PERFORMANCE, MORALE, & JOB SATISFACTION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

WITH AUTOCRATIC LEADERSHIP:

A MODIFIED DELPHI STUDY

by

Joshua L. Hadnot-Harris

Copyright 2021

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Management

University of Phoenix

The Dissertation Committee for Joshua L. Hadnot-Harris certifies approval of the following dissertation:

PERFORMANCE, MORALE, & JOB SATISFACTION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT WITH

AUTOCRATIC LEADERSHIP:

A MODIFIED DELPHI STUDY

Committee:

Leslie Huffman, DM, Chair

Christine Enslin, EdD, University Research Methodologist

James Lane, EdD, Panel Validator

Les H Huffman

Leslie Huffman

Christine Enslin

Christine Enslin

James Lane

James Lane

Hinrich Eylers, PhD
Vice Provost, Doctoral Studies
University of Phoenix

Date Approved: 4/10/2021

ABSTRACT

Law enforcement agencies struggle to manage personnel's performance, morale, and job satisfaction. The literature examined indicted that law enforcement has long practiced autocratic leadership due to the connection of paramilitary structure. The specific problem for this study was how leaders can influence future changes to policing through education and training by examining the influences that autocratic leaders have on performance, morale, and job satisfaction within Texas law enforcement. The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi study was to gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes to the profession through education and training of future leaders. The expert panel was a mixture of participants in leadership positions with knowledge and understanding of performance, morale, and job satisfaction of law enforcement in Texas. The experts engaged in three rounds of surveys on autocratic leadership strategies and practices that may influence performance, morale, and job satisfaction. The study identified five themes that identified how strategies and practices of police leadership may change if viewed differently, while establishing a foundation for future research. The themes were identified as: performance is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders, morale is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders, job satisfaction is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders, education and training is influenced strategies and practices of leaders, and leadership strategies and practices influence every officer differently. The implications of this study for leaders, is that law enforcement leaders should utilize alternative approaches to leadership styles

and practices outside of the natural autocratic style, which could affect performance,

morale, and job satisfaction.

DEDICATION

To my wife, Taylor Hadnot, I love you, and there are not enough descriptive, motivating words that I could put in this section to express my gratitude for your continued support and sacrifices throughout this doctoral journey. The missed family events, sleepless nights, and countless hours of research in my office have generated a study we can be proud of. To my children, Jaidyn Hadnot, Amelia Hadnot, Joshua Hadnot a.k.a Grady, and Parker Hadnot, I am proud of all of you and hope one day when you read this manuscript, it will inspire you to embrace change and be bold enough to lead the discovery of new ways and methods to lead the world as strong followers of God. Without my family's support, sacrifices, and encouragement, I could not have completed this doctoral journey.

To my mother, Joy Hadnot, I appreciate your guidance and sound advice that you have continued to provide me throughout my life while never letting me settle for average desires. To my aunt, Katie Kenebrew, I appreciate your support and guidance in conjunction with my mother to constantly encourage me even in my darkest hours providing hope and unconditional love with a focus on success in the face of setbacks. To my in-laws, Gary and Karen Marshall, I thank you for accepting me into your life, as your son, without reservation. You both have stood by me through the good times and bad while offering constant support and encouragement. I appreciate you showing me that God should be first in all things and we are here to serve him in everything we do.

I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my late grandmother, Arline Hadnot a.k.a Granny. It was in your memory that I was persistent in this dissertation process as your presence was felt as a source of encouragement for me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents   Page

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

The various styles of leadership can be hard to navigate in law enforcement as organizations are made up of a large generational gap. Generational differences can be described as the characteristics, social values, and beliefs a certain generation holds that are different when compared to another generation (Duron, 2018). With this gap comes the task of trying to find the consensus leadership style to use outside of the normal autocratic style that most law enforcement officers are accustomed to. Davis and Bailey (2018) explained that command-based leadership, is task-oriented, directive, and autocratic as police leadership is centralized from a top-down structure and lacks the innovative approach to expanding power throughout the organization. The contemporary policing landscape necessitates a move away from command-based leadership to incorporate innovative approaches to leadership (Davis & Bailey, 2018).

Along with this task is the ability to implement some type of strategy to survey, question, or analyze the temperature of the organization and immediately change the culture. The College of Policing (2015) confirmed the need to develop collaborative leadership practices in which power is dispersed across police organization (College of Policing, 2015; Davis & Bailey, 2018). Autocratic leadership is a style of leadership where a leader dictates guidelines, policies and directs and governs all activities without any meaningful participation by their employees (Hackman & Johnson, 2009). Autocratic leadership style has been greatly criticized during the past years and some studies informed that organizations with many autocratic leaders have higher turnover and absenteeism than other organizations (Cherry, 2015).

Many researchers, in the past examined the performance and factors affecting employee performance (Chua et al., 2018). One of the dominant key factors that have been discussed were leadership such as participative, autocratic, and democratic (Iqbal et al., 2015). Leadership style is the most dominant factor that impact employees' attitudes and behaviors including organizational commitment (Chua et al., 2018). Research findings indicate the common factors of low morale to be low pay, poor job benefits (Goleman, 2017). Leadership appears to have a relationship with morale, regardless of whether or not the leader sees or understands this. Figuring out what may lead to morale issues within law enforcement agencies is a current challenge (Minto, 2019). Organizational research has found that job satisfaction promotes affective commitment and attachment (Yousef, 2017), reduces burnout (Peng et al., 2016), and increases employees' intentions to continue working for the employer (Yousef, 2017).

Job satisfaction is a key element in attracting and retaining officers (Paoline & Gau, 2020). Affective component of job satisfaction is a subjective construct representing an emotional feeling individuals have about their jobs. Hence, affective job satisfaction for individuals reflects the degree of pleasure or happiness their jobs in general induce (Obodo et al., 2019). Training organizational leadership and management to move away from the autocratic style and toward more of a coaching/mentoring approach will help to retain employees of all generations (Hubbard, 2019).

The research focused on building a consensus among Texas law enforcement officers' perception regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership. Chapter 1 presents a background of performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership. Also included in Chapter 1, are the problem statement,

purpose statement, significance of the study, nature of the study, research questions, theoretical framework, population and sample, and scope. The concluding parts of Chapter 1 include the assumptions, limitations, delimitations, and chapter summary for the Delphi study.

