh, North Carolina 27610  
   919.661.5980


   Absolutely, feel free! Best wishes in regards to your dissertation.

   Ali Bowen, Research Analyst  
   National Fraternal Order of Police  
   ABowen@fop.net  
   615-902-3048 (direct line) 615-732-9484 (cell) 615-399-0400 (fax)

   This communication is intended for informational purposes only. No part of this communication is intended to constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon in lieu of consultation with appropriate legal advisors in your own jurisdiction.
Appendix F: Published Survey Results (Tested) from the North Carolina Department of Justice (2016).

Full results of the published Results and Test are located at the Survey Link:

https://www.ncdoj.gov/getdoc/1f68a32a-ebfc-4eca-b93d-958a6e726dc8/Law-Enforcement-Retention-Survey-Results.aspx
Appendix G: Published Survey Results (Tested) Anders, B., Poston, W., Jahnke, S., & Haddock, C. (n.d.). Commerce City Police Department Morale Survey Summary.

Full results of the published Results and Test are located at the Survey Link:

http://www.denverfop27.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Commerce-City-PD-Survey-Results_FINAL.pdf
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Appendix I: Qualtrics Likert Scaling Graphs

Results from the Survey

1. Please rate the overall job satisfaction (morale) within your police department.

   Small Agency

   ![Small Agency Graph]

   Medium Agency

   ![Medium Agency Graph]

   Large Agency

   ![Large Agency Graph]
2. I’m asked for my input on decisions that affect me at work.

Small Agency

[Bar chart showing responses]

Medium Agency

[Bar chart showing responses]

Large Agency

[Bar chart showing responses]
3. The agency fosters a culture which supports employees.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 4: Pressure from my job originates primarily from within the department.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 5: The department management values quality of work over quantity of statistics.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 6: I am confident that my voice is heard within the department.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 7: When possible my opinion is taken into account by management.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 8: Promotions are based primarily on merit.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 9: Special unit assignments are based primarily on merit.

Small Agency

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 10: Morale is important to my daily performance of duties in this department.

Small Agency

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 11: I am satisfied with the morale within this department.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 12: Operating procedures are communicated in a clear and timely manner.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 13: Management clearly communicates what is expected of me.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
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Question 14: I feel valued by the police department Command Staff.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 15: I feel respected by the department Command Staff.

Small Agency

Strongly agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

Strongly agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly disagree

Large Agency

Strongly agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly disagree
Question 16: The praise that I receive from the command staff is genuine.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 17: The Command Staff exemplifies the values and integrity it expects of the officers.
Question 18: The department operates from a belief system that values doing the right thing.
Question 19: The department functions from a strong value system rather than a “gotcha” mentality.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 20: Double standards are used by the administration in the disciplinary action.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 21: I feel confident in the leadership of this department.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 22: I am satisfied with the amount of praise that I receive.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 23: I often feel micromanaged.

**Small Agency**

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**

**Medium Agency**

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**

**Large Agency**

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
Question 24: Management trusts in my ability to do my job effectively without constant direction.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 25: I have faith in leadership of the Sergeants of this department.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 26: I have faith in the leadership of the Captains of this department.
Question 27: I have faith in the Majors of this department.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 28: I have faith in leadership of the Chief of this department.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Part a. The following survey questions and response results will answer: What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to retention rates within law enforcement departments?

1. Are you considering leaving your agency?

   **Small Agency**

   ![Bar chart for Small Agency showing responses to the question]

   **Medium Agency**

   ![Bar chart for Medium Agency showing responses to the question]

   **Large Agency**

   ![Bar chart for Large Agency showing responses to the question]
Question 2: I feel that the department values longevity in the workplace.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 3: I would recommend this department to friends as a good place to work.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 4: I am satisfied with the relationships I have with my coworkers.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 5: A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my work group (unit or shift).

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
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Question 6: People treat each other with respect in my work group (unit or shift).

Small Agency

- Strongly agree: [Full Bar]
- Agree: [Full Bar]
- Disagree: [Partial Bar]
- Strongly disagree: [Small Bar]

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree: [Full Bar]
- Agree: [Full Bar]
- Disagree: [Partial Bar]
- Strongly disagree: [Small Bar]

Large Agency

- Strongly agree: [Full Bar]
- Agree: [Full Bar]
- Disagree: [Small Bar]
- Strongly disagree: [Empty Bar]
Question 7: I am satisfied with opportunities for promotion.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 8: I am satisfied with my coworkers.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
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Question 9: My current overall level of satisfaction with my job here is high.

Small Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Medium Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Large Agency

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Part b. The following survey questions and response results will answer: What is the relationship between leadership and law enforcement officer’s morale in regards to turnover rates within law enforcement departments?

1. **If you considered leaving your agency was it to go to a different law enforcement agency or a different job industry?**

   - **Small Agency**
   - **Medium Agency**
   - **Large Agency**
Question 2: I am satisfied with my job at this department.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 3: I have seriously considered looking for a job with another police department.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
Question 4: I have seriously considered looking for another job outside of law enforcement.
Question 5: Taking everything into consideration, I plan on making a serious effort to find a new job within the next year.

- Small Agency

- Medium Agency

- Large Agency
Question 6: I do not have the level of job security that I feel I should have.

Small Agency

Medium Agency

Large Agency
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