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ABSTRACT

Current literature on policing indicates that the retention rate of patrol officers is on a steady decline. Varying factors that encompass policing as a whole, including fatigue, stress, and workload, appear to be some of the reasons for turnover rates in police departments. This paper examines the perceptions of issues related to job satisfaction and correlating factors in order to substantiate patrol officers’ views of contemporary policing in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania. Municipal police officers from several south central Pennsylvania police departments were surveyed to determine any significant differences between their discernment of job satisfaction and previous research regarding police perceptions of job satisfaction, to include any correlations of satisfaction with administration, shiftwork, equipment, community support, and other organizational issues.
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Chapter One:

Introduction
According to Dantzker & Surrette (1997), since 1974, over 2,000 studies have been published regarding the study of job satisfaction; however, the numbers of studies assessing job satisfaction in police organizations within this timeframe were limited to only 34. Dantzker & Surrette (1997) further note that investigating job satisfaction issues in policing is critical because low satisfaction can affect how officers perform and, ultimately lead to an entire department’s level of efficiency. Social researchers can benefit from exploring causality of job satisfaction levels in policing so police administrators can become aware of internal conflicts in an effort to reduce stress, improve productivity, decrease turnover, and improve morale.

In a report published by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) (2004), historically smaller police departments have had more difficulties in retaining patrol officers than have larger agencies. Yet, upwards of 45% of officers who left small agencies continued to work in a law enforcement capacity (NIJ, 2004). While it is clear that there are factors that influence an officer’s decision to leave his/her respective department, it is not always apparent as to the extent of their levels of on-the-job satisfaction as it pertains to job induced stressors or internal conflicts. The notion that the nature of police work is exciting and unequalled is rooted in a façade of cinema and the media; television shows, such as CSI, Law & Order, and COPS gives way to citizen’s perceptions of the police officer mentality; studies indicate that, by and large, citizens are perceptually unaware of what patrol officers actually do.

A strong decision for an officer to resign from his/her department may be closely correlated to lower levels of job satisfaction, affecting that officer both in and outside the department; the latter meaning that police officers are generally considered police officers 24 hours a day and may be obligated to disengage in certain activities while off duty as departmental policies and procedures prohibit actions due to their status in the community. For example, some officers desire a second job to supplement income; some departments have
policies that dictate off duty work requires approval by the chief. Also, frequenting known
nuisance businesses and locations as well as hanging out with persons of ill-repute may be
restricted. Additionally, some departments may require the officer and his/her family to live
within a pre-determined radius from their principal jurisdiction, thus limiting the officer’s choice
to reside and affecting cost of living issues; this particular protocol is generally utilized for
larger, metropolitan departments.

Retention in contemporary policing today has been gaining as much attention to
administrators as recruiting. Yearwood (2003), found that “80 percent of the responding
agencies lost officers to larger law enforcement agencies, suggesting that higher salaries and
more competitive benefits may explain these losses” (p. 23). Yearwood (2003) concluded that
the average length of an officer’s employment is 34 months; additionally, it’s noted that 84% of
the agencies reported an average length of stay to less than three years. The two most important
factors determined by officer’s view of improving their departments in Yearwood’s (2003) study
were definitively rooted in obtaining better salaries and benefits.

Koper, Maguire, & Moore (2002) also note that police officers serve for shorter periods
in smaller agencies than in large agencies, and that “half of officers leaving large agencies but
only a fifth of those leaving small agencies are retirees” (p. iii). This may appear significantly
different; even considering the numbers per capita, but when administration, organization, shift
differentials, and other factors are considered, there seems to be noteworthy differences in
satisfaction levels between large and small agencies. These, and other dynamics, are examined
here to compare and contrast levels of job satisfaction with police officers in small (departments
with less than 50 patrol officers), predominantly suburban police departments, in south central
Pennsylvania; more specifically, municipal departments in Cumberland County.
While addressing the projection of job satisfaction in policing is not considered a new venue, results of such studies can provide important insight which may prove valuable to administrators of law enforcement. Among several factors indicating an officer’s perception of job satisfaction, this researcher takes into account the overall perceptions of stress in policing as an acting byproduct of the individual variables considered in this study. The theory here is that correlations of stress-induced procedures, precipitated by a working environment, have presumably been a key factor in the determination of job satisfaction.

The suggestion that stress can be translated between both an individual’s private life and career indicate that there may be no true measurement or indicator as to where a stressful environment originates. However, certain variables, contained within atmospheric working conditions, have the propensity of compounding sources of strain that originate both in and outside an individual’s career environment. While the number of occupations that can introduce profuse amounts of stress on the job are as limitless as the initiators which produce the stress, the craft of policing has been shown to encompass a wide variety of both external and internal variances of stress in the presence of their duties that appear to be a standard in which few other occupations encounter.
Chapter Two:

Literature Review
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction in policing pertains to the subjective ideals of an individual officer’s perception about how they view specific aspects about how his or her department is administrated in addition to variables outside the department, and how these variables affect the officers’ mental and physical status. Determining job satisfaction in policing has typically been conducted through means of surveys. Barnes, Sheley, Logsdon, & Sutherland (2004) conducted a job satisfaction survey which, when administered, resulted in a 76% response rate out of a total 1108 deputies, sergeants, and lieutenants; these were randomly selected for a sum of 844. The questionnaire included the ratings of: shift assignment (to include shiftwork), employee relationships, supervision, compensation, and policy resources to name a few. Interestingly, the overall ambience of responders’ attitudes pointed toward a lessening of job satisfaction with more years on the job (Barnes et al., 2004). Males tended to have a higher degree of job satisfaction than women; however, this was seen as dependent on the multivariate levels of education, marital status, and whether or not they had children (Barnes et al., 2004).

Dantzker & Surrette (1997) utilized a 23-point job satisfaction table with related questions involving: community relations, in-service training, current administrators, educational requirements for recruits, off-duty job policy, grievance processes, promotional systems, general duties, report systems, equipment, and supervisory satisfaction. This particular study used a large sample size of 2611 officers from 14 agencies in seven states. Of the 23 questions on the questionnaire, Dantzker & Surrette (1997) deduced that officers were satisfied with only seven of the variables with “present assignment” having the highest satisfaction score. Dantzker & Surrette (1997) concluded in their job satisfaction research that, although there is an indication that generally the police are happy being police, “when being a police officer is divided into
several facets, and these facets are examined, it is interpreted that there is less satisfaction” (p. 11).

Carlan (2007), in addition to other similar independent articles on job satisfaction, included the scope of biographical demographic information on the survey. Ultimately, Carlan (2007) established that basic demographic information, at best, exerted only a small influence on the outcome of job satisfaction as independent variables. Interestingly, Carlan (2007) found that “the most instrumental elements associated with job satisfaction elevation are social contribution, pay, adventure/excitement, autonomy, peer respect and job security” (p. 83). Moreover, the study found that officer’s who alluded to having traits of being more open-minded and creative in their thinking, had slightly higher levels of job satisfaction (Carlan, 2007).

Jaramillo, Nixon, & Sams (2005) found that, in addition to job satisfaction, there was evidence to indicate a direct relationship between group cohesiveness and organizational commitment. Accordingly, group cohesiveness can provide a coping mechanism with on the job stress, thus aiding in the development of positive attitudes and ultimately affecting overall job satisfaction and performance. Organizational commitment, as noted by Dantzker (1997), laments to its direct reflection on police department size. Dantzker (1997) found that departments employing less than 100 officers had a higher rate of job satisfaction, as opposed to departments that employ between 101 to 500 officers. This may be the result of commitment by the hierarchal organizational structure, to employ a more cohesive and less rigidly structured environment for the police officers (Dantzker, 1997).
Administration

Patrol officers are inherently forced to deal with issues stemming from decisions made by both line supervisors and the department’s top administration. The role of leadership in policing is based on a system of a bureaucratic hierarchy. Stevens (2008) notes:

It can be argued that, should police managers lack specific leadership skills, tension among their officers could be very high. Thus, poor leadership style gives rise to stress among police officers…professional leadership skills can enhance public confidence toward the police and help bring the police closer to their organizational mission (p. 103).

In 2000, Robin Engel released a study that described the effects of supervisory styles and the effects on officer behavior. The research was limited to line supervisory roles, or direct supervisors, and the effects on a patrol officer’s decision making skills. The findings concluded that, although supervisory styles were not a significant predictor of patrol officer’s decision(s) to make an arrest, it did show that actively engaged direct supervisors had a positive influence on a patrol officer’s decision to conduct more community policing and peer engagement (Engel, 2000). Hoath, Schneider, & Starr (1998) expanded on the notion of community policing and job satisfaction in the notion that “there are features of the work environment prescribed by community policing that may contribute to increased levels of job satisfaction” (p. 346).

Organizational structure in large departments appear to be inherently configured differently than smaller departments in regard to chain of command makeup, levels of regulation, policies and procedures, and officer discretion. Poole, Regoli, & Lotz (1978) balanced connections of professionalism, alienation, and cynicism in both small and large police departments. Interestingly, the conclusion of their findings found that officers in smaller departments had a higher rate of autonomy due to their structure; in larger departments,
autonomy is rare and precious, and it seemed that organizational effectiveness required greater coordination (Poole et. al, 1978). Results from this particular study did find, albeit slight, a correlation with work alienation, cynicism, and professionalism in policing with the actual structure, hierarchy, and autonomy given to officers in both large and small departments.

To further accentuate organizational commitment, Jaramillo et al. (2005) utilized a survey instrument to 150 police officers in six different law enforcement agencies in order to determine internal stress on officers within their perspective departments. Jaramillo et al. (2005) established that the most important stressors in explaining organizational commitment are promotion, upward mobile opportunities, and supervisor support. Toch (2002) further noted that political connections and ethnicity play an important role in promotion decisions.

**Equipment**

In 2003, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) published an annual report on police staffing, procedures, and operations regarding community policing; in addition, various policing equipment data emerged from the report. Contained in the details, it was noted that, although all police departments examined by the report required their officers to carry firearms, only 71% of local police departments mandated field officers to wear protective body armor at least some of the time (BJS, 2003). This was seen as a substantial increase, as opposed to 1990, where only 30% of officers were required some type of body armor on duty (BJS, 2003).

Nonlethal weapons, or weapons designed to stun and/or incapacitate a suspect without the imminent threat of death, have expanded exponentially in the past decade. Some of these items include various types of pepper sprays, tazers, and soft projectiles. More recently, public perceptions in the applications of these tactics have been shown to be controversial. Properly fitted and/or working personal equipment (equipment carried on the officer’s person) is an
important issue when considering the notion that an officer has this equipment on him/herself for their entire shift. Handed down equipment, poor maintenance, and incorrectly fitted duty gear can inhibit an officer’s daily routine, thus providing insight into an officer’s direct satisfaction with their own security. Dantzker’s (1997) agency size comparison of job satisfaction noted that the equipment subscale in smaller agencies were more satisfied than were larger agencies; this was determined by the questionnaire indicating satisfaction in regards to equipment regarding both availability and quality.

**Stress as a Byproduct**

Dantzker (1987) notes that law enforcement organizations are ranked among the top most stressful occupations worldwide. Although stress can be classified in several ways, Stevens (2008) defines stress as “a mental, emotional, or physical strain caused by anxiety or overwork” (p. 30). It is this researcher’s belief that parallels can be drawn by comparing levels of stress with levels of job satisfaction. The real difficulty arises in determining which one causes which. Haarr (2005) remarks that decisions made by new police officers to resign from their position are related to stress that may be induced by gender discrimination, family strain, conflict with coworkers, administrative ambiguity, and incorrect job expectations.

It is critical to understand the sources of police occupational stress so as to “implement strategies for reducing stressors, or, if they cannot be reduced, for assisting officers in coping effectively with them” (Morash, Haarr, & Kwak, 2006, p. 27). The understanding of job related stress in policing could seemingly help facilitate a functional knowledge of police activities by the public that would normally inhibit the general population’s ambiguity and suspicions towards the policing culture.
On duty stress can impede a structurally sound working environment in many ways. The physiology of stress can result in both psychological and physical alterations. Anderson, Litzenberger, & Plecas (2002) point out that evidence of physical stress in policing can result in cardiovascular issues, digestive problems, and minor muscular degeneration. However, it is the impact of psycho-social stress that leads to physical and mental issues that are a direct reflection of a police officer’s work setting. Some of the factors related to chronic social stress are shiftwork, work overload, anticipation of incident response, fear of personal safety, time management, and work-home conflicts (Anderson et al., 2002). Violanti & Aron’s 1995 *Police Stressors* study involving 60 stress related questions showed shiftwork to be ranked sixth on the list of most stressful events in policing. Numbers one through five were ranked in order by the following: being killed in the line of duty, a fellow officer being killed, a physical attack, dealing with a battered child, and high speed chases.

Stevens (2008) provides information that contemporary police officers “must function as counselors, social workers, psychologists, negotiators, and investigators, as well as traditional police officers, and then they have to go home to their families and friends” (p. 34). Stevens (2008) also argues that policing is among the most visible, immediate, and intimately involved position that encompasses the public eye. The adaptation for an officer to shape their behaviors and attitude, while encountering different incidents, accentuates the functionality of that individual to repress his or her self-actualization (Stevens, 2008).

Violanti & Aron (1995) generally define police stressors as “factors in the police environment external to the officer and subjectively perceived as being bothersome or frustrating” (p. 288). An extension to this concept can be noted by Kop & Euwema’s 2001 study, *Occupational Stress and the Use of Force by Dutch Police Officers*. Kop & Euwema (2001) consider the most important factors of police officer stress contained within exposure to
danger, fear of the unknown, shiftwork, lack of confidence in management, and lack of internal communication. While organizational hazards emerged as the leading cause of stress in police officers, the authors found that police officers scored fairly low on emotional exhaustion as compared with other occupations; the authors consider this a result of the police officer’s need to assimilate into the *John Wayne syndrome*, indicating the false façade of police to act macho in the event of a critical incident.

Conversely, the need to conform can prove costly regarding an individual police officer’s psyche and, as a result, produce harmful effects to both their physical and mental stability. Morash et al. (2006) note that when individuals are overwhelmed with occupational stress, they can suffer from depression, heart disease, stomach disorders, alcohol and drug abuse, divorce, and suicide. The literature appears consistent with the concept that when a police officer internalizes workplace stress, their fundamental biological and mental functions begin to become inconsistent with their desired outcome, both in professional and in private life. This, in turn, leaves the officer with reduced apathy and compassion toward the general public; ultimately this phenomena can lead to burnout.

Martinussen, Richardsen, & Burke (2007) explore the complexities of police officer stress and burnout. A three dimensional aspect of burnout was identified within the study and concluded that fatigue, distant attitudes toward work, and lack of personal accomplishments, were among the top indicators of stress induced attitudes in policing (Martinussen et al., 2007). Additionally, Martinussen et al. (2007) discovered that “the most traumatic category of stressors was exposure to death and injury and dealing with victims of sexual crimes” (p. 240); these stressors were shown to produce the highest rate of internal condemners.

He, Zhao, & Archbold (2002) consider the widespread effects of stress on both male and female officers in their study; a total of 943 male officers and 157 female officers responded to a
self-reporting questionnaire. The purpose of the study was to “investigate whether levels of clinically developed measures of psychological and physical stress are similar between male and female police officers, and the impact of work environment, work-family conflict, and stress coping mechanisms” (He et al., 2002, p. 688). The study concluded that there’s evidence that female police officers have statistically significant higher levels of somatization and depression compared to male police officers (He et al., 2002). These decisive findings show there may be gender-specific variables within policing that elevate levels of stress when females are contrasted with males.

Scott (2004) conducted a study involving stress in small municipalities in south central Pennsylvania. Scott (2004) found that administrative changes were a significant predictor of stress levels. Also, Scott (2004) concluded that sudden shifts in organizational procedures were considered nerve-racking for the patrol officers and were precursors for heightened stress and viewed by many patrol officers as unnecessary.

Shiftwork

Another factor involved with policing that has a tendency to contribute to job satisfaction levels in a police setting is shiftwork. Most police departments require patrol officers to engage in shiftwork; a practice that research has found to have a potentially negative impact on personnel. Vila, Morrison, & Kenney (2002) note that constant shiftwork can starve an individual officer of necessary sleep, thus launching additional emotional demands, including fatigue, decreased alertness, and mental discomfort. Moreover, these variables could be compacted considering certain shifts can produce additional stressful occurrences for an officer, meaning that night shifts may tend to offer more severe critical incidents than day shifts.
Thibault, Lynch, & McBride (2004) maintain that departments realize criminal activity increases between the hours of 4 p.m and 2 a.m. Thibault et al. (2004) also note that “the main problem with shift redesign in traditional agencies stems from union or personnel opposition since most officers prefer day shifts” (p. 166). Regarding mandatory varying rotations in policing, “we can expect excess fatigue to adversely affect police officer’s performance health and safety, their relations to the public, and the quality of their discretionary decisions” (Vila et al, 2002, p. 5).

Barton, Spelten, & Totterdell (1995) constructed a battery of shiftwork related problems in occupations that operate on a 24-hour basis. Barton et al. (1995) provided results in their analysis of shift work, assessing that approximately 60-70% of shift workers complain of sleep disruption; it was found that a distinction could be made between “quality of sleep and behavioral strategies used to induce sleep” (p. 11). Along with Barton et al.’s (1995) shift work pattern index, fatigue and mental depravity weren’t the only factors that affected the individual. While the long term health consequences of shift work are largely unknown, Barton et al. (1995) showed that shiftworkers experienced higher rates of cardiovascular disease, digestive problems, loss of appetite, heartburn, and constipation; the study illustrates that the frequency of shiftworkers developing digestive issues is between two and five times more likely than workers who work permanent day shifts.

In general, the structure of a 12-hour shift requires officers to rotate only two shifts in their cycle. For example, a rotation of 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. would be correlated with an officer’s rotation time of 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. Eight hour shifts typically require an officer to rotate on a cycle of three shifts in a given time, i.e. days, mids, and nights. While it should be noted that many departments choose to elect permanent shifts for officers, other departments may also choose to
use variations of eight, ten, or 12-hour shifts for officers in conjunction with permanent shifts for others.

Twelve hour shifts are seemingly becoming a more popular choice in contemporary occupations; not only in policing, but also nursing, manufacturing industries, and other service organizations (Smith, Hammond, Macdonald, & Folkard, 1996). Smith et al. (1996) explored the prospects and results when comparing 8 vs. 12 hour shifts in policing. Regarding 12-hour shifts, the advantages were found to include increased possibility of larger blocks of rest days, reduced commuting, more time for scheduling meetings, and improvements in the quantity or quality of services to the public (Smith et al. 1996).

Additional positive aspects of 12-hour shifts also appear to be less physically and psychologically damaging than eight hour shifts. For example, the research showed that there was a slight increase in off duty night shift sleep quality on the 12-hour system compared to a lower quality on the rigid eight hour system (Smith et al. 1996). However, the research has evidently provided similarly negative effected distributions for both types of rotating shifts. This is because the research shown proves to be difficult when considering various individualistic extraneous variables associated with officers; to include an officer’s lifestyle, family cohesiveness, and other variables.

Overtime, in conjunction with shift work, is another related cause of officer fatigue and stress. Voluntary overtime within the jurisdictions to be surveyed, and in this researcher’s experience, can rely on state, federal, and county funded enforcement programs; such programs offered to these jurisdictions include, but are not limited to the following: Smooth Operator, Buckle-up, Click it or Ticket, and DUI checkpoints and patrols. Involuntary overtime is principally a product of court appearances; both at the magisterial and county court levels. Also, there are inherent involvements with instances of shift overlap to fill voids in the shift, incident
involvement, and being involved with special police related groups and agencies, such as Drug Task Forces or SWAT. Vila (1996) examined the prospects of overtime and its correlation with officer fatigue. Officers who worked copious amounts of overtime were more vulnerable to accidents, injuries, and lack acute decision making skills due to fatigue than officers with less overtime (Vila, 1996).

**Public Support**

In 2003, the NIJ reported a study of public opinion poll in Los Angeles regarding officer demeanor and whether the police were respectful, trustworthy, fair, and/or helpful. The NIJ concluded that the opinions of the public in this instance were correlated with several factors; the resident’s formal and informal contacts with the police, prior experience with police, levels of crime in their neighborhood, resident’s demographic characteristics, and the role of the media (2003). As may be expected, the residents showed lower approval with the police when the residents perceived overwhelming problems or disorder in their neighborhoods.

The current literature does provide items associated with a correlation of public opinion and criminal justice policymaking. Johnson & Huff (1987) state that public opinion surveys can be used to assess public tolerance and public views regarding policies and policy options. Furthermore, public opinion data issued by state criminal justice agencies can be appropriate and useful in formulating new public policies (Johnson & Huff, 1987). The decision to implement policies based on public opinion can intrinsically originate from law enforcement administration, which, in turn, could have a direct effect on an officer’s job satisfaction.

As indicated earlier, officer’s who feel that the public holds a negative perspective about them is reinforced by the media (Stevens, 2008). As a result, how an officer responds to perceived public disrespect might have a lot to do with the end result of how a call is handled.
(Stevens, 2008). The weakening of positive police-public contact doesn’t appear to be limited to large agencies. In suburban areas, this may be attributed to the fact that citizens may have difficulty identifying the community police sincere, since there are often too few officers to serve the population effectively (Thibault et al., 2004).
Chapter Three:

Methodology
This study’s objective is to correlate police officer’s job satisfaction as it relates to several variables involved with administration, equipment, public support, levels of department morale, and others. This was accomplished by administering a voluntary, anonymous questionnaire survey delivered to approximately 14 municipal police departments and their police officers located in Cumberland County, PA; this constitutes the bulk of all municipal police departments in Cumberland County. Chiefs of police were decidedly omitted from participating in the survey for two reasons. First, because of the nature of questioning regarding satisfaction as it pertains to the administration of each department, which classically includes chiefs, these individuals’ surveys would be null and void of data analysis. Secondly, the premise behind determining job level satisfaction with the police will be limited to officers who work around the full scope of the job; meaning shiftwork rotations, patrol and court overtime, and officers who utilize standard police patrol and equipment in their daily duties.

This researcher discussed, and obtained permission with each of the chiefs of police of the participating departments. During the permission contact, all chiefs were promised a full copy of the findings after the research is complete; these copies will be sent in electronic form (email) to each chief by the researcher, should they desire a copy. Regarding survey instrument dissemination, the surveys were distributed to the chief’s primary departmental website email through a web-based service provider named Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com). Initially, this researcher developed a survey instrument, to include an implied consent on the website, which replicated the survey copies given to the chiefs of police. After the survey was constructed on the website, the primary transmission of an independent survey link was delivered to each of the departments to the chiefs of policed. Confidentiality was obtained by way of heightened encryption, which was provided by the web-based program.
Once the surveys were sent to each chief of police, they deemed appropriate measures to distribute the surveys to their officers, i.e. to their work or personal email addresses. Once the officers read the implied consent and have decided to participate in the survey, the information was sent to a secure database provided by the website program until this researcher recovered the information, which was protected by a username and pass code. In order to facilitate an understanding of the importance of a police officer’s time, each department’s chief determined the best course of action when and if each suitable officer filled out the survey; each chief was advised that the survey had been constructed to minimize officer time by designing the questionnaire to be simple, clear, and succinct; approximately 10 minutes to complete.

The instrument construction is loosely based on Dantzker’s (1993) questionnaire in his article entitled *Designing a measure of job satisfaction*. The questionnaire used in this study was designed to help show a congruent pattern of job satisfaction by systematically dividing most concepts on a 5-point Likert scale as to denote the definitions for each. Some biographical data was asked, which included: age, years on the job, educational level, gender, ethnicity and job position, however, this researcher developed a 6-point Likert scale. This was done primarily to induce perceptions that officers feel satisfaction one way or another, discouraging a median answer as claiming “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.” In order to promote each officer to complete the entire questionnaire, the survey proposed an assurance of $1.00 to be donated to the Children’s Make-A-Wish Foundation for every instrument returned to the researcher that has been completed in its entirety. Also, an implied consent was attached, preceding the instrument, which informed the officer that their answers were confidential and anonymous as possible. Each department was allowed sufficient time for all applicable officers to fill out the survey; approximately two weeks or more per department.
OPERATIONALIZATION OF KEY CONCEPTS

**Police officer:** Any individual, who works in a full-time capacity, and currently has been issued a Municipal Police Officer Certification as promulgated by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, whereas the individual has successfully completed his/her ACT 120 required training and is sponsored by a municipal police department.

**Stress:** A term used to describe a burden or bothersome internalization by a police officer that he or she may deem harmful to the consciousness as it relates to their position on duty.

**Job satisfaction:** The subjective notion that the police officer deems appropriate as he or she perceives the overall quality of their happiness as it pertains to the policing job environment; both general satisfaction and specified variables involved with policing are noted on the survey.

**Shiftwork:** Working various rotating shifts within a specific time frame as part of a regularly scheduled implementation by the department, to include weekends and holidays. Shiftwork, also known as shift rotations, employ the use of mandating all three standard rotating shifts (eight or ten hours per shift) or two rotating shifts (12 hours) during a given time.

**Administration:** Any individual(s) who directly oversees the management of the police department, and who are also directly involved with the implementation of procedures and policies within the department; most commonly a lieutenant, captain and/or chief; for purposes of this study, administration is considered levels above a patrol officer.

**Policies & Procedures:** Management principles set forth by guidelines constructed to ensure the operations of a police department. Policies may entail examples of proper dress code, general officer conduct, and report writing procedures. Instances of patrol level procedures can vary from arrest procedures, high speed chases, and/or court appearance agendas. All police departments generally develop and utilize their own policies and procedures as it best suits the jurisdiction in which they reside.
PROPOSED STUDY’S HYPOTHESES

Seven identified hypotheses were considered for the study and were tested. While there are certainly a multitude of other variables to consider when testing job satisfaction, this proposed study weighed the pinnacle, or, what the literature indicated as important sources of the variables examined.

H1: Higher levels of job related stress produces a decrease in job satisfaction.

H2: More frequent shift rotations decrease job satisfaction.

H3: Discontentment with departmental policies and procedures decreases job satisfaction.

H4: Low department morale decreases job satisfaction.

H5: General disapproval of current administration decreases job satisfaction.

H6: Low satisfaction with duty equipment/vehicles decreases job satisfaction.

H7: Public support has an affect with an officer’s overall job satisfaction.
Chapter Four:

Data Analysis and Findings
Online surveys were sent to 14 participating departments during a four-week continuum. Initially, all links to the survey were provided in an email format and were electronically delivered to each chief of police of each department and, in turn, the chief’s were asked to distribute the email to their officers. After three days of sending the initial email, this researcher sent a follow up email with the same link to the survey. However, during the second week of the time table it was discovered that a number of officers verbally claimed not to have received the email. After considering the options, this researcher emailed the chiefs of police a third follow up survey.

This researcher began investigating individual officer’s email addresses that were supplied through each officer’s department website. Eight of the 14 departments included in the study had individual contact information for the officers per their respective departments’ websites. These emails were collected and sent another follow up link to the survey in email form. Also, this researcher began contacting various officers, both by email and in person, with the purposes of encouraging officers from different departments to promote participation. The final result was 120 full responses via the approximated 174 total full time officers in Cumberland County (with exceptions of the chief of police); this equated to a 68.9% response rate.

After the fourth full week of participation, this researcher realized that the 120 responses had leveled and failed to reach any higher accumulation. It was determined that the total aggregate number of 120 was to be used for the purposes of this study. Officers who participated in the study and, in which the researcher had conversations, indicated that the survey was not difficult to complete, and claimed that there was very little, if any, confusion based on the instructions given at the beginning of the survey. These officers, by in large, also claimed that they had no issues opening the link which was provided in their email. Once the data results of
the 120 surveys were submitted, all numbers were compiled into an SPSS data bank and filtered with numerical data code for analyzing.

DEMOGRAPHIC FINDINGS

Among policing studies indicative of demographic data, the variables here retained similarities. For instance, males dominated the survey gender spectrum; n=112 as opposed to females (n=8). Over 95% of respondents claimed themselves as White as opposed to Blacks and Hispanics, who each reached a percentage of 1.7%. Interestingly, the highest age percentage reported of respondents was over 40 (37.5%), with the next lower age denominations between 26 and 35 (36.7%). This result correlated reasonably with the variable of years on the job, noting the highest rate at over 15 years (38.3%), followed by 6–10 years (16.7%) and 11-15 years (14.2%). While educational requirements in policing do not generally appear more substantial than a high school diploma/GED, over 33% indicated they had some college. Closer examination found that 35 officers (29.2%) held a bachelor’s degree. Both high school diploma/GED and an associates degree were found equal in the findings at 17.5% (n=21) x2. Only three respondents reported having a master’s degree.

Table 1 shows the mean average of the total number (120) of officers who ranked their satisfaction levels in answering questions 10 through 20; the summative dissemination of differences between Patrol Officers (n=80) and others (n=40) are noted. The “other” category represents officers who identified themselves as Investigators/Detectives, Corporals, Sergeants, Lieutenants, and other, normally higher scale positions, located within their respected departments. Table 1 indicates the mean average of responses for 11 questions in which the officers were asked to respond to their current satisfaction with each variable posed. Each of the
11 questions were based on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1=Strongly satisfied to 6=Strongly dissatisfied.

Table 1

Scale Means (satisfaction levels) by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Patrol Officer</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.363)*</td>
<td>(1.310)</td>
<td>(1.482)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Chief</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.454)</td>
<td>(1.462)</td>
<td>(1.430)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Equipment</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.182)</td>
<td>(1.232)</td>
<td>(1.071)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Morale</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.339)</td>
<td>(1.412)</td>
<td>(1.181)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.860)</td>
<td>(.873)</td>
<td>(.843)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/Procedures</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>6.619**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.122)</td>
<td>(1.142)</td>
<td>(.996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Comms.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.364)</td>
<td>(1.331)</td>
<td>(1.430)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Rotation</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.623)</td>
<td>(1.671)</td>
<td>(1.490)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime Compensation</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.054)</td>
<td>(1.006)</td>
<td>(1.159)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Duties/Description</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.722)</td>
<td>(.693)</td>
<td>(.778)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.190**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.965)</td>
<td>(1.006)</td>
<td>(.844)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ( )=Standard deviation; *=p <=.01; **p <=.10;
Table 1 reflects the subtle standards of the satisfaction levels of various independent variables as compared with the positions provided. As seen here, the three lowest satisfaction ranking variables among both patrol officers and supervisors collectively are: levels of morale, radio communications, and shift rotation. With the exception of “Immediate Supervisor” and “Overtime Compensation,” patrol officers consistently scored lower on all other job satisfaction measures. However, only “Overall Satisfaction” and “Policies and Procedures” proved to score a significance level less than .10.

OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION

For purposes of better depicting an accurate compression of the analysis, several variables were re-coded in order to gain a clearer picture of the distribution of the dependent variable, overall job satisfaction and others. For example, the age category was recoded for two variables between 21-35 and 36 years of age and over. Also, years on the job were changed to differentiate between 0-10 years and 11 years and over. This researcher found a wide discrepancy when counting for the various aspects of each single variable in these cases. Furthermore, the education variable was recoded to represent officers with a high school diploma and some college as a combined variable, and associates degree or higher for the second option. The “hours on shift” variable was changed to represent either eight hours or more than eight hours per shift. Shift rotations were redesigned to represent those officers rotating in shifts in either less than one month (one week, two week, and three weeks) or officers rotating monthly or more. Finally, the job position variables were modified to indicate whether an officer has a position of patrol or supervisor.

Years on the job did not particularly show a significant difference in the officers’ answers to their overall job satisfaction. Officers with ten years or less on the job had a calculated mean
score of 2.35 (n=57) with an f score of .190 and a significance of .664. Officers with 11 years and more (n=63) in policing showed a slightly lower rate of job satisfaction, rating a mean score of 2.43. These results have been found in other studies. This could be the result of several factors. Officers who have been on the job longer tend to be higher in age and have attained a rank above the patrol officer level. Also, these officers likely have more responsibilities, in addition to the knowledge of patrolling.

The age category shows to parallel the above findings. When comparing overall job satisfaction with the dichotomized variable of 21-35 and 36 years of age and over, this researcher found a similar pattern. For officers in the 21-35 age categories, their score resulted in a mean of 2.24 with an f score of 1.900 and a significance level of .171. Officers aged 36 and over had a slightly lower overall job satisfaction record with a mean of 2.49. Again, there can be factors associated with the above interpretations to include maturity, family care, and responsibilities that older officers manage more so than younger officers.

Educational differences when compared with overall job satisfaction resulted in an f score of .125 and a significance level of .724. The two groups (high school diploma/some college and associates degree or higher) obtained a cumulative mean score of 2.39. Officers with a high school diploma and/or some college (n=61) had a mean score of 2.36, as compared with officers with an associates degree or higher (n=59), who had a mean score of 2.42, or a slightly, but less significant average of overall job satisfaction.

Officers who work eight hours per shift (n=106) had a lower average of overall job satisfaction (mean=2.41) as opposed to officers working more than eight hours per shift, i.e. ten hours or more (mean=2.29, n=14). This test was conducted using an f score of .187 and a significance level of .666. Regarding the literature involving contrasting and comparing levels of satisfaction with eight hours vs. 12-hour shifts, this particular survey found that only nine
officers responded that they currently work 12-hour shifts. The following question in the survey asked if the officer(s) who currently work 12-hour shifts had a preference between 12 and eight hour shifts; eight out of nine officers who currently work 12-hour shifts said they preferred 12-hour shifts.

The shift rotation variables were recoded and placed into three categories: rotations less than a month, rotations of one month or more, or not currently rotating at all. When compared with overall satisfaction this test resulted with an f score of 5.965 and a significance level of .003. This researcher found that officers who rotate shifts weekly, bi-weekly, or every three weeks (n=38) showed a mean score of 2.79, as compared to individuals rotating monthly or more (n=48) with a mean score of 2.33. Additionally, officers who are not currently rotating shifts; i.e. permanent shifts (n=33), showed the highest rate of overall job satisfaction with a mean of 2.03. These results showed a fairly strong correlation between the faster rotating shifts and levels of overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #2 can be given evidentiary value by the numbers indicated with both faster shift rotations as well as lower number of hours worked per shift. This study indicates that the more frequent an officer rotates their shift, the lower the job satisfaction level. However, it should be noted that the vast majority of officers working in Cumberland County are working eight hours in a given shift. The deficiency of 10 and 12 hour shifts did not lend to any significance in difference with satisfaction numbers when compared with shift spans. Although further studies with this genre of contemplation should consider more equitable numbers in all shifts, Smith et al. (1998) found that “satisfaction with the 12-hour [rotation] was clearly greater when it was implemented in a flexible manner than both satisfaction with the 8 hour system and the more 12-hour rigid system” (p. 330).
Lastly, overall job satisfaction was compared with position levels. The variables were, again, dichotomized to represent either patrol officer or supervisor. The f statistic resulted in a 3.190 and a significance level of .077. Patrol officers (n=80) had a lower level of job satisfaction with a mean of 2.49 as compared to supervisors (n=39) who had a slightly higher level with a mean of 2.15. Many of the previous levels of job satisfaction correlated with other variables, to include age and years on the job, were almost contradictory to the above pattern, given that higher age and more years on the job indicated a lower level of satisfaction. Much can be explained for this. First, patrol officers were twice as likely to take the survey, given their larger numbers. The product of the 93% significance could possibly be due to the fact that many officers with higher age and more years on the job opt to stay in the patrol section of a department.

STRESS FINDINGS

As noted by the literature review, and as one of the hypotheses in this study suggests, levels of stress and job satisfaction show an association. After conducting an ANOVA test between the two variables (as overall job satisfaction is the dependent variable), the hypothesis appears to be generally conclusive. The f statistic resulted in a .913 with a significance rating of .437; not very significant, but that was expected. Tables 2 and 2a are the charts conducted by this statistic, which shows a lessening of job satisfaction with elevated degrees of stress. Table 2 shows overall job satisfaction as a dependent variable and levels of stress as the independent variable, whereas Table 2a reverses the statistic and proves, perhaps, even greater impact on the parallels between job satisfaction and stress.
Table 2

Scale Means - Overall Satisfaction Levels* by Stress Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Scale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Stress</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Stress</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Stress</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/High Stress</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stress</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * = dependent variable; f=.913; sig.=.437

Table 2a

Scale Means – Stress Levels* by Overall Satisfaction Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Scale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * = dependent variable; f= 2.830; sig.=.019
Here you can see the mean records of satisfaction heighten (indicating the lower levels of satisfaction) as the stress levels increase. This would conclude with our hypothesis that, in this study, there appears to be a direct relationship between levels of stress and levels of overall job satisfaction. Table 3 shows a comparison of position as it relates to stress. The principle for identifying this information is a further analysis of stress as viewed by both administrators and patrol officers alike.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Lieutenant</th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Corporal</th>
<th>Detective</th>
<th>Patrol Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Stress</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=No Stress, 2=Low Stress, 3=Medium Stress, 4=Medium/High Stress, 5=High Stress
Notes: * = dependent variable; f= 3.550; sig.=.005

LEVELS OF MORALE

As indicated by Table 1, levels of morale scored the lowest in satisfaction levels by both patrol officers and supervisors. Hypothesis # 5 claims that, as levels of department morale decrease, so do levels of job satisfaction. Table 4 represents the cross sectional tabulation of the means as job satisfaction represents the dependent variable and levels of morale represents the independent variable.
Table 4

Scale Means – Levels of Morale by Overall Satisfaction Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * = dependent variable; f= 14.270; sig.=.000

Officers who claimed lower overall satisfaction had perceptions of lower department morale. Also, officers who showed higher rates of stress perceived his or her department as having lower morale. Additionally, education showed almost no difference in comparison of perceptions of department morale. Officers with high school diplomas and some college scored almost evenly with officers holding higher degrees. “Years on the job” was also not found to be a precursor to determining officer’s perceptions of department morale; all officers within this variable scored a mean of 3.75 and 3.81 respectively. Overall satisfaction and stress levels appeared to be the only reasonable predictors of perceptions of departmental morale. Hypothesis #5, in this researcher’s mentality, was able to lend enough of a correlation to conclude merit when compared to overall job satisfaction.
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS POSED

A question posed at the end of the survey (Q. 22) asked the officer whether he or she would immediately accept a better paying job outside of policing if it were offered. The statistic revealed in this scenario was interesting. With an f score of 16.790 and a significance of .000, the outcome provided insightful, but not surprising results. Officers who retained a mean score of 2.97 (n=37) in their level of job satisfaction answered “yes.” In addition, officers who answered “no” had a higher level of job satisfaction (n=38, mean score of 1.82). The option of “I don’t know” was answered by the majority of officers (n=45), who had a mean satisfaction of 2.40. After speaking with officers who had already taken the survey indicated that they answered “I don’t know” because of other options not displayed with the question. For example, one officer explained that he would have answered differently if he knew he would be working closer to home or working in a field related to investigations or other types of enforcement.

Another question (Q. 23) in the survey asked each officer if he or she would change departments without losing seniority. Another large f score (14.784) and a significance level of .000 generated about the same responses as the previous question in terms of numbers. However, officers who answered “yes” had an even lower rate of job satisfaction within their own department (n=31) with a mean score of 3.03. Officers who answered “no” (n=48) had a fairly higher rate of satisfaction with a mean of 1.94. Officers (n=41) who indicated “I don’t know” represented a mean of 2.44.

Hypothesis #3 was considered a predictor of job satisfaction when evaluating a department’s policies and procedures. The reason for this hypothesis is that officers within the chain of command are governed by the administrations rules and regulations regarding nearly every aspect of policing, this may include, but not limited to: strict patrol zones, hair length, uniform tidiness, scheduling, overtime policies, off-duty behavior, etc. However, when
comparing both satisfaction rates with levels of position as well as overall satisfaction with policies and procedures, the hypothesis doesn’t conclude a direct correlation with the proposed idea. Table 5 includes position titles with policies and procedures satisfaction data.

The results did indicate a lessening of overall job satisfaction when compared to the satisfaction means of including policies and procedures. However, a mean of 3.01 still points toward a level of “somewhat satisfied” job satisfaction with patrol officers and a “satisfied” position with their administrative counterparts. This researcher will conclude that, with this hypothesis, no significant level of correlation can be drawn from the resulting numbers. More than likely, an officers position with his or her satisfaction with policies and procedures would generally be a facet of subjectivity on the part of an officers interpretation and would be more subject to scrutiny should this variable be added with other variables in the study for further data analysis.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Officers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Officers Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
<td>1.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
<td>.844*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: f= 6.619; sig.=.011. *=Overall Satisfaction scores when compared with position; f= 3.190; .077
Hypothesis #5 was developed by the impression that the general disapproval (or lower satisfaction rating) of a department’s current administration by patrol officer’s equate to a correlation in overall job satisfaction. For purposes of this study, the administration is considered positions of immediate supervisor and chief of police. The mean of patrol officers (n=80), while considering their satisfaction with their immediate supervisor, is 2.17 with f=.093 and significance level of .761. The mean entered the “satisfied” category of all patrol officers, while their general satisfaction mean equated to 2.49. However, there is a shift change when comparing levels of satisfaction with his or her current chief. The mean of 2.87 with an f score of 1.410 had a lower significance level of .237; equating to a lower level of satisfaction than current overall job satisfaction (2.49). While the highest significance rating between the variables of current supervisor and chief doesn’t reach the level of 80%, this researcher believes an argument can still be made, at least, with the case of chief satisfaction levels slightly determining overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #6 (lower satisfaction with proper equipment equates to lower overall job satisfaction) was tested. It was interesting to find that officers who had scored “dissatisfied” in their overall job satisfaction resulted in a mean of 2.33 (satisfied) when referencing the quality and satisfaction of their equipment and vehicles. The majority of officers who were satisfied with their overall job satisfaction (n=61) resulted in a mean of 2.30 when asked about the quality of their equipment. Again, there didn’t seem to be a significant differentiation between officers’ levels of job satisfaction and their equipment. The hypothesis, at least for this study, was determined to be inconclusive as to having a substantive correlated effect.

Radio communications appeared more evenly distributed through the satisfaction realm than the other variables. Over 52% (n=63) reported being less than satisfied with their current radio communications. This variable was not broken down into specified discrepancies, but was
deemed not to be a result of county dispatcher inconsistencies as, more probable than not, a technical deficiency related to the radios themselves. Further studies may opt to choose a more detailed exploit of radio communications and its effects on stress and/or satisfaction.

Almost 16% of officers (n=19) were less than satisfied with their levels of public support and opinion. In order to explore the rationale for officers being satisfied with public support and opinion, a look at variables within the county itself should be noted. None of the participating departments provide police protection in areas that having a population more than 28,000. Most of the municipalities surveyed are actively engaged in suburban and rural areas with some of them operating with varying amounts of businesses; very few of the departments occupy any significant abundance of strict urban territory. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2009), 2008 resulted in a population of 229,361 with a median household income of $58,336 in Cumberland County, which is higher than the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s median income of $48,562 (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/42/42041.html).

The U.S. Department of Justice (2003) examined public support of policing and determined that residents with informal police contacts had a more positive perception of police; furthermore, race, ethnicity, or media had virtually no affect of resident’s approval of police job performance. Disorder and heightened levels of crime in neighborhoods, however, had the most impact on resident’s opinion of police (USDOJ, 2003). Further examination of data should be comprised of pulling crime rate data with municipalities in Cumberland County who occupy more urban regions in order to distinguish these differences in public perception.
Chapter Five:

Conclusions and Discussion
This thesis studied varying degrees of work-related job satisfaction variables for over approximately 68% of municipal police officers in Cumberland County, PA. State police and the county sheriff’s department were omitted from participating in the study. This was decided because municipal police officers share a common bond of similar initial training, have reasonably similar issues with other municipalities, and are familiar with methods and procedures relating to incident response, patrol, and co-worker relations; the administrative structure is similar in municipal departments as well. Also, all municipal police officers, to include chiefs of police, are required to be Pennsylvania ACT 120 certified by the Municipal Police Officer Education and Training Commission.

It was stated earlier in this study that Dantzker & Surrette (1997) signified that, in general, responding police officers appear relatively satisfied with their jobs; and there doesn’t seem to be any exception to that rule with the outcome of this study. Combined variables will materialize a difference in overall job satisfaction; however, in the case here, the majority of single variables did not constitute a significant lessening or heightening of job satisfaction in and of themselves. It does appear evidentiary that higher stress levels, faster rotating shifts, and officers’ perceptions of department morale, impact the levels of overall job satisfaction where there exists a more direct correlation. By and large, the mean responses to an officer’s duties and job descriptions were fairly high. Over 17% of officers noted they were strongly satisfied with their job descriptions, while over 63% of officers were satisfied; this indicates that cops simply like being cops. In addition, the overall job satisfaction rating was slightly lower than the job description analysis, but not by much. Over 13% of officers were strongly satisfied in general, while at the same time 61% of officers were satisfied; only one officer indicated a level of being strongly dissatisfied.
There did seem to be a connection between stress and overall job satisfaction; as levels of stress increased, the levels of overall satisfaction decreased, and vice versa. While this may not be considered a breakthrough synopsis, it does give way to perceptions of the police subculture in general. In Carlan’s (2007) job satisfaction study, he found that “seventy percent of the officers agreed that they were satisfied with their job as a police officer, and this observation is well supported in the findings of other studies” (p. 83). Again, this study indicates nearby the same levels of satisfaction; perhaps modestly higher. Also, the basic demographic findings in this study do not significantly alter the dimensions of overall satisfaction, and this appears to be the case with the majority of other similar studies found in the literature.

Generally, officers are recognized as adapting to almost any situation, and the product of this study does enforce the impression that officers in Cumberland County fit the design of departmental adaptation. During the course of the study, this researcher was employed by one of the participating municipalities. First hand experience determined that, after lengthy interviews with other officers in the county, it was lamented to the researcher that there was a wide variance of satisfaction levels with current administration. Furthermore, there were expressions of low levels of morale and unsavory experiences with public support and opinion; these broad-spectrum interviews were passed along by officer’s representing several of the participating departments after they completed the survey. Individually, these variables scored an average of below satisfactory satisfaction levels, but the final disposition of overall satisfaction and the attainment of officer’s general job duties and descriptions, remain remarkably elevated. These concepts remained fairly consistent with literature that studied multiple departments, both large and small. It should be repeated that this study delved into small police departments. Dantzker (1997) notes that:
It would appear that organizational size does make a difference whereby officers in agencies employing less than 100 sworn personnel were the most satisfied in all areas…agencies with less than 100 officers have advantages larger size organizations may not have, such as the size of their service population, and may have a better relationship with their communities’ members and with each other (p. 315).

When probing the connection experience between smaller police departments and the public, Nofziger & Williams (2005) state that the quality of the interaction between officers and the residents, not simply contact, has a significant impact on the public’s confidence in their local authority. Nofziger & Williams (2005) further note that “in nonurban settings, where formal ties are much closer, such involvement may have a greater impact than in urban communities” (p. 264).

The scope of policing in smaller urban area locations are inherently different than in large departments, especially for lower ranking, younger officers. Brunetto and Farr-Wharton (2003) claim that younger officers will feel most committed to their job when they’re involved in decision making, feel supported by their superiors, and receive an adequate level of feedback about their job tasks, performances, and expectations. This insight should be a valuable asset to police administrators. This study shows that there is a reasonably high satisfaction rate of officer’s immediate supervisor support. Patrol officer-line supervisor engagements play a vital role when considering the bridge between road cops and the administration; this suggests that communication variables have a direct impact on levels of satisfaction. Since policy changes and department head decisions can cause what Scott (2004) calls a ripple effect, specificity can become vaguer by the time it lands within earshot of patrol officers. Therefore, it makes sense that a positive open line of effective communication between patrol officers and their immediate supervisors is central to the understanding of departmental concerns.
Along with administration, policing supervisors must realize that their officers’ attitudes concerning problem solving are “weakly correlated with their supervisors’ attitudes and, further, that officers’ perceptions of their supervisors’ attitudes are often inaccurate” (Engel, 2003, p. 131). The possibilities of two distinct police subcultures (patrol officers and their supervisors) suggest that hierarchical controls may be unreliable when an officer’s situational discretion takes precedence over the bureaucratic discretion implied by administration. After all, police administration isn’t always looked on too fairly by officer’s who operate day in and day out on the street. The idea of the title “supervisor” gives a connotation that he or she is directly responsible for their officer’s actions, when in reality, only a fair part of supervisor’s actually witness the daily duties of the officer’s they are supervising. Initially, the closest relation we can establish for monitoring officer’s discretion is the field officer. The field officer, one who initially trains officers in their profession, resides with the officer initially on the street.

Lastly, the structure of a subcultural organization, such as policing, is shaped by the administration of that organization. Herbert (1998) acknowledges that bureaucratic control, for example, will have to be restructured such that officers at the lower ranks are given more leeway to construct unique strategies for the distinctive situations extant in given communities. While the younger officers are regularly being mentored by field training officers, immediate supervisors, and fellow officers, it has been the job of administrators to enforce liability in officer’s discretion, thus further inducing friction between the patrol officers and administrators.

It is critical to understand the sources of police occupational stress and levels of job satisfaction so as to “implement strategies for reducing stressors, or, if they cannot be reduced, for assisting officers in coping effectively with them” (Morash et al., 2006, p. 27). The understanding of job related stress and satisfaction in policing can help facilitate a functional knowledge of police
activities that would normally inhibit the general population’s general ambiguity towards the policing culture.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Hart (1999) claimed that police satisfaction samples “may be particularly good ones for research on job experiences and well-being because police work is not just a job but a way of life for many officers” (p. 568). Future police officer job satisfaction studies should entail not only the descriptors listed in this study, but also an aggregate account of inter-departmental consistencies. For example, determining level of manpower, police union issues, and work productivity should be operationalized and analyzed when establishing levels of satisfaction; much can be gleamed from these additional variables. These items, however, require an in-depth investigation to departmental records in addition to requiring officers to “open up” and express confidence in a researcher, which isn’t easy or always viable. Police officers are, by trade, inherently suspicious and apprehensive when there are inquires regarding their personal feelings in relation to their chosen profession from outside entities.

In order to produce a more coherent and natural flowing form of information regarding the dissemination of satisfaction variables, it would make sense to re-code the satisfaction variables to denote “1” equating levels of extreme dissatisfaction and “6” representing the level of extremely satisfied. This particular study reversed this numbering, which may prove more difficult to extract identifying satisfaction levels upon reading included tables. Another variable that should be included in the scope in a study of this nature should also look into officer workload. Departments that are in need of additional officers may require their current officers to patrol extra zones, take on added responses, and cover supplemental shifts.
Due to the nature of workload in policing, this researcher realized during the study that an officer’s free time can be both atypical and unexpected. The convergence of simplicity and brevity in designing the actual survey served to keep the officers participating time at an absolute minimum. Several policing job satisfaction studies include basic demographic factors within the confines of their study; this study did the same. However, if it can be established that basic demographic variables consistently show little or no significant viable indication of overall job satisfaction in policing, it would work to a researcher’s advantage to omit these types of variables in order to expand the scope of his or her study when officers are charged to participate in a survey. This could systematically reduce redundancy and allow the researcher to probe into the true capacity of what is being examined, while at the same time shortening an officer’s on-duty survey time.

Other added variables to be examined with officer job satisfaction would necessitate the investigation of departmental records. Levels of absenteeism can shed light with correlations of job satisfaction. Municipal departments may offer various types of sick, personal, compensation, and/or health leave for officers. Inspection of absenteeism could indicate a pattern of satisfaction. In addition, records of arrest, reports of infractions and/or suspensions, and indications of regular active enforcement might open up imminent incursion as it relates to satisfaction and stress. In sum, peer reviewed articles referencing officer job satisfaction do not appear abundant when examining smaller departments. This study, and others like it, should provide an outlook to researchers exploring causation factors in substantial suburban and rural department classifications.
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APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT LETTER (EMAIL) TO PARTICIPATING CUMBERLAND COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENTS
To: Chiefs of Police/Police Officers/Cumberland County  
From: Jason Julseth, Graduate Student/PennState Harrisburg  
Date: 11/7/2009  
Subject: Police Officer survey recruitment

To all Police Officers in Cumberland County,

My name is Jason Julseth, I am a graduate student at PennState Harrisburg, a Hampden Township Police Officer, and a member of the Cumberland County Special Response Team. I am conducting a study involving Police Officer job satisfaction in Cumberland County. This study is in conjunction with my graduate thesis in the Criminal Justice Program.

Research volunteers are being sought, and I am asking for your assistance to complete a confidential on-line survey that will be forwarded by your Chief of Police in the near future.

The email that will be forwarded by your Chief will contain a link. Should you choose to participate, you may click on the link and the web-based survey program website, SurveyMonkey, will redirect you to a description of the survey, an implied consent, and the survey itself.

There are a total of 24 questions asked on the survey. You may choose not to take the survey, or to quit at any time during the survey. There will be no negative consequences should you choose not to take the survey.

Although your name, email, and/or department name will not be asked, there will be various demographic questions, including: age, rank, ethnicity, gender, years on the job, and education level asked. You’re chief or anyone else in your department will not have access to these surveys.

Only myself and my assistant, Dr. Hummer will have direct access to the completed surveys. Once a survey is completed online and sent, the information is directly sent to a pool of other surveys. All police officers in municipal police departments in Cumberland County are being asked to participate.

The survey should only take approximately ten minutes to complete. Any individual choosing to participate must have a valid ACT 120 municipal certification.

Thank you in advance for your support and cooperation. Any questions, comments or concerns regarding the upcoming survey can be directed at me.

Jason Julseth  
PennState Harrisburg  
jwj127@psu.edu  
(717) 645-2963
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE COVER LETTER TO SELECTED PENNSLYVANIA MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS
Dear Chief of Police:

I am currently a Graduate Student at Penn State University completing my graduate thesis. My thesis examines patrol officer job satisfaction and variables associated with stress in several Municipalities in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania. I am also a full-time police officer with Hampden Township Police Department.

For the purpose of this study, officer job satisfaction is determined by a survey administered to several full-time officers in order to determine levels of satisfaction associated with variables to include: [levels of morale], equipment, communications, policies & procedures, public support/opinion, overtime, shiftwork, and administration.

The information collected in the enclosed survey will act as the foundation for my research. The survey should only take about 10 minutes to complete. I’m asking that the surveys be distributed to all full-time officers. All of the information will remain confidential and will only be shared with the chair of my thesis committee, Dr. James Ruiz, and my analysis assistant, Dr. Don Hummer.

Your help in this matter is greatly appreciated. My expectation is that this research will give municipal directors, chiefs of police, and individual officers, an overall view of issues associated with stress and job satisfaction in Cumberland County.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (717) 645-2963 or email me at jwj127@psu.edu.

Respectfully Yours,

Jason W. Julseth
Penn State University
Criminal Justice Graduate Program
APPENDIX C

IMPLIED CONSENT FORM FOR CUMBERLAND COUNTY
MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS
Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Municipal Police Officer Job Satisfaction in Cumberland County Pennsylvania: A Study of Organizational Development in Small Police Departments

Principal Investigator: Jason W. Julseth, Graduate Student, Hampden Township P.D.
777 W. Harrisburg Pike
Middletown, PA 17057
(717) 645-2963; jwj127@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. James Ruiz
777 W. Harrisburg Pike
Middletown, PA 17057
(717) 948-6292; jmr33@psu.edu

1. **Purpose of the Study:** The purpose of this research study is to survey full-time police officers employed by several municipal police departments located in Cumberland County in an effort to determine what variables affect levels of job satisfaction.

2. **Procedures to be followed:** You will be asked to answer 24 questions on an online survey.

3. **Benefits:** The main benefit of the study is to provide police administrators, supervisory personnel, and individual officers with information regarding satisfaction levels to include: shift work, equipment, policies and procedures, co-worker relations, and on the job stress.

4. **Duration:** It will take about 10 minutes to complete the survey.

5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is considered confidential. There are various biographical data questions asked, such as: age, gender, ethnicity, years on the job, and education level. The web-based program, SurveyMonkey ensures all surveys are protected by encrypted software. Only the researcher has access to the surveys. Each survey will be sent to a pool with all other sent surveys with other departments; there are no identifiers for each department. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

6. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact Jason W. Julseth at (717) 645-2963 with questions, complaints, or concerns about this research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, or problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact Penn State University’s Office for Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. Questions about research procedures can be answered by the research team.
7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Refusing to participate or withdrawing early from the study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would be entitled to otherwise.

8. **Discomforts/Risks:** There are no physical discomforts associated with completing the survey.
   The risks associated with taking the survey include the possibility of the various identifiable demographic data being released to persons other than the principal investigator by either surreptitious means and/or technological issues.

You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. Completion and submission of the survey implies your consent to take part in this research study.

Please print off this form to keep for your records

This informed consent form was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB #32317 Doc. #1) at The Pennsylvania State University on 11/06/2009. It will expire on 10/31/2010. (J. Mathieu)
APPENDIX D

SURVEY
1. Gender
☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Ethnicity
☐ Black ☐ Hispanic
☐ White ☐ Other

3. Age
☐ 21-25 ☐ 36-40
☐ 26-35 ☐ Over 40

4. Total years of police experience
☐ Less than 2 ☐ 11 to 15
☐ 2-5 ☐ Over 15
☐ 6 to 10

5. Level of Education
☐ High school diploma/GED ☐ Bachelors degree
☐ Some college ☐ Master's degree
☐ Associates degree

6. How many hours do you normally work on a shift?
☐ 8 hours ☐ Other
☐ 10 hours
☐ 12 hours

7. If you currently work 12-hour shifts, have you in the past worked 8 hour shifts?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I do not currently work 12-hour shifts

8. If you answered "Yes" to question 7, which shift do you prefer working? If you answered "No" to question 7, please move to question #9.
☐ 8 hour ☐ No preference
☐ 12 hour

9. If you are currently working rotating shifts, what is your current shift rotation?
☐ Weekly ☐ Bi-monthly
☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Other
☐ Every 3 weeks ☐ I am not currently rotating shifts
☐ Monthly
DIRECTIONS: Please rate your overall job satisfaction level on the items listed below. Select the level that best represents your level of overall job satisfaction for each item below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Strongly Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Your immediate supervisors support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Your Current Chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The quality of your duty equipment, i.e. weapons, vehicles, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Your departments level of morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Public support/opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Your departments policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The quality of your radio communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Current shift rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Compensation for court time/overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Your general job duties/descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Your overall job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Please describe your average stress level in your current position as a police officer

☐ No stress
☐ Low stress
☐ Medium stress
☐ Medium-high stress
☐ High stress

22. If I received an offer for a better paying job outside of policing I would immediately accept it!

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don't know

23. If I could change police departments without losing seniority I would!

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don't know

24. What position do you currently hold?

☐ Lieutenant
☐ Sergeant
☐ Corporal
☐ Detective/Investigator
☐ Patrol Officer
☐ Other

Thank you for completing the survey. For every survey successfully completed and returned, there will be a $1.00 donation to the Children's Make-A-Wish Foundation.

Please share comments pertaining this survey and/or factors that make your job satisfying or unsatisfying (optional):
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RECEIPT FOR CHILDREN’S MAKE-A-WISH FOUNDATION DONATION ($120.00)
February 14, 2010

Dear Mr. Jason Julseth,

Thank you for your recent gift of $120.00 to the Make-A-Wish Foundation® of Philadelphia and Susquehanna Valley. Your gift will have a profound, positive impact on the lives of children with life-threatening medical conditions.

Your generous support helps us grant the wishes of children at a time when they need inspiration. Your compassion brings hope, strength and joy into their lives – and into the lives of their families.

We deeply appreciate your personal commitment to the Make-A-Wish Foundation's work. You have truly made a difference to the children we serve. If you have any questions about your donation, please contact our Donor Care specialists toll-free at 1 (866) 880-1382, or via e-mail at customerservice@wish.org. Please include your transaction number with any correspondence.

Sincerely,

David Williams,
President & Chief Executive Officer

Your Receipt
Transaction number: 105******
Date: February 14, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Donation</th>
<th>$120.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donation Benefiting Make-A-Wish Foundation® of Philadelphia and Susquehanna Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total charged to card: $120.00
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PARTICIPATING MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS
Camp Hill Police Department
Carlisle Police Department
East Pennsboro Township Police Department
Hampden Township Police Department
Lower Allen Township Police Department
Mechanicsburg Police Department
Middlesex Police Department
New Cumberland Police Department
North Middleton Township Police Department
Shippensburg Borough Police Department
Shiremanstown Police Department
Silver Spring Township Police Department
Upper Allen Township Police Department
West Shore Regional Police Department
APPENDIX G

APPLICATION FOR THE USE OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

EXPEDITED FORM
APPLICATION FOR THE USE OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS
EXPEDITED & FULL REVIEWS

Form Instructions:
- To complete the form, press TAB or SHIFT TAB between boxes and enter an ‘X’ or text. For assistance, contact the Office for Research Protections.
- This application will ask general questions about your study. Depending on your response, additional appendices may need to be completed in order to provide more detailed information. For example, if you indicate that your study involves prisoners, Appendix 4 also will need to be completed and submitted. Do NOT change the questions in this application.
- Submit recruitment materials, informed consent forms, and all other supporting materials as attachments to the application. Do NOT include these documents within the application.
- If this research study will be conducted in another language, submit the recruitment materials, informed consent forms and all other supporting materials in English as well as the language in which the study will be conducted. A letter verifying the accuracy of the translations from an individual not affiliated with the study must also be submitted.
- Handwritten applications will NOT be accepted.

Project Title: Municipal Police Officer Job Satisfaction in Cumberland County Pennsylvania: A Study of Organizational Development in Small Police Departments

| Principal Investigator: Jason W. Julseth | PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): 915082395 |
| University Status (Faculty, Staff, Student, etc.): Grad student | Telephone Number: (717) 645-2963 |
| Email Address: jwj127@psu.edu | Dept: Criminal Justice |
| College: Penn State | Campus: Harrisburg |
| Mailing Address including city, state & zip code: 777 West Harrisburg Pike, Middletown PA 17057 |

| Faculty Advisor, if PI is a student: Dr. James Ruiz | PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): 926138801 |
| Email Address: jmr33@psu.edu | Telephone Number: (717) 948-6292 |
| Dept: Public Affairs | College: Penn State |
| Mailing Address including city, state & zip code: 777 W. Harrisburg Pike, Middletown PA 17050 |

Is there anyone you wish to include on correspondence related to this study (e.g., a project coordinator, etc.)?

Name: Dr. James Ruiz | PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): 926138801
University Status (Faculty, Staff, Student, etc.): **Staff**

Telephone Number: **(717) 948-6292**

Email Address: **jmr33@psu.edu**

Dept: **Public Affairs**

College: **Penn State**

Campus: **Harrisburg**

Mailing Address including city, state & zip code: **777 W. Harrisburg Pike, Middletown PA 17057**

Role in this study: **Advisor**

---

**A. Funding:**

1. Is this research study funded? Funding could include the sponsor providing drugs or devices for the study.
   - **X** No → Skip to Question 7
   - Yes → Answer Questions 2 – 5
   - Pending → Answer Questions 2 – 6

2. Provide the name and mailing address (street, city, state & zip code) of ALL funding sources. Provide a copy of your grant proposal with the application – budget information is not needed. If a copy of the grant proposal is not included, explain.

3. Is the funding awarded through a subcontract?
   - No → Skip to Question 5
   - Yes → Answer Question 4

4. Who is the prime sponsor? For example, if the University of Michigan subcontracts part of an NIH study to PSU, NIH is the prime sponsor?

5. Has the sponsor agreed to pay for direct costs of treating injuries?
   - Yes
   - No

6. If funding is not awarded, will the research still be conducted?
   - Yes
   - No
   - N/A

**B. Conflict of Interest:**

7. Do any of the investigator(s), key personnel, their spouses and/or dependent children have a financial or business interest(s), as defined by PSU Policy RA20, "Individual Conflict of Interest," associated with this research? **NOTE: There is no de minimus in human participant research studies (i.e., all amounts must be reported).**
   - **X** No
   - Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix 1

**C. Class Projects:**

8. Is this study being conducted as part of a class requirement? For more information on the difference between a class requirement and a research study, see IRB Guideline IV, "Distinguishing Class-related Pedagogical (Instructional) Assignments/Projects and Research Projects," which may be located at [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/policies/guide4.asp](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/policies/guide4.asp).
   - **X** No
   - Yes → Provide the following information:
     - Instructor’s Name:
     - Course Title and Number:
     - Semester course is being offered:
     - Semester the project is due:

**D. Review Level:**

9. What level of review do you expect this research to need?
10. **Expedited Research Categories:** Read the following categories and **choose one or more** that apply to your research. Your research must fit in **at least one category** and be no more than minimal risk in order to be considered for an expedited review.

- **Category 1:** Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) OR (b) is met.
  (a) Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21 CFR 312) is not required. (*Research on marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the product is not eligible for expedited review.*)
  (b) Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application (21 CFR 812) is not required; or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling.

- **Category 2:** Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick or venipuncture as follows:
  (a) From healthy, non-pregnant adults who weigh at least 100 pounds. For these participants, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; OR
  
  **W.** From other adults and children, considering the age, weight, and health of the participants, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these participants, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

- **Category 3:** Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by non-invasive means. Examples include:
  - Hair and nail clippings in a non-disfiguring manner;
  - Deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction;
  - Permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction;
  - Excreta and external secretions (including sweat);
  - Uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue;
  - Placenta removal at delivery;
  - Amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor;
  - Supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques;
  - Mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings;
  - Sputum collected after saline mist nebulization

- **Category 4:** Collection of data through non-invasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications. Examples include:
  - Physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the participant or an invasion of the participant's privacy;
  - Weighing or testing sensory acuity;
  - Magnetic resonance imaging;
- Electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electoretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, oppler blood flow, and echocardiography;
- Moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

**Category 5:** Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for non-research purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis).

- What is the source of the data?
- Was the data being used in this study collected specifically for this research study?
  - Yes
  - No

**Category 6:** Collection of data from voice, video, digital, image recordings made for research purposes.

**X** **Category 7:** Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including but not limited to research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

### E. Research Personnel:

**NOTE:**
- The Principal investigator is responsible for ensuring that all individuals conducting procedures described in this application are trained adequately prior to involving human participants.
- All individuals listed on this application who (1) are responsible for the design/conduct of the study, (2) will have access to the human participants (i.e., will consent participants, conduct the study), or (3) will have access to identifying AND confidential information must successfully complete the IRB’s Training on the Protection of Human Participants or provide verification of training from their home institution. PSU’s training may be located at [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/education/modules/irb/index.asp](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/education/modules/irb/index.asp). Approval will NOT be granted until all individuals listed on this application have successfully completed the training. Verification of training does NOT need to be sent in if the individual completed the Penn State’s training.
- As personnel change, the principal investigator must submit a Modification Request Form to add or remove personnel. The Modification Request Form may be located at [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/index.asp](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/index.asp).

**W.** Provide the name of the other individual(s) assisting with this study who (1) will be responsible for the design/conduct of the study, (2) have access to the human participants (i.e., will consent participants, conduct the study), or (3) have access to identifying AND confidential information. If the individual does not have a PSU Access User ID, please provide some other form of contact information. If additional space is needed, attach a separate sheet containing the same information. **IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO INCLUDE INDIVIDUALS ALREADY LISTED ON PAGE ONE OF THIS APPLICATION.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>PSU User ID (e.g., abc 123)</th>
<th>Complete Mailing Address (city, state &amp; zip code)</th>
<th>Role in this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Don Hummer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dch18@psu.edu">dch18@psu.edu</a></td>
<td>920373556</td>
<td>777 W. Harrisburg Pike, Middletown PA 17057</td>
<td>Co-investigator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
W. Identify (1) the procedures/techniques each person (including advisors) listed in Question 11 AND on the first page of the application will perform and (2) describe their level of research experience & experience in performing the procedures/techniques identified.

Jason Julseth will be conducting a survey questionnaire. Jason will survey several police officers located in various municipalities located in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, in an effort to determine levels of job satisfaction among police officers and to investigate any significant predictors of organizational commitment and variables that will enhance or subdue levels of job satisfaction. Dr. Ruiz will be reviewing the data that Jason will be collecting and the thesis paper as a whole. Dr. Hummer will assist in collecting the data information from the surveys and incorporating statistical data information in the data analysis section of the thesis. Neither Dr. Ruiz nor Dr. Hummer will be conducting the survey. Jason has taken graduate level classes on research methods, statistics, and criminal theory. Both Dr. Ruiz and Dr. Hummer are Associate Professors at PennState Harrisburg. Dr. Ruiz holds extensive vitae, which includes the assisting of several graduate students in research regarding human participants. Dr. Hummer has held the position of graduate advisor of students who have utilized human research through PennState’s ORP. Dr. Hummer is the primary source for decoding and interpreting data regarding the human subjects’ questionnaires.

13. Explain how the persons assisting with this research are kept adequately informed about the study and their research-related duties and functions.

Jason will be exchanging information with and meeting Dr. Ruiz and Dr. Hummer on a consistent basis. Jason keeps in regular contact with both Dr. Ruiz and Dr. Hummer via email and telephone. Dr. Ruiz is Jason’s acting chair of his thesis committee; he will be reviewing all of Jason’s research.

F. Purpose & Procedures:

14. Is this study associated with any other IRB-approved study (e.g., an extension study or uses data or tissue from another study)?
   ___ X ___ No
   ___ Yes → Provide the IRB number(s): ______

15. Background/Rationale: Briefly provide the background information and rationale for performing the research study.

   Jason will be surveying approximately 100+ full time police officers in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, in an effort to determine job satisfaction levels within their respective police departments. The police officers will be specifically asked about various items within their working environment and to rate them on a satisfaction score, i.e. levels of satisfaction with equipment, administrators, co-worker relations, policies & procedures, shiftwork, etc. Jason determined that studies such as job satisfaction in policing appear to be almost non-existent regarding the peer reviewed literature.

16. Purpose: Summarize the study’s research question(s), aims or objectives [hypothesis].

   The study proposes approximately six hypotheses. The premise of the hypotheses is studied to determine how individual factors affect job satisfaction in policing than others. The main objective is to compare factors that are present in policing and how those factors affect their individual job satisfaction.

17. Research Procedures involving Participants: Summarize the study’s procedures by providing a description of how the research will be conducted [i.e., methodology – a step-by-step process of what participants will be asked to do]. Numbering each step is highly recommended. **DO NOT COPY & PASTE INFORMATION FROM THE GRANT PROPOSAL IN THIS RESPONSE – THE QUESTION MUST BE ANSWERED IN LAY TERMS (NO TECHNICAL JARGON).**

   1. Permission will be asked to Chiefs of Police at each police department to be studied.
   2. All Chiefs will be provided applicable information, to include copy of implied consent and copy of survey. The Chiefs of Police will be given an email to distribute to the officer’s for purposes of recruitment.
   3. Surveys will be provided to all police officers in participating departments and asked to complete surveys. The online survey will allow officers to skip any or all questions that they do not wish to answer.
   4. All departments will be given an indeterminate amount of time to fill out survey.
5. Surveys will be collected by principal investigator only through applicable web-based site.
6. Surveys will then be studied, compressed, and analyzed through SPSS software.

18. Please describe any research procedures that are already being performed for diagnostic or treatment purposes.

__X__ N/A

19. How long will participants be involved in this research study? Include the number of sessions and the duration of each session – consider the total number of minutes, hours, days, months, years, etc.

   One session per officer; approximately 10-15 minutes.

20. Briefly explain how you will have sufficient time to conduct and complete the research within the research period.

   The principal investigator will allot enough time to gain permission from each Chief of Police, distribute the surveys to each participating department, and collect the surveys. Since the surveys will be distributed through a web-based internet program, the returns on individual surveys are almost instant.

W. Where will this research study take place? Choose all that apply.

   ______ University Park → Specify the building and room number. If not yet known, indicate such.
   ______ Other PSU Campus Location → Specify the campus, building and room number. If not yet known, indicate such.
   ______ Hershey Medical Center → Specify the building and room number. If not yet known, indicate such.
   ______ Hershey Outpatient Surgery Center (HOSC)
   ______ Other HMC Clinics → Specify the clinic.
   ______ Mt. Nittany Medical Center
   __X__ Other Site(s)

   ↩ List each site and provide contact information (name & mailing address) for each site.

   The study will take place at the location of the police departments or any location where a participant has access to a computer with internet access.

   ↱ Do any of these sites have an IRB?
   __X__ No → A letter of agreement/permission from an individual in a decision making position indicating their willingness to participate in this research study must be obtained by the researcher and kept in his/her research records. The letter does NOT need to be submitted to the IRB; however, a copy could be requested by the IRB at any time.
   ______ Yes

   ↱ Has the site’s IRB reviewed and approved the research or does it plan to defer to PSU’s IRB?
   ______ The site will defer review to PSU’s IRB.
   ______ The site’s IRB will review & approve the research study. ➪ Provide a copy of the IRB approval letter.

22. Does this research study involve any of the following centers?

   ______ General Clinical Research Center at University Park
   ______ General Clinical Research Center at the Hershey Medical Center
   ______ MRI – Social & Life Sciences Imaging Center [Chandlee Laboratory]
   ______ Survey Research Center at University Park
   ______ Center for Survey Research at Harrisburg
23. Describe the facilities available to conduct the research for the duration of the study?

SPSS data software analysis will be provided to the principal investigator at the Penn State Harrisburg Campus.

☐ Is this a multi-center study? A multi-center study is a project that is led by one investigator (a project director) while the study occurs at several sites. Each site has a principal investigator responsible for the following study protocol at that site and for reporting to the project director.

☐ No → Skip to Question 26
☐ Yes → Answer Question 25

☐ Is any Penn State investigator on this application the overall project director of this multi-center study?

☐ No
☐ Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix 18

26. List criteria for inclusion of participants.

The participant must be a full-time certified police officer for the state of Pennsylvania in Cumberland County.

27. List criteria for exclusion of participants.

Participants that will be excluded are individuals that do not meet the above criteria.

G. Participants:

28. Maximum number of participants/samples/charts to be enrolled by or for PSU researchers (Enter one number – not a range): 110

NOTE: This number should include the estimated number that will give consent but not qualify after screening or who will otherwise withdraw and not qualify for inclusion in the final data analysis. This number should be based on statistical analysis unless this is a pilot study. It must match the number of participants lists in the informed consent form, if applicable.

29. Was a statistical/power analysis conducted to determine the adequate sample? ☐ Yes ☑ No

☐ Does this research exclude any participants based on their:

Gender Identity ☐ Yes → Provide a scientific rationale for the exclusion:

☐ Racial/ethnic groups ☐ Yes → Provide a scientific rationale for the exclusion:

☐ Sexual Orientation ☐ Yes → Provide a scientific rationale for the exclusion:

☐ Age range – Choose all that apply.

☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 7 – 12 years ☑ 18 – 25 years ☑ 40 – 65 years

☐ 1 – 6 years ☐ 13 – 17 years ☐ 26 – 40 years ☐ 65+ years

☐ Choose all categories of participants who will be involved in this research study.

☑ Healthy volunteers
☐ Penn State students
☐ Subject Pool Students → Will all participants involved in this study be from the subject pool? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Indicate the subject pool:  

- CAS 100A  
- Psychology – Behrend  
- Psychology – Harrisburg  
- Psychology – Schuylkill  
- Psychology – UP  

- Children  

For more information on the definition of a “child,” please see Section XVII, “Potentially Vulnerable Participant Groups,” which may be located at http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/policies/IRBSOP.rtf.

- International Research – participants will be living outside of the U.S.  

For more information on international research, please see IRB Guideline II, “International Research involving Human Participants,” which may be located at http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/policies/guide2.asp.

- Prisoners  

Complete & Submit Appendix 4  

- Pregnant Women or Fetuses  

Complete & Submit Appendix 19  

- Women of reproductive potential at the time of this research – Choose one of the following:  

  - The research poses no added risk associated with pregnancy and/or lactation  
  - Precautions against pregnancy and/or lactation, and pregnancy tests are addressed in the research proposal and consent form  
  - The research poses no added risk associates with pregnancy and/or lactation BUT pregnant and/or lactating females will be excluded from this research study  

Explain why these individuals are being excluded.  

- Patients  

Complete & Submit Appendix 5  

- Adults with a decisional impairment  

Complete & Submit Appendix 6  

- Institutionalized individuals (e.g., patients in state hospitals or nursing homes)  

Complete & Submit Appendix 7  

- Neonates  

- Other → Explain:  

- None of the above apply  

Will participants be currently enrolled in a course/class of any personnel listed on this application?  

X No  

Yes → Describe the steps taken to avoid coercion & undue influence:  

Will participants be employees of any personnel listed on this application?  

X No  

Yes → Describe the steps taken to avoid coercion & undue influence:  

Could some or all participants be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence due to special circumstances? Do not include children, decisionally impaired persons, and prisoners in your answer.  

X No  

Yes → Describe the steps taken to avoid coercion & undue influence:  

H. Recruitment:  

36. Describe the specific steps that will be used to identify and/or contact prospective participants, records and/or tissue. If applicable, also describe how you will have access to lists and/or records of potential participants.  

Contact information for the participants will initially be obtained through their perspective Chiefs of Police. The Chiefs of Police will be contacted during a monthly Chiefs of Police meeting that the principal investigator will attend and present the study. The Chiefs not attending the meeting, but whose departments are still eligible for participation, will be contacted via email with permission for the submitted proposed study by the principal investigator. If the Chief does not wish to meet in person, the principal investigator will email and attach applicable paperwork, to include a permission letter, a copy of implied consent, and a copy of the survey instrument. Once permission is granted by the Chiefs of Police, a preliminary email will be generated and distributed to each Chief of Police. This researcher will then ask each Chief of Police...
to distribute this email to all applicable officers in their perspective departments. The email will contain information on the purpose of the study, contact information, and statements that they will not be required to conduct the web-based survey. This email will be considered part of the recruitment phase for each officer.

- Indicate the types of recruitment that will be used for this research & attach copies of the materials. Choose all that apply:
  - Newspaper/magazine ads → Where will the ads be placed?
  - Radio/TV ads → Where will the ads be placed?
  - Letters/Emails to potential participants
- Explain how potential participants contact information (name & address) was obtained: Each Chief of Police will be sent an email to distribute to his/her officers, preparing them for the survey. The email will consist of information regarding the survey and applicable contact information.
  - Letters/Emails to healthcare professionals for recruitment purposes
  - Flyers/posters – Where will the items be displayed/distributed?
  - Brochures – Where will the items be displayed/distributed?
  - Web sites – List all the sites where the recruitment materials will be posted:
  - Email via Listserv
  - Script – Verbal (i.e., telephone, face-to-face, classroom)
  - Subject Pool → Indicate which subject pool will be used:
    - Psychology – UP
    - Psychology – Harrisburg
    - Psychology – Schuylkill
    - Psychology – Behrend
    - CAS 100A
- Note: If you are not a member of the subject pool’s department, a permission letter will be needed.
  - Other → Explain:
  - None of the above

38. Who will approach and/or respond to potential participants during recruitment?
   Jason W. Julseth

39. Explain how your recruitment methods and intended population will allow you access to the required number of participants needed for this study within the proposed recruitment period.

   The intended applicants are all qualified Police Officers in Cumberland County, PA. The most recent research conducted has established the approximate number of Police Officers in Cumberland County equating to approx. 174 personnel.

- Before potential participants sign a consent form, are there any screening/eligibility questions that you need to directly ask the individual to determine whether he/she qualifies for enrollment in this study? NOTE: Attach the screening/eligibility questions, data collection sheet and, as appropriate, a procedure and script for the screening/eligibility questions.
  - No → Skip to Question 42
  - Yes → Answer Question 41

- During screening/eligibility questions, will identifiable information about these individuals be recorded?
  - No
  - Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix B

- Will investigators access medical charts and/or hospital/clinic databases for recruitment purposes?
  - No → Skip to Question 44
  - Yes → Answer Question 43

- Has a waiver of authorization to access protected health information been requested?
  - No → Explain why a waiver of authorization has NOT been requested:
  - Yes
Will physicians/clinicians provide identifiable, patient information (e.g., name, telephone number, address) to investigators for recruitment purposes?

☐ X No
☐ Yes → Provide a copy of the written authorization release form for review.

I. Consent:

45. When and where will participants be approached to obtain informed consent/assent [include the timing of obtaining consent in the response]? If participants could be non-English speaking, illiterate or have other special circumstances, describe the steps taken to minimize the possibility of coercion and undue influence. Attach a copy of the informed consent/assent form(s).

When the participants receive the survey via their departmental email, they will be asked to read the implied consent, which will accompany the survey instrument; the implied consent will precede the survey instrument. Both the implied consent and the survey instrument will be in an internet-based form on any selected computer, originating from a web-based survey program.

46. Who will be responsible for obtaining informed consent/assent from participants?

The participants will be provided an implied consent prior to their participation in the survey. The implied consent will be the first webpage before the study. The officer must elect to click on the “next” button to go to the next web page, which would be the survey. Contact information for the researcher, and the researcher’s advisor, is written in the confines of the implied consent web page should any questions or comments arise.

47. Do the people responsible for obtaining consent/assent speak the same language as the participants?

☐ No → Explain how consent/assent will be obtained.
☐ X Yes

What type of consent will be obtained? Choose all that apply. Guidelines for developing informed consent forms and sample and template informed consent forms may be located at http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/samples/index.asp#expfull.

☐ Signed consent – participant will sign consent form
☐ X Implied consent – participant will not sign consent form (e.g., mail survey, email, on-line survey)
☐ Verbal consent – participant gives consent verbally (e.g., in-person interview, telephone interview)
☐ X Passive/Opt Out consent – participant only required to act if they do not want to participate
☐ Waiver of certain parts of informed consent – researcher does not want to inform participants of the study’s true purpose (e.g., deception)
☐ Complete waiver of informed consent – researcher does not want to obtain consent at all
☐ Other → Describe:

49. If multiple groups of participants are being utilized (i.e., teachers, parents, children, others), who will and will not sign the assent/consent form? Specify for each group of participants.

The participants will read a copy of the implied consent provided to them in the web-based survey. Should a participant desire to keep a copy of the implied consent for themselves, they may print one off the computer from the template.

50. Participants are to receive a copy of the informed consent form with the IRB approval stamp/statement on it. Describe how participants will receive a copy of the informed consent form to keep for their records. If this is not possible, explain why not.
The implied consent will be accompanied with the survey instrument for the participator to read and print from the computer in which they are receiving the survey. If a printer is not accessible, he/she may save a copy of the implied consent for their future records on a separate database of their choosing.

J. Payment for Participation:
51. Indicate the type and amount of payment for participation that will be offered. Choose all that apply. **DO NOT STATE THE AMOUNT OF EXTRA CREDIT IS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR – THE AMOUNT FOR EACH CLASS MUST BE PROVIDED.**
   ___ Compensation will **NOT** be offered
   _____ Extra/Class Credit (e.g., 5 points, 1% of final grade) Amount: ______
   _____ Money Amount: ______
   _____ Gift Certificate Amount: ______
   _____ Drawing Explain: ______
   _____ Other (e.g., merchandise) Explain: ______

52. An alternative, equal in time and effort, must be offered to individuals who do not wish to participate in the research study. Describe the alternative(s) available for earning the extra/class credit. The description should include the length of time it will take to complete the alternative as well as how undue influence will be prevented. **DO NOT STATE THE ALTERNATIVE IS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR – A DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE NEEDS TO BE PROVIDED.**

53. Will compensation be pro-rated? **NOTE: Pro-rating is required for FDA-regulated studies.**
   _____ No → Skip to Question 55
   _____ Yes → Answer Question 54

54. Describe how compensation will be pro-rated. Pro-rating is recommended to avoid unfair inducements to remain in the study when one might otherwise withdraw. Researchers may provide a small bonus incentive for participants who complete the entire study.

K. Data Collection Measures/Instruments:
55. **Choose any of the following** data collection measures/instruments that will be used in this study. **Attach a copy of all instruments/measures, interview and focus group topics/questions to the application.**
   _____ Biological Specimens – e.g., blood, urine & other human derived samples
   _____ Biomedical Devices – e.g., EEG, EKG, MRI
   _____ Diaries/Journals completed by the participants
   _____ Focus Groups
   _____ Individual Interviews – Open-ended, Semi-Structured, In-person, Telephone
   _____ Knowledge/Cognitive Tests
   _____ Observations
   _____ Physical Testing Measures – e.g., Height, Weight, Body Mass Index, Blood Pressure
   ___ Questionnaires/Surveys – e.g., Mail, Internet, Telephone, Email, Paper/Pencil
   _____ Course Assignments and/or Grades
   _____ Other → Explain: ______

56. Will participants be assigned to groups?
   ___ No → Skip to Question 58
   _____ Yes → Answer Question 57

___ Will a control group(s) be used?
   _____ No
   _____ Yes → **Choose one of the following:**
          _____ Placebo control
L. Recordings – Audio, Video, Photographs
58. Will any type of recordings (audio, video, digital) or photographs be made during this study?
   ___ X ___ No
   ____ Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix 10

M. Computer/Internet
59. Will any data collection for this study be conducted on the Internet or via email (e.g., on-line surveys, observations of chat rooms or blogs, on-line interviews, surveys via email)?
   ____ No
   ___ X ___ Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix 11, Section A

60. Will a commercial service provider (i.e., SurveyMonkey, Psych Data, Zoomerang) be used to collect data or for data storage?
   ____ No
   ___ X ___ Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix 11, Section B

N. Discomforts and Risks
61. List the potential discomforts and risks (physical, psychological, legal, social or financial) – describe the likelihood or seriousness of the discomforts/risks. For studies presenting no more than minimal risk, loss of confidentiality may be the main risk associated with this research study.

   There are certain demographic data questions that are asked within the survey that may or may not be identifiable within each department, should other individuals or the researcher seek to identify the specific variables associated with each survey. The possible risks could result in loss of job status or changes in work environment.

62. Describe how the discomforts/risks will be minimized and/or how participants will be protected against potential discomforts/risks throughout the study (e.g., label research with code numbers, screening to assure appropriate selection of participants, identify standard of care procedures, sound research design, safety monitoring and reporting).

   The effects of risk will be minimized through the web-based program, meaning no specific department is indicated within the survey. The researcher will not know which survey came from each participating department. Also, there are no emails associated with each officer when their survey is completed and sent. Only the researcher has access to the website to retrieve the surveys. SurveyMonkey.com purports that even they don’t have direct access to the encrypted surveys.

63. Does this research involve greater than minimal risk to the participants?
   ___ X ___ No
   ____ Yes → Study must be reviewed by the Full IRB at a convened meeting.

64. Describe how the discomforts/risks to participants are reasonable in relation in anticipated benefits.

   The benefits outweigh the risks because the benefits will provide much needed information on the subject matter, i.e. job satisfaction. Each officer is assumed to take all appropriate caution in completing the survey on a computer away from other individuals, who may have the ability to watch how the officer is replying to the questions. Should an officer be identified through surreptitious means and job loss occurs, he/she has the option to take action against an unjust termination for simply replying to a Chief-condoned survey. The importance of officer job satisfaction is critical for this area and the importance will be emphasized during the recruitment phase, as well as the process of how to safeguard answers.

   ___ X ___ Will medical or psychological care be available for participants who may require it as a result of the study?
   ___ X ___ No → Explain why medical or psychological care will NOT be available: The participants are completing a survey regarding their job satisfaction and will not need assistance from medical or psychological services
   ____ Yes → Identify the source of medical or psychological care available – include address & telephone number: ______

   ___ X ___ Does the research protocol have a plan for routine analysis or monitoring of the data and safety of this research study?
For studies involving greater than minimal risk, a plan will need to be developed for review and approval at the convened IRB meeting.

Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix 17

O. Benefits

67. What are the potential benefits to the individual participants of the proposed research study? If none, state such. PLEASE NOTE: PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION CANNOT BE CONSIDERED A BENEFIT.

The benefit to the participants is that it will provide a clearer picture to the police administrators a more accurate depiction of factors that influence their officer’s job satisfaction. They may then be able to use this information to develop programs or modify policies that addresses the needs of the department.

68. What are the potential benefits to others from the proposed research study? If none, state such.

Society – Any possible benefits to society would entail a clearer understanding regarding levels of job satisfaction of police officers in their jurisdiction.

P. Deception

69. Does this study involve giving false or misleading information to participants or withholding information from them such that their “informed” consent is in question?

No → Complete & Submit Appendix 12

Q. Confidentiality and Privacy

What’s the difference between participant privacy & data confidentiality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consider the following when addressing data confidentiality:</th>
<th>Consider the following when addressing participant privacy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Is confidentiality pledged?</td>
<td>• Will participants think that the information sought is any of the researcher’s business?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there any legal or ethical requirements to maintain confidentiality?</td>
<td>• Will participants be comfortable in the research setting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will data release NOT cause risk or harm?</td>
<td>• Do procedures for identifying participants minimize any invasion of privacy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there restricted access (locks/passwords)?</td>
<td>• Are the research procedures designed to minimize any invasion of privacy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is a Certificate of Confidentiality needed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are techniques used to protect data from re-identification?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. Describe the provisions made to protect participants’ privacy interests and minimize intrusion.

Due to the various biographical data information requested in each survey of the officer, there is the possibility that this particular information could be linked to each individual officer, i.e. gender, age, years in the occupation, etc. The web-based system, Survey Monkey, cannot guarantee anonymity, nor can the principal investigator, due to issues of hacking, etc. However, the web-based provider, Survey Monkey, does provide sophisticated anti-intrusion efforts to individuals who respond to registered survey templates, i.e. the participants in this particular study.

71. Describe the provisions made to maintain confidentiality of the data. Choose all that apply.

Password protected computer files
Locked file cabinets
Locked offices
Identification code (i.e., code numbers, pseudonyms) – data will NOT be associated w/personal identifiers
Other → Explain:

72. Will the data contain identifiable information?
73. Who will have access to the data?
   The principal investigator, Jason W. Julseth and Dr. Don Hummer, co-investigator.

74. Will identifiers be disclosed to a sponsor or collaborators at another institution?
   __X__ No
   _____ Yes → List the identifiers that will be disclosed and explain why this is necessary: _____

75. Will a record or list containing a code (i.e., code numbers, pseudonyms) and participants’ identity be used in this study?
   __X__ No → Skip to Question 79
   _____ Yes → Answer Questions 76 – 78

76. Where will the record or list linking the code to participants’ identity be stored and how will the list be secured?

77. Who will have access to the record or list linking the code to participants’ identity?

78. Will the list linking the code to participants’ identity be destroyed?
   _____ No
   _____ Yes → When will the list be destroyed? _____

79. What will happen to the research records when the research has been completed? Choose only one.
   _____ Stored indefinitely with identifiers removed → If a code list will be maintained, this choice is NOT APPLICABLE.
   _____ Stored indefinitely with identifiers attached
   __X__ Stored for length of time required by federal regulations/funding source & then destroyed (minimum of 3 years)
   _____ Destroyed after a number of years (minimum of 3 years) → Specify the number of years: _____
   _____ Destroyed when notified by sponsor
   _____ Other → Explain: _____

80. Could the information being collected for this study have adverse consequences for participants or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, insurability or reputation?
   __X__ No
   _____ Yes → Indicate the type of information being collected:
   _____ Substance abuse or other illegal risk behaviors
   _____ Determination of HIV status for the research
   _____ Genetic information about inheritable diseases
   _____ Other → Explain: _____

81. Will a "Certificate of Confidentiality" (CoC) be obtained from the federal government?
   __X__ No
   _____ Yes → Indicate who will obtain the Certificate of Confidentiality & submit a copy of the CoC when it is received.
   _____ Sponsor
   _____ Principal Investigator
   _____ Other → Explain: _____

R. Health Insurance Portability & Accountability Act (HIPAA) – Use of protected health information
82. Will participant’s protected health information (PHI) be obtained for this study?
S. Drugs, Medical Devices, and Other Substances
83. Does this research study involve the use of drugs, biologics, alternative medications, supplements, herbals, chemicals or other substances?
   \[ \square \text{No} \quad \square \text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Complete & Submit Appendix 13} \]

84. Does this research study involve a device?
   \[ \square \text{No} \rightarrow \text{Skip to Question 87} \quad \square \text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Go to Question 85} \]

85. Does the device meet the FDA’s definition of a medical device?
   \[ \square \text{No} \rightarrow \text{Skip to Question 87} \quad \square \text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Go to Question 86} \]

**FDA’s Definition of a Medical Device:** If a product is labeled, promoted or used in a manner that meets the following definition in section 201(h) of the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic (FD&C) Act it will be regulated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as a medical device and is subject to pre-marketing and post-marketing regulatory controls. A device is:

- “an instrument, apparatus, implement, machine, contrivance, implant, in vitro reagent, or other similar or related article, including a component part, or accessory which is:
  - Recognized in the official National Formulary, or the United States Pharmacopoeia, or any supplement to them,
  - Intended for use in the diagnosis of disease or other conditions, or in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease, in man or other animals, or
  - Intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals, and which does not achieve any of it's primary intended purposes through chemical action within or on the body of man or other animals and which is not dependent upon being metabolized for the achievement of any of its primary intended purposes.”

86. Is the medical device being used as approved by the FDA?
   \[ \square \text{No} \rightarrow \text{Complete & Submit Appendix 20} \quad \square \text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Go to Question 87} \]

87. Does the study involve participants ingesting food or drink for research purposes?
   \[ \square \text{No} \rightarrow \text{Skip to Question 89} \quad \square \text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Go to Question 88} \]

88. Are there any plans to submit the data to the FDA for a marketing application (i.e., health care related marketing claims)?
   \[ \square \text{No} \quad \square \text{Yes} \]

T. Biological Specimens
89. Will biological specimens (including blood, urine and other human-derived samples) be used in this study?
   \[ \square \text{No} \quad \square \text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Complete & Submit Appendix 15} \]

**NOTE:** If the response to Question 89 is YES, an “Application for Research – Human Blood or Products” must be submitted to the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) for review and approval. This application may be located at [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/biohazardous/applications/index.asp](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/biohazardous/applications/index.asp).

U. Other Biomedical Procedures – Diagnostic Radiation Procedures, Physical Activity, Diet Modifications
90. Will participants be asked to undergo a diagnostic radiation procedure(s) while enrolled in this study?

____X__ No
_____ Yes → Complete & Submit Appendix 16 → Study must be reviewed by the Full IRB at a convened meeting.

91. Will participants be required to engage in or perform any form of physical activity?

____X__ No
_____ Yes → Describe the nature and extent of the physical activity: ______

92. Will any type of electrical equipment other than audio headphones be attached to the participants (e.g., EMG, EKG, special glasses)?

____X__ No
_____ Yes → Submit a letter describing the most recent safety inspection of the equipment with the supporting documents for this application.

Assurances

As the principal investigator on this research study, I assure that...

1. this application, if funded by an extramural source, accurately reflects all procedures involving human participants described in the grant proposal to the funding agency previously noted or an explanation is given for any differences.

2. I will obtain approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) before initiating any changes to the approved study, including changes in procedures, personnel, documents, instruments, etc., except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. In the latter instance, the IRB must be notified by the next workday.

3. I am familiar with and will comply with all pertinent institutional, local, state, and Federal regulations and policies. I will (a) adhere to the policies and procedures described in Penn State’s Federalwide Assurance with the Office for Human Research Protections as well as Federal regulations for the protection of human participants involved in research (45CFR46; 21CFR parts 50 & 56) and (b) conduct the research ethically according to the Belmont Report. Copies of these documents are available in the ORP upon request or on their website – http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/.

4. the information provided in this application reasonably summarizes the nature and extent of the proposed use of human participants.

5. I will notify the IRB of any unanticipated problems according to the IRB’s Standard Operating Procedure Addendum, “Reporting of Unanticipated Problems involving Risks to Participants or Others,” which may be located on the ORP website at http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/policies/index.asp#area3.

6. all individuals listed on this form are competent and have been properly trained. I also assure that all individuals will complete the required training for the protection of human participants available on-line prior to contact with human participants.

7. any individual associated with or responsible for the design, the conduct, or the reporting of this research will comply with Penn State’s Conflict of Interest Policy, RA-05.
Signature of Principal Investigator, REQUIRED

I hereby confirm that I have read this application and my signature denotes the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.

PRINT Name of Faculty Advisor, REQUIRED IF PI IS A STUDENT

SIGNATURE of Faculty Advisor, REQUIRED IF PI IS A STUDENT

Date

I hereby confirm that I have read this application and my signature denotes departmental/unit approval of this project. To the best of my knowledge, the information in the attached application relating to members of my department is correct.

The investigator(s) who are members of my department are qualified to perform the roles proposed for them in this application. Any novice researchers from my department will be supervised by qualified investigators.

PRINT Name of PI’s Department/Unit Head, REQUIRED

SIGNATURE of PI’s Department/Unit Head, REQUIRED

Date
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APPENDIX 9
WAIVERS OF INFORMED CONSENT

Form Instructions:

- To complete the form, press TAB or SHIFT TAB between boxes and enter an ‘X’ or text. For assistance, contact the Office for Research Protections.
- Handwritten applications will NOT be accepted.

Project Title: Municipal Police Officer Job Satisfaction in Cumberland County Pennsylvania: A Study of Organizational Development in Small Police Departments

Principal Investigator: Jason W. Julseth

PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): 915082395

Email Address: jwj127@psu.edu

A. Waiver of Documentation of Informed Consent – Complete if “Implied consent” or “Verbal consent” is checked in Question 48 of the Application for the Use of Human Participants

NOTE: A waiver of documentation of informed consent occurs when you are obtaining informed consent but participants are not required to sign the consent form (e.g., implied consent, verbal consent). The act of their completing and submitting the survey/interview would be considered their implied consent to participate.

1. One of the following two conditions must be met to allow for a process other than signed informed consent to be utilized. Choose which condition is applicable:

   _____ The only record linking the participant and the research would be the informed consent form. The principal risk to the participant is the potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each participant will be asked whether he/she wants documentation linking the participant with the research and the participant’s wishes will govern. If choosing this category, this study CANNOT be FDA-regulated. → Explain how your study fits into the category: _____

   __X_ The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to participants & involves no procedures for which signed consent is normally required outside of the research context. → Explain how your study fits into the category: Participants are not asked anything incriminating in the survey, nor are they asked to provide information on episodes of diverting policy. The study involves compressing data from a group of individuals (police officers) and determining the totality of the circumstances regarding job satisfaction. A signed consent form would not enhance the results of the subject matter. Prima Fascia, these surveys are considered confidential and risk is considered minimal. The participant has the option to choose not to continue with the survey after reading his/her implied consent, which will be provided before the survey. Confidentiality is only possible if the officer does not fill out the survey within the confines of other individuals watching the officer, and/or the officer verbally talks about his/her answers on the survey to others. There is also a possibility of information being compromised by various technology flaws. The demographic based questions are extremely important in determining factors relating to job satisfaction. The possibility of confidentiality being compromised through the researchers actions and/or the web-based program itself is as minimal as possible.

2. Describe how participants will receive a written summary of the information to keep for their records. If this is not possible, explain why it is not possible for participants to receive a written summary of the information to keep for their records.

The implied consent is placed in conjunction with the instrument survey which is provided to each participant through their respective emails. The implied consent form specifically states that by reading the form, it implies that they agree to...
consent to participate in the study. Since the survey will be conducted on the internet by the participant, he/she has the option of printing a copy of the implied consent for his/her records. If there is no printer available, the participant may copy the implied consent to save to a different database for their records. The participant may opt to choose not to complete the survey.

B. Waiver of Informed Consent – Complete if “Passive/Opt out consent,” “Waiver of certain parts of informed consent,” or “Complete waiver of informed consent” is checked in Question 48 of the Application for the Use of Human Participants

NOTE: A waiver of informed consent means that the IRB is not requiring the principal investigator to obtain informed consent (i.e., the participants are sent a letter and are not required to act unless they do NOT wish to participate in the study OR the investigator is not required to obtain consent from participants) OR a consent procedure which does not include or which alters some or all of the required elements of consent. If requesting a waiver of informed consent, this study CANNOT be FDA-regulated.

1. Explain why a waiver of informed consent is being requested. _____

2. Describe how this study meets all four of the following conditions:
   • The research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants. → Explain how your study meets this criteria: _____
   • The waiver will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of participants. → Explain how your study meets this criteria: _____
   • The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver. → Explain how your study meets this criteria: _____
   • Will participants be provided with additional pertinent information after participation?
     _____ Yes
     _____ No → Explain why not: _____
APPENDIX I

USE OF COMPUTER AND/OR INTERNET IN RESEARCH
APPENDIX 11
USE OF COMPUTER AND/OR INTERNET IN RESEARCH

Form Instructions:
- To complete the form, press TAB or SHIFT TAB between boxes and enter an ‘X’ or text. For assistance, contact the Office for Research Protections.
- Handwritten applications will NOT be accepted.

Project Title: Municipal Police Officer Job Satisfaction in Cumberland County Pennsylvania: A Study of Organizational Development in Small Police Departments

Principal Investigator: Jason W. Julseth
PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): 915082395
Email Address: jwj127@psu.edu

A. Complete this Appendix if the response to Question 59 in the Application for the Use of Human Participants is YES.

1. Is there a method in place to authenticate the identity of participants (i.e., use of pin number, logging into a site)?
   - No → Explain why an authentication method is not in place:
   - Yes → Describe the authentication method: There is a user name and password only linked to the principal investigator's information that is required in order to create a web-based online survey for the principal investigator. The participants of the survey, however, will not be asked to identify their names or contact information; there is discernable identifying data on the surveys that could possibly identify an officer regarding race, gender, age, years on the job, etc. A combination of this data has the propensity to specifically identify an officer by name if the information was available to members of the department or others. Each officer has an option to choose not to provide the various demographic informative questions.

2. Will data be sent in an encrypted format?
   - No → Explain why data will not be sent in an encrypted format:
   - Yes → Describe the level of encryption: Verisign certificate Version 3; 128 bit encryption

B. Complete this Appendix if the response to Question 60 in the Application for the Use of Human Participants is YES.

1. Identify the commercial service provider who will collect and/or store the data.
   - SurveyMonkey
   - Zoomerang
   - PsychData
   - Other → Identify the commercial service provider:

2. Describe the commercial service provider's confidentiality policies and procedures - include information about security audits of the server. If policies & procedures are attached, indicate such.
   The Survey Monkey website provides the following policies on confidentiality and security:
We [Survey Monkey] are located in the US and all surveys and data are stored on our servers. The servers are kept at Sungard - www.sungard.com. In regards to the security of our infrastructure, here is an overview:

**Physical:**
- Servers kept in locked cage
- Entry requires a passcard and biometric recognition
- Digital surveillance equipment
- Controls for temperature, humidity and smoke/fire detection
- Staffed 24/7

**Network:**
- Multiple independent connections to Tier 1 Internet access providers
- Fully redundant OC-48 SONET Rings
- Uptime monitored every 5 minutes, with escalation to SurveyMonkey staff
- Firewall restricts access to all ports except 80 (http) and 443 (https)
- QualysGuard network security audits performed weekly. Hackersafe scans performed daily.

**Hardware:**
- Servers have redundant internal power supplies
- Data is on RAID 10, operating system on RAID 1
- Database is log-shipped to standby server and can failover in less than one hour

**Software:**
- Code in ASP.NET 2.0, running on SQL Server 2005 and Windows 2003 Server
- Latest patches applied to all operating system and application files
- SSL encryption of all billing data and passwords
- Data backed up every hour internally
- Data backed up every night to centralized backup system, with offsite backups in event of catastrophe