Background of the Problem

The general problem within the law enforcement community is that law enforcement leaders typically utilize autocratic leadership similar to that of military model to supervise. Harms et al. (2018) explained that it has always been quite common for law enforcement agencies to utilize the military structure for police leadership. Trustworthy leaders, especially those who have loyalty from others, tend to excel because their word has value. They have earned respect and trust for their hard work, dedication, and commitment to the organization and its people (Wickramasinghe, 2021). Organizational leaders must facilitate an environment based on trust to navigate the organization successfully. Without trust, organizations tend to derail from their vision and future possibilities (Wickramasinghe, 2021).

McGlon (2016) explained that in law enforcement problems stem from a lack of leadership or socially defective law enforcement individuals. In general, most of the literature to date has explored the ways in which autocratic or authoritarian leadership may have negative influences on follower performance and satisfaction. Highly autocratic leadership is also associated with higher levels of follower cynicism (Jiang et al., 2017), as well as increased feelings of role conflict and role overload (Zhang & Xie, 2017). Leadership includes perceptions of best practices of leaders; indispensable

leadership skills; critical mistakes made by leaders; as well as essential qualities necessary for effective leadership (Garner, 2017).

The dangerous work and outward stress law enforcement officers (LEOs) face suggest law enforcement leaders should further educate themselves on innovative leadership tactics to maintain a healthy workforce (Woodard, 2017). Leadership in general is very difficult component to locate within law enforcement and standard practices provide misconceptions about what leadership is and how effective it can be. Woodard (2017) explained that sometimes autocratic management practices or the lack thereof can provide unnecessary stress to law enforcement officers that may influence performance. Such leadership, as a style of exercising formal authority and position power, may inhibit employees' extra-role behaviors in the hierarchical role structure (Zhang & Xie, 2017). At a time when police leadership needs to become more innovative and people focused, the pressures and complexities of contemporary policing mean that police officers retreat to leadership that is command-based and driven by the primacy of business needs (Davis & Bailey, 2018). The perception of leadership performance and organizational morale in law enforcement organizations are crucial to the longevity of a law enforcement officers career, job satisfaction and wellbeing (Woodard, 2017).

Dictators and other autocratic leaders rely on violence and intimidation to get people to do what they want. Autocratic leader behavior is often seen as negative for team morale and performance (De Hoogh et al., 2015). The amount of power leaders are willing to share with their team members is an important topic in both research and practice (De Hoogh et al., 2015). Autocratic leaders are classic and bossy in nature and want their subordinates to work according to them (Al Khajeh, 2018). Police

4

organizations throughout the world use autocratic leadership, which is a traditional

approach to policing (Marks & Sklansky, 2008). Shane (2019) stated that autocratic

leadership style is the status quo of law enforcement agencies. The autocratic leaders are

less creative and only promote one- sided conversation. This severely affects the

motivation and satisfaction level of the employees. (Al Khajeh, 2018).

In order to respond to such challenges, police leadership has emerged as a focal

point for development (Hoggett et al., 2019). Few police leaders have been able to

provide adequate leadership development to meet the supervisory challenges that face

police officers on a daily basis (Isenberg, 2017). In the context of leadership in the police,

academics and policymakers appear to be racing ahead, championing particular styles

without full understanding of the meaning of leadership to those in leadership positions

(Davis, 2017).

Woodard (2017) in a qualitative narrative inquiry study sampled 10 retired law

enforcement participants in central Georgia. The experiences and stories of retired law

enforcement professionals provided data through interviews using open-ended questions.

Woodard explained that autocratic leaders have positive and negative effects throughout

the law enforcement community, especially on individual officers. Woodard (2017)

explained how positive internal effects could be increased budgets, restructuring

operating procedures which may have a positive or negative effect on the organizational

culture and leadership practices. Whereas the negative external effects could be officer

complaints or amendments to laws.

A law enforcement officer's career can be affected both, indirectly or directly, by

work related stress and their perception of how they are valued. An unhealthy work

relationship between employers and their subordinates can lead to stress, a hostile work environment and a high turnover rate (Woodard, 2017). This stress is sometimes elevated by autocratic management practices or the lack thereof. These stressors could be minimized by supervisors if they are further educated on leadership (Woodard, 2017). Woodard (2017) further explained that understanding the significance of how different management practices impact employees will further assist law enforcement leaders in identifying methods to reducing stress and maintain a healthier workforce thus lowering turnover. Woodard (2017) showed evidence that law enforcement leaders should prioritize education and take a proactive approach to understanding how leadership styles impact officers stress and turnover leaning toward other styles of leadership versus the known autocratic style. Maxwell (2007) explained that as leaders show respect for others of less power or positions, they gain respect from others and people want to follow those they respect. When leaders show respect for others – especially for people who have less power or a lower position than theirs – they gain respect from others.

Leadership deals with people and their dynamics, which are continually changing (Maxwell, 2011). Understanding the significance of how different management styles and practices impact employees will assist future law enforcement leaders in identifying methods to reduce burnout and stress while increasing performance, morale, and job satisfaction. Leadership shapes organization strategies, their execution and effectiveness by inspiring employees to execute task beyond expected organizational targets thereby achieving organizational stated objectives (Puni et al., 2016).

Problem Statement

Law enforcement in the United States has changed a great deal during the last 150 years, but supervisory management and leadership beliefs, principles, and practices have not necessarily kept pace with other changes (Warren, 2020). Martin et al., (2017) explained that historically police organizations were trained for non-changing bureaucratic structure ideally those autocratic in nature. Sarver and Miller (2014) explained that one style can be exhibited most often in a police organization, but those studies do not demonstrate that one style is predominant in law enforcement as a whole. The long-standing approach of the effective autocratic leader is dissolving as law enforcement organizations are turning to adaptive styles of leadership that can produce better officer performance, morale, and job satisfaction. Sarver and Miller (2014) explained that a transformational-type leadership style based on mutual participation can be more effective and have a significantly positive effect on organizational commitment, compliance, satisfaction, communication, and influence. Clearly, leadership skills for policing will need to adjust to meet potential challenges that are likely to occur and traditional police leadership may need to be replaced to facilitate transformation (Martin et al., 2017).

The specific problem is that it is not known and understood how leaders can influence future changes to policing through education and training given that many agencies are structured under an autocratic and hierarchical structure resulting in a lack of input on policy and decision making (performance), lack of administrative support (morale), adverse working schedules such as shift work affecting, unfair disciplines or performance evaluations (job satisfaction), and promotion practices (education and

training (Akwaboah, 2017). Additionally, autocratic leadership is associated with high rates of officer burnout in law enforcement (Russell et al., 2014). Akwaboah (2017) explained that the elements impacting performance, morale, and job satisfaction for exposed officers after months on the job may formulate burnout as a result, ultimately leading to resignation or reassignment of duties. Additionally, burnout is a stress-related syndrome that often affects personnel working with demanding populations that require high interpersonal communication, idiosyncratic situations, and highly loaded emotional work (Akwaboah, 2017). The long-standing approach of the effective autocratic leader is dissolving as law enforcement organizations are turning to adaptive styles of leadership that can influence and produce new strong cultures with expectations of leadership.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi technique was to gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes to the profession through education and training of future leaders. The objective of this study was to gain in-depth knowledge and understanding of the consensus regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas law enforcement for the future of police personnel. Data collection using the Delphi techniques repetitive rounds of questionnaires ensures consensus among the expert panel. However, sometimes during a research study consensus is not attainable due to uncertainty in the group. The choice of the modified Delphi method for this study provided the opportunity to utilize the knowledge, experience and expertise of public safety professionals and practitioners in Texas.

The selection of expert panel members was accomplished by using the purposive expert sampling technique. Expert panelists were asked to participate in a three-round Delphi study, which was administered confidentially through online survey questionnaires, which also contained informed consent and demographic information of participants. Leaders could benefit from the results of research by expanding their knowledge regarding multiple styles of leadership versus one in particular.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was Texas Commission on Law Enforcement certified male and female experienced law enforcement personnel currently in supervisory positions in Texas that have attained certifications in leadership from accredited recognized institutions. Mikkelsen (2020) and Rutberg and Bouikidis (2018) identified population as the full set of conditions from which the sample was selected. According to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (2020) there are approximately 80,088 certified peace officers within Texas. Participants for this study were 15 Texas law enforcement experts currently in leadership positions ranging from Sergeant to Chief of Police or Sheriff but having since been in a subordinate role also. The investigator reached out to several seasoned Texas law enforcement officers to recruit a 15-member expert panel to participate in a three-round Delphi study process. According to Steele et al. (2008), a panel size ranges from 15 to 35 is the typical size for a Delphi study, with the expectation that 35% to 75% of the population will participate (Altaai, 2020). The Delphi literature recommends a panel size range from 10-18 participants (Weimer & Securing, 2008). Therefore, the appropriate sample size was selected from the population of 35 subject matter experts, which was 15 participants.

Qualitative researchers seek to understand an experience through smaller samples, where the selection of the sample is not done by mathematics (Berg & Lune, 2012; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The sample size was determined upon the answers of section I of the first-round questionnaire which was the demographic and general information of participants, which was provided after informed consent. Expert panelist possessed a high school diploma or equivalent and or had a post-secondary degree with a minimum of seven years of experience in law enforcement, active sworn Texas peace officer or sworn federal agent with law enforcement privileges, hold a current leadership position with a minimal rank of Sergeant and a maximum rank of Chief of Police or Sheriff or designated position of supervision through the federal agency's structure. Along with having attended some additional form of leadership training such as FBI National Academy (FBI-NA), Federal Bureau of Investigations Law Enforcement Executive Development Association (FBI-LEEDA) Supervisor, Command, or Executive Leadership Institute, The Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas (LEMIT) Leadership Command College, Institute for Law Enforcement Administration (ILEA), or the Senior Management Institute for Police (SMIP) through the Police Executive Research Forum.

Panel members could discontinue participation anytime they deemed necessary. The recruitment process was conducted through both face-to-face contact and primarily emails to potential study participants who may met the preceding established criteria. The strategy was to send two separate emails a week and a half apart from each other. The first e-mail requested participation in the study and the second being a reminder of the initial request for participation. All e-mail correspondence to participants originated from

a secured email account for added security, anonymity and provided the ability to unsubscribe from future e-mail correspondence. The initial e-mail request contained a synoptic description of the problem and importance of this study, time commitment, study research question, research design, and the iterative nature of the Delphi technique.

Excellent sources of information are experts who are knowledgeable in or about the subject matter of an area of research work and able to express as well as share their expertise (Patton, 2015). Purposeful sampling was appropriate for this qualitative modified Delphi study on the future of performance, morale, and job satisfaction in Texas law enforcement with autocratic leadership and the consensus experts may relate it to. Purposeful sampling is the approach, which identifies and selects individuals or groups of individuals who are knowledgeable or experienced regarding the subject matter of a study or research interest (Patton, 2015). There is a tendency for bias in purposeful sampling due to the use of personal judgment by researchers to determine participants expertise and competence, thus the imperativeness to clearly define the requirements for participation in the study (Tongco, 2007).

The selection of the 15-member expert panel was from local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies in Texas. The principal investigator has obtained designation from Federal Bureau of Investigations Law Enforcement Executive Development Association (FBI-LEEDA) Trilogy series compromising of the Supervisor Leadership Institute (SLI), Command Leadership Institute (CLI), and the Executive Leadership Institute (ELI). Along with the Leadership Command College (LCC) designation consisting of three universities, Texas A&M University (TA&M), Texas Woman's University (TWU), and Sam Houston State University (SHSU); thus, from all settings, a

significant number of expert panel members could be recruited for this study from the personal and professional network of the principal investigator.

Significance of the Study

This research could contribute to further studies regarding autocratic leadership and management practices, which can shape the law enforcement profession. Manners (2011) explained that law enforcement officers' attitudes toward change differs because of the intricacy of the organizational structure, their emotional and cognitive processes. Determining how performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas is perceived by law enforcement leaders on a broader perspective is important and healthy for work relationships within law enforcement organizations. This study sought to obtain consensus regarding autocratic leadership within law enforcement organizations on a broad scale with a mixture of generations from the respective profession. Actively sworn, Texas law enforcement officers along with federal officers with law enforcement privileges and powers were selected to participate in this study due to their longtime law enforcement careers and to compile a wide range of leadership traits and characteristics from a broad consensus base for future education, training and changes to leadership.

The data collected from active law enforcement officers based on their careers may assist the law enforcement community in improving leadership skills training and reducing turnover while extending careers. Furthermore, this study was intended to help current and future law enforcement leaders improve relationships with their subordinates. A healthy working relationship throughout the law enforcement organization is essential in today's society. Law enforcement organizations are paramilitary and have utilized the authorization or autocratic leadership style predominantly. The dominant style of

autocratic leadership in law enforcement organizations is based solely on the beliefs of positivism. Basically, they believe that the land of the law is the only basis for human knowledge and critical thinking. This leadership style could be problematic because the concept of motivating with fear could increase stress amongst officers (Woodard, 2017). This is or may be the philosophy of some law enforcement leaders because it implies that they are in charge, the current system is working, why change their leadership strategies (Woodard, 2017).

Law enforcement is expected to believe in this theory due to the laws of our government and the sworn duty to uphold and enforce the laws that are understood by all. Most law enforcement organizations are structured based on an autocratic, hierarchical model with strictly enforced lines of authority (Hubbard, 2019). Understanding the impact of autocratic leadership and its counterproductive characteristics in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction is why it may serve as a catalyst for a future study. Simply put – at its most elemental and practical level – leadership is communicating to people their worth and potential so clearly that they come to see it themselves (Covey, 2013).

Nature of the Study

The nature of this qualitative modified Delphi study was to obtain consensus and gain knowledge of the effect of autocratic leadership styles from active Texas law enforcement for the future performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police personnel. The methodology utilized to address the research questions and collect data for this research were qualitative. The nature of a qualitative Delphi study is to gain insight into the practices of experts within a given field (Avella, 2016), in order to determine

consensus (Hsu & Sandford, 2010), or best practices utilized (Linstone & Turoff, 2002) in dealing with complex problems (Davidson, 2013) is unique to the qualitative Delphi method (Linstone & Turoff, 2002). Hasson and Keeney (2011) classified the Delphi technique into four categories: decision, scenario, policy and argument. Two designs that could have been used to explore the research topic were a case study and a modified Delphi study. A case study uses a bounded approach (Kehr, 2020). A bounded system is one that refers to a single case that is easily differentiated from others (Kehr, 2020). Case studies were used to explore an event, program, or activity involving one or more people and from multiple contexts (Kruth, 2015). Yazan (2015) explained that Merriam and Caffarella (1999) centered upon usages and tenets of qualitative research with a secondary emphasis on it applied to case study research. Case studies allow for a variety of data collection methods to include documents, historical records, interviews, observation, and physical artifacts, with interviews, observations, and documents being the most commonly used method (Campbell, 2015).

The structure of the Delphi technique allows a wide range of adaptations to suit the needs of the problem or question being addressed, and facilitates knowledge exchange (Hasson & Keeney, 2011). Conversely, the Delphi technique is a research tool used to guide managerial decision making (Kehr, 2020). The Delphi technique was used to lay the appropriate framework and evaluate 15 active law enforcement officers' opinions in a closed setting where bias and judgement were not present. Dalkey and Helmer (1963) explained that the objective was to obtain the most reliable consensus from the opinions of a group of experts. Along with understanding what Covey (2013)

explained from the Greek philosophy of influence as being ethos, pathos, and logos and their impact with followers.

Dodgson (2017) explained that all the qualitative methods view the world as subjective, rather than objective. As several methods can be applied when examining the proper qualitative research method only two really stand out, with those being critical theory or phenomenology. Dodgson (2017) explained that qualitative research does not seek to measure anything; therefore, the assumption that there is an objective way to study a particular phenomenon does not apply. Qualitative research allowed opportunities to interact and interview participants without bias while collecting useful data, ensuring accuracy of that data, and systematically analyzing it for additional use.

Qualitative research method allows researchers to understand studied behavior(s) and obtain a close understanding of the beliefs and values system of the studied phenomenon (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The Delphi method is a creation of the RAND Corporation in the 1950s to facilitate the future prediction of a studied phenomenon and to aid the improvement of decision making in line with the resulting predictions (RAND, 2011). The Delphi design got its name from Delphi, a Greek city known for the oracular power of Pythia, a priestess renowned for predicting the future (Helmer, 1967a).

The Delphi technique is applicable under the following conditions: (1) when the research goal is not to solve presented problem analytically, (2) when the research objective is to secure or obtain a subjective opinion from experts in a specialized area, and (3) when it is not possible to assemble all the study participants in one place or geographical location (Grisham, 2009). The Delphi method is of two kinds: classical and modified. Classical Delphi process requires the researcher to meet in person and

individually with each study participants, while modified Delphi approach entails using

technology to gather needed data for a study (Helmer, 1967; Hsu & Sandford, 2007a).

The main data set for this study was a series of questionnaires with data provided

back to the participant and then another round generated totaling three rounds. Data

saturation is an elusive concept and standard in qualitative research since few concrete

guidelines exist (Marshall et al., 2013). Marshall et al. (2013) stated data saturation is the

point when information within the data becomes repetitive. If data saturation was not met

additional participants would have been recruited using the same methods to obtain

participants initially in order to gain consensus and was pegged at 14. Questionnaires

were done via the internet on the platform SurveyMonkey to be able to track data

associated with feedback and other elements. The modified Delphi technique is adaptive

to an anonymous online survey, thus more suitable for this study because it reduces bias,

fear of intimidation and fosters a higher willingness of panel members to participate in

the study (RAND, 2011). The panelist possessed a high school diploma or equivalent and

or hade a post-secondary degree minimum of seven years of experience in law

enforcement, a sworn Texas peace officer, holding a current leadership position with a

minimal rank of Sergeant and a maximum rank of Chief of Police or Sheriff. Along with

having attended some additional form of leadership training such as Federal Bureau of

Investigation National Academy (FBI-NA), Federal Bureau of Investigations Law

Enforcement Executive Development Association (FBI-LEEDA) namely the Supervisor

Leadership Institute (SLI), Command Leadership Institute (CLI), and the Executive

Leadership Institute (ELI). The Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute

of Texas (LEMIT) Leadership Command College, Institute for Law Enforcement

Administration (ILEA), Senior Management Institute for Police (SMIP) through the Police Executive Research Forum.

Qualitative content analysis involves a process designed to condense raw data into categories or themes based on valid inference and interpretation (Patton, 2005). A generalized impression to identify direct quotes and common ideas was paraphrased allowing for the qualitative data to be transposed for quantitative use. Related patterns will then be combined into themes followed by making a storyline that is trustworthy and reliable as explained by Aronson (1995) for coding. This analysis was to gain an in-depth understanding of themes and questionnaire results using a manual coding technique. It was administered and analyzed through SurveyMonkey and NVivo respectively. SurveyMonkey was used to design, distribute, collect, and analyze data response from the list of open-ended questions. NVivo was used to analyze data responses from the list of open-ended questions in the survey.

A study is reliable if it measures what it set out to measure consistently over time. The higher or lower the standard error of measurement, the higher and lower the reliability, respectively (Thorndike & Thorndike-Christ, 2009). Validity is the extent a test or an assessment instrument measures what it claims to measure, and for the specific reason, it is used (Creswell, 2008). Reliability of a study is the degree of consistency inherent in the study (Huck, 2012)

Research Questions

This research was aimed to obtain consensus and knowledge of autocratic leadership within Texas law enforcement for the future performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police personnel. The targeted research population of this study was active law enforcement officers that currently work in the state of Texas and those that meet the inclusion criteria. The central research question for this study was RQ1.

RQ1. What is the consensus among a panel of active Texas law enforcement officers, on leadership strategies to increase performance, morale, and job satisfaction in relation to education and training?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that serves as the groundwork for this qualitative modified Delphi study is relevant to theories that describe the broad working relationship between leaders and followers. The following five theories lay the foundation for this study: Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX), Organizational Support Theory (OST), Job Characteristics Model (JCM), Social Learning Theory (SLT), and Autocratic Leadership Theory (ALT). This section provides understanding through theory about how leadership plays a role in the employee's perception of their value and is heavily related to their performance, morale, and job satisfaction within an organization. Along with the dynamic characteristics and behaviors of leadership styles exhibited by those is critical leadership positions by way of title or responsibility.

Leader Member Exchange Theory

As always it has been the leader's job to not only influence the followers but also learn their characteristics and what motivates them. Healthy relationships between these two is what generates the best working environments but also high performing employees in correlation with other theories mentioned. Babic (2014) explained that this would require leadership changes that foster relationships and accompany ethical burdens and responsibilities, as making a change in people may influence not only their working lives, but also the lives of people around them. Babic (2014) explained that trust, therefore, plays a central role in developing relationships with employees during the process of change management.

Organizational Support Theory

One of the biggest factors causing law enforcement officers to leave the organization is not feeling supported or social interaction from supervisors. Baran et al. (2012) explained that organizational support theory demonstrates the connection between employees and their supervisors based on a healthy social exchange. Most law enforcement officers careers are affected by work related stress and their perception of how they are valued by the organization's leaders. Although, employees are expected to work hard and become a productive member of the organization, that accomplishment is a struggle to obtain due to the mental and emotional struggle for social acceptance.

Job Characteristics Model

In law enforcement the hardest things to track are performance, morale, and job satisfaction. As no set characteristics have a predictable outcome, which can be standard across the board. All of these traits are geared toward the type of leadership style

demonstrated by the organizations. Hackman and Oldham (1976) proposed the Job

Characteristics Model, which is widely used as a framework to study how particular job

characteristics impact on job outcomes, including job satisfaction. The job characteristics

model provided five core job characteristics along with critical psychological states that

can impact the employee within the organization. Hackman and Oldham (1976) described

these characteristics as skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and

feedback which impact three critical psychological states experienced meaningfulness,

experienced responsibility for outcomes and knowledge of the actual results. All these

factors play heavily into the aspect of how employees view leadership along with its

effectiveness. Autocratic leadership can have a negative impact on these characteristics.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) explained that the five characteristics are combined to form

a motivating potential score, which can be used as an index of how likely a job was to

affect an employee's attitudes and behaviors. Singh et al. (2016) explained that the way

jobs are designed impacts outcomes that are important to workers such as job satisfaction

and their productivity.

Social Learning Theory

Bandura's social learning theory emphasized the importance of *observational*

(vicarious) learning or learning that occurs in the absence of overt performance by the

learner (Bandura, 1977; Bandura & Walters, 1963). The application of developing social-

cognitive approaches to leadership showed that for both leaders and followers, how they

interpreted leadership processes and outcomes was a critical mediating process linking

leaders and followers (Lord et al., 2016). Thus, research showed that leadership style was

a flexible, social, and task-dependent process (Lord et al., 2016). It retains the

assumptions of SLT—that people learn by watching others' behaviors and that behaviors are learned in a social context—and further takes into account the social and environmental influences on the learning process (Bandura, 1986).

Autocratic Leadership Theory

In law enforcement, a paradigm shift has occurred regarding leadership theories. The concept of autocratic leaderships comes from older philosophical views of how humans should interact and dispose of authority and power. Shaw (1955) explained that a leader's role was to coerce and govern followers because people have an intrinsic aversion for work and will refrain from working when possible. Shaw (1955) also explained that people must be mandated through force, intimidation or authority, and controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to accomplish the organizational tasks and assignments. Autocratic styles can have effects on the pure characteristics of employees than can be influenced and passed down to other employees.

<div align="center">

Definition of Terms

</div>

For the purpose of this modified qualitative Delphi study, the following terms and their contextual definitions are defined:

Autocratic leadership. Autocratic leadership is a style of leadership when a leader dictates guidelines, policies and directs and governs all activities without any meaningful participation by their employees (Hackman & Johnson, 2009).

Best Practices. Best practices are those activities carried out to demonstrate producing the desired result (Wellstein & Kieser, 2011).

Consensus. Allows researchers to synthesize the knowledge or expertise of the participants in a study to generate the best possible strategy for solving the current or future problem presented in the study (Hsu & Sandford, 2007a).

Delphi Technique / Delphi Method: is a process that involves a collection of experts coming together to deliberate on a research problem by providing response on a series of questionnaires that is iterated, with the final data being aggregated to reflect consensus on each of the questionnaire (Davidson, 2013).

Employee Retention. Employee retention is defined as the voluntary procedure within an organizational environment where employees were encouraged and motivated to remain with them for a maximum period (Al-Emadi et al., 2015).

Employee Turnover. The intention of employee turnover refers to the estimation of an employee's probability to quit or leave an organization (Wells & Peachey, 2011).

Law enforcement officers (LEOs). Law enforcement officers are the assembly of police officers and other members of the executive branch of government for the enforcement of laws and protection of the community (Reid, 2006).

Law enforcement subculture. Law Enforcement Subculture is a configuration of the unique set of morals, perceptions, and standards that exists within the law enforcement community (Dansby, 2002).

Leadership. Leadership is the influence exercised by one person to direct the activities and attitudes of others (Andrews et al., 2009).

Perceptions. Perceptions are individual's interpretations of their current reality (Davidson, 2018).

Assumptions

A study assumption(s) differentiates elements of a study, which are beyond the research study's control (Neuman, 2014). Neuman (2014) stressed the imperative of study assumptions to ensure the validity of research work. One assumption that was present was the element of trustworthiness of the interviewer. Simon (2011) reiterated the need for a researcher to assure the confidentiality and anonymity of study participants to encourage honest participation. Law enforcement officers are trained professionals and will quickly pick up on body language and other emotional responses. In everyday rhetoric and daily interactions, assumptions cannot be avoided as every viewpoint holds to some degree a concealed assumption (Theofanidis & Fountouki, 2018).

The forming of consensus in a Delphi study usually starts in the second round and continues to go through refinement with more repetition of the surveys conducted (Hsu & Sandford, 2007a). The first assumption of this study was the expectation of panel members, to be honest in the self-reporting of their experiences to conform to the criteria for study participation. The second assumption of this study was the possibility to determine consensus with regards to the role of active law enforcement leaders and their view of leadership styles for the future performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police personnel. The third assumption of this study was the expectation of panel members, to be patient in sharing their thoughts and in no mad rush to answer posed questions in the survey (Green & Mitchell, 1979).

Limitations

In qualitative research, the results might not be generalizable due to the small sample size and the subjective nature of the data collection (Durand & Chantler, 2014). Qualitative studies have a limitation due mainly to their restricted sample selection, sample size, researchers bias, and data gathering technique (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). There are 15 active LEOs that participated in this study; therefore, the results are not generalizable to the population of law enforcement officers nationally. Brutus et al. (2013) explained that limitations need to state not only the shortcomings of a study but also implications of those shortcomings. Furthermore, this research study was focused on active officers that have worked within the field of law enforcement for a specified tenure of seven years or more. If this study was including participants outside the law enforcement community several different perspectives and dialogues may present themselves as they should with those not directly correlated to the profession and its daily rigor emotionally, mentally, and physically. Chenail (2011) reiterated it is commonplace in a qualitative study to have researcher bias and usually appears in the choice of instrumentation. Simon (2011) defined limitations as an inherent weakness in a study, capable of affecting the study and beyond the control of the principal investigator.

The first limitation of this study was the potential for researcher bias due to preconceived ideas, and the prolonged exposure to the vast leadership challenges faced by law enforcement leaders. A second limitation of this study was the tendency for attrition due to the peculiar nature of the Delphi technique design. Attrition is a significant limitation of the Delphi technique (Trochim, 2006). Attrition in research is non-responsiveness bias and defined as the absence of subsequent response to

questionnaires during a Delphi study (Trochim, 2006). A researcher can address attrition in several ways, such as issuing deadlines for responses and using email reminders (Hsu & Sandford, 2007b). This study used response deadlines and email reminders to prevent or reduce attrition.

A third limitation of this study was the concern for validity. Validity for this study was dependent on the expert panel members reaching a consensus. Study consensus may be difficult to attain sometimes if not impossible. Consequently, in the event expert panel members fail to agree on the importance of leadership styles for the future performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police personnel and consensus prove impossible at the end of the Delphi process, then a 50% majority must be used to conclude the study (Von der Gracht, 2012).

A fourth limitation of this study was the expectation of expert panel members to be utterly truthful regarding their experience and expertise to reach a consensus. This limitation raises the issue of social desirability bias, which is the propensity to give a socially okay or preferable response by a study participant(s). This concern is likely to be more in face-to-face interviews where respondents are hesitant in answering controversial questions and least likely in a self-administered anonymous survey (Gittelman et al., 2015). Expert panel members in this study did not encounter social desirability bias because this study is an anonymous modified Delphi survey and guarantees confidentiality of responses and individual identities.

Delimitations

The objective of this study was to generate a consensus from the expert panel of 15 active law enforcement officers with direct experience to leadership in the profession. These participants would have tenure with law enforcement organizations throughout Texas and would currently be in the best positions to help understand the impact of autocratic leadership and its practices in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction.

Cozby and Bates (2012) and Trochim (2006) warned of the potential of study delimitation because it works against the validity and transferability of a study. The biggest choices made by the principal investigator are the boundaries in which it follows and adheres to. Confidentially and the ethical relationship that the research study embodies must not be tarnished or taken for granted. Thus, delimitations are mainly concerned with the study's theoretical background, objectives, research questions, variables under study and study sample (Theofanidis & Fountouki, 2018). Usual reasons for choosing a particular sampling technique for example are related to available resources, local circumstances (practical access), ethical and permit considerations or time constraints (Theofanidis & Fountouki, 2018).

As the narrow scope may impose some challenges because the study only had 15 participants, however, despite any delimitations the shared experiences and stories of active law enforcement officers can add value to the current and future research of leadership within law enforcement. Hopefully, the research would improve how leaders throughout the state of Texas view autocratic leadership and its impact on law enforcement officers.

Validity is two-fold: internal and external validity. A study or an assessment instrument is said to have internal validity if it shows one or more cause and effect relationship, while external validity implies the outcomes or results of the study or an assessment instrument is or should apply to the general population (Trochim, 2006). Hsu and Sandford (2007a) advised of the likelihood of research studies to undergo several iterations until there is no noticeable or reasonable change in the response of the Delphi process, thus the resulting consensus.

Data collected at a lousy time for study participants is an instance of the threat posed by place and manner of data collection and results in weak study conclusions and non-transferability (Trochim, 2006). The electronic Delphi process permits the convenience input of data by expert panel members in three or four survey iterations and consequently prevents the challenge posed by the time and place threat consideration (RAND, 2011; Trochim, 2006). Data for this study was conducted electronically through the internet, which increases the likelihood of the expert panel members responding. With the exception of participants not having internet access. It allows respondents to access and view the survey in real-time and without mailing received and completed surveys back to the researcher by or through regular mail (Alessi & Martin, 2010; Reitz & Anderson, 2013).

Survey response rates from Internet-based research match up to response rates of paper-based surveys (Coughlan et al., 2009). Web-based or internet surveys are cheaper, faster, and independent in time and space than face-to-face, telephone, and mail surveys (Blasius & Brandt, 2010).

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi technique was to gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes to the profession through education and training of future leaders. The autocratic style according to Gonos and Gallo (2013) is where an individual has complete control over all decision with little input from group members. While understanding and gaining consensus in-depth of how experts currently in the field perceive that affect in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction. In the law enforcement community, organizational structure greatly impacts the employee's performance, morale, and job satisfaction and simply the ability of officers to perform their duties. Most importantly, this research would inform law enforcement leaders of how their leadership styles could affect the performance, morale, and job satisfaction of other officers. The results of this study should open up critically needed dialogue throughout the law enforcement community, training academies, and other affiliates of law enforcement leadership. The belief is that this research would provide a foundation for future researchers and leaders concerning leadership and management practices within law enforcement.

Chapter 2 provides a literature review from numerous selections of studies used for this study. The literature review includes both germinal and contemporary literature as well. It examines historical facts of leadership theories in law enforcement as it relates to the influences those practices have upon law enforcement organizations of the present. Also, this research provides a mixture of influential literature from which the study

relates autocratic leadership to performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police

personnel.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi technique was to gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes to the profession through education and training of future leaders. Woodard (2017) explained that autocratic leaders can have positive and negative effects throughout the law enforcement community. This research could educate current and future law enforcement officers and future leaders on the impact of autocratic leadership in relation to elements that officers deem important and essential to the job. Sadiq (2020) explained that organizational leadership plays an important role in installing management systems and demonstrating actions and behaviors. It is very important that leaders within the field understand how their leadership and management practices can impact officers on a personal and professional level.

The purpose of a literature review is to obtain documented research and factual data to include, books, scholarly articles and journals to determine if the research demands a research study (Lambert & Lambert, 2001). Although there is extensive research on autocratic leadership, minimal literature exists on autocratic management practices in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction of LEOs in the southern region of the United States, specifically in Texas.

This literature review includes the following sections: (a) a review of the article research documents, and journals researched; (b) a historical overview of policing and examination of performance, morale, and job satisfaction; (c) a current overview of

policing and examination of performance, morale, and job satisfaction; (d) the theoretical underpinning of the theoretical framework; (e) organizational support theory, leader-member exchange theory, and job characteristics model, social learning theory, and autocratic leadership theory; (f) an examination of leadership theories. The chapter will close with conclusions drawn from the literature, a summary of the literature findings, such as autocratic leadership theory, open systems, rational systems, methodology literature and the modified Delphi design.

These topics are important because they link self-desired standards for performance, morale, and job satisfaction within law enforcement to the responsibilities and actions of managers, supervisors, and leaders alike.

Title Searches and Documentation

There was an abundance of sources derived from the research material for this study. The SAGE Research, SAGE Journals, ProQuest, Google Scholar, Emerald Insight, and EBSCOhost database in the University of Phoenix online library contained bibliography citations for resources with collections of dissertations and peer-reviewed scholarly journals dating from 1931 to 2020. The principal investigator also used both public and online libraries to review books, peer-reviewed, and scholarly journal articles for this research study. These particular resources and databases provided access to several useful articles, journals, books, and external websites aiding with information on the qualitative research methods, modified Delphi technique, autocratic leadership, leadership theories, organizational support theory, leader member exchange theory, and job characteristics model, social learning theory, autocratic leadership theory, and

theories related to police management and leadership. Along with open systems theory, rational systems theory, and law enforcement education and training.

This research contains references and sources from peer-reviewed articles, journals and scholarly books all found on dominant sources used for research. The utilization of law enforcement libraries containing police manuals or publications, and law enforcement websites generated additional resources and government data. Google Scholar, ProQuest, Emerald Insight, and SAGE database were particularly used to access a majority of the peer-reviewed journal articles, dissertations, and books.

The key words used to search for applicable peer-reviewed and scholarly articles included: *autocratic leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, situational leadership, servant leadership, self-leadership, organizational support theory, leader-member exchange theory, job characteristics model, social learning theory, autocratic leadership theory, Delphi technique, Delphi research methods, qualitative research*, *rational systems theory, open systems theory, and law enforcement education and training*.

Historical Content

Sir Robert Peel, the founder of modern policing, established nine "Principles of Policing" when he organized the London Metropolitan Police in 1829 (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). Labeled as the father or policing those principles helped start the process of American policing. Agencies must deploy police officers who possess the requisite ethical orientation as well as critical thinking, problem solving, and leadership skills necessary to engage law-abiding citizens and assist them with the identification of, and the creation of solutions to, problems that plague individual communities (Ortmeier, &

Meese, 2010). Amendments to the responsibilities, duties, and structure of law enforcement organizations have allowed this profession to advance from ineffective watch groups to law enforcement organizations that combine emergent technology and problem-solving strategies into their regimen (Platt, 1982).

Police responsibilities have changed significantly since its creation. Wren (1995) explained that we must know how to strengthen and support good leaders, while observing those leaders who seek to exploit us by targeting our prejudices, hatred, or leading us down dangerous paths. Through the implementation of civilian authority, the public has progressively exerted its influence over the performance of law enforcement organizations, creating newer models and innovative policing (Robinson & Scaglion, 1987). However, times have changed and the need for a variety of leadership styles has grown to a significant importance. Leaders continuously seek ways to improve the cohesiveness and morale amongst LEOs by applying critical thinking techniques (Marks & Sklansky, 2008). Law enforcement practitioners are developing their critical thinking to include concepts such as design, which will encourage creative thinking and innovation (Kingshott, 2006).

Kingshott (2006) explained how within a certain type of management structure means that decision making must be decentralized, which will propel increased discretion, allowing lower ranks to make management and leadership decisions. We fail to grasp the essence of leadership that is relevant to the modern age and hence we cannot agree even on the standards by which to measure, recruit, and reject it (Wren, 1995). The first step is not action; the first step is understanding (Wren, 1995).

Autocratic leadership

Burnes (2007) highlighted the experiences within organizational development by examining the work of Kurt Lewin, a German-American psychologist. In terms of the importance of the studies to organizational development (OD), the first phase, the Lewin years, is the most important (Burnes, 2007). Lewin was a German Jew who immigrated to the United States in 1933 to escape the rise of fascism (Lewin et al., 1939). He was a humanitarian who believed that only by resolving social conflict, whether it be religious, racial, marital, or industrial, could the human condition be improved (Burnes, 2007). Lewin believed that the key to achieving this was to facilitate group learning through democratic participation and so enable individuals to understand and restructure their perceptions of the world around them (Burnes, 2004a). A leadership style which is effective in one situation may not be successful in others (Fiedler, 1972). Fred Edward Fiedler's (1972) Contingency Model explained that, the leadership style of a person is fixed.

Lewin et al. (1939) explained the effects of autocratic and democratic atmospheres. Hoyle (2012) opined that autocratic leadership style can be illustrated in the structure of a pyramid, whereby on the top of the hierarchy stands the leader, while staff are below. The autocratic leader would generally solve an issue and make decisions for the group using observations and what they feel is needed or most important for the majority of the group members to benefit at that time (Val & Kemp, 2015). Innovative ideas may elude organizations as a result of the use of autocratic style and this stems from the inability of staff to contribute because they are not consulted (Northouse, 2015).

Performance

Leadership is the driver of culture and serves as a source of intrinsic motivation for behavior (Levy et al., 2010). As in law enforcement leadership prior to the 21st century it was merely based off which clique you belonged to. For example, the acceptability of autocratic leadership has been found to be contingent upon the culture within which leadership is exercised (Dickson et al., 2003). A vital metrics to determine the effectiveness of the leadership in a group or an organization is how well the group or organization performs during the period under review in respect to its set goals and objectives (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Policing prior to the 21st century utilized elements of foot patrol as officers worked beats and had the ability to learn the area and people within the area, thus generating a small form of leadership within their assigned area. The police, because of their paramilitary structure, are strongly Theory X-oriented (Cizanckas & Hanna, 1977), which aligned well with the times and law enforcement issues related to the Political era, Reform era, and the Community era pre 9/11 fit the mold for performance.

The field of leadership has developed over time from the premise of the initial theories or conceptualizations (Sanders & Davey, 2011). The dominant leadership style being that of an autocratic nature was sufficient for this time of policing as task had to be dictated and monitored. Effective leadership requires skills and herein is the critical difference between successful and unsuccessful leadership regimes (Pulakos, 2009). Departments were less formal as most officers knew residents within the jurisdiction. Performance was based less about statics and more toward the personal relationships established while officers worked their beats. Hence allowing the level of mental

intelligence (IQ) to grow in terms of performance and without the assistance of

technology. Mental intelligence (IQ) is the ability to analyze, reason, think abstractly, use

language, visualize and comprehend (Covey, 2013).

Morale

The question of morale goes hand in hand with the important management

consideration of motivation. Without a proper level of morale, there can be no real

motivation (Cizanckas & Hanna, 1977). As officers walked beats focusing on

relationships and rapport building, morale could be a testament to retention. Officers did

not leave one department for the next based off conditions, pay, or leadership. Bad

leadership causes low morale, high turnover rates, and inefficiency in the profession

(Cruickshank, 2012). As a rule, morale is a group phenomenon, whereas motivation is a

personal trait (Cizanckas & Hanna, 1977). Historically police went on strike several

different times around the United States for reasons directly tied to morale issues. Police

in 1974 in Baltimore followed a similar stance regarding the initial Boston strike in 1919

which was directly tied to morale and leadership issues. Officers during these eras

possibly understand what Covey (2013) explained as ethos, logos, and pathos. Ethos is

the ethical nature, personal credibility, and the amount of trust or confidence others have

in your integrity and competency (Covey, 2013). Logos stands for logic and has to do

with the power and persuasion of ones thinking and presentation better depicted as

mental intelligence (IQ) (Covey, 2013). Pathos stands for empathy highlighting the

understanding of others feelings and needs, depicted as emotional intelligence (EQ)

(Covey, 2013).

Poor morale directly relates to poor management practices, including

unresponsive, exclusive administration that fails to involve all members of the

organization in programs and change or direction (Cizanckas & Hanna, 1977). Numerous

theories exist pertaining to law enforcement morale. All have individual merit, but fail to

address the big picture. One popular theory argues that leaders do not properly

lead (Cruickshank, 2012). Law enforcement leaders must use their leadership qualities

efficiently and realize their competence levels in leadership through a self-awareness

process called "identity clarity" (Bye, 2007, p. 32). Law enforcement leaders can improve

their emotional intelligence and leadership skills by associating and identifying with

people who fosters trustworthiness, continued education and high performance in the

organization (Mersino, 2007). Organizational leaders must use tools to assess the

emotional intelligence and stress of their employees (Mersino, 2007). Leaders who

understand how to increase employee morale lessen nuisances, and increase production

and satisfaction (Goleman, 2006).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been one of the most studied variables over the last decades of

organizational research. Interest in job satisfaction derives from its relationships to other

organizational outcomes including organizational commitment, absenteeism, turnover

and performance (Sušanj & Jakopec, 2012). As related to the strikes by law enforcement

in both Baltimore and Boston respectively, the level of job satisfaction was tremendously

low to warrant a strike or stoppage in work by officers. Job satisfaction implies a positive

affect resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Locke, 1976). Being

paid a certain wage, working conditions, along with quality leadership were essential.

The altering job satisfaction tool was the involvement or participatory management practices that displayed a severe separation between line officers and supervisors. Ford et al., (2003) cited that "researchers have also examined the impact on departmental- level factors on officers' job satisfaction and on-the-job behavior, such as level of participatory management practices (Wycoff & Skogan, 1994). An organization's culture has a tremendous impact on its ability to achieve the organizations' goals and objectives (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). An organizational culture includes artifacts, embraced values, and fundamental assumptions that can increase organizational development (Colquitt et al., 2014). Assisting these factors are what Covey (2013) identified as emotional intelligence that either extended careers or forced them to change. Emotional intelligence (EQ) is one's self-knowledge, self-awareness, social sensitivity, empathy and ability to communicate successfully with others (Covey, 2013).

Education and Training

The holistic learning management is the integration of learning management by various methods emphasized teaching in the actual situation, self-learning, conjoint learning, learning from nature, practical learning, measurement and evaluation correlated to learning activities by assessing the practices, and actual situations (Jessadawirote, 2005). Community opinions towards law enforcement are changing (Hudson, 2014). Besides upholding social order, law enforcement is asked to be proactive, to build community relationships, to effectively address problems, and to access resources by utilizing a problem solving process (McDermott & Hulse, 2012). Education in critical thinking and interpersonal communication skills will allow officers the ability to de-

escalate and improve decision-making by challenging officers to question their assumptions and biases (Safi & Burell, 2007).

Law enforcement officers are assigned long-term to particular areas of the community so that they develop connections and relationships through consistent interactions (Chappell, 2009). Training geared towards problem solving, critical thinking and communication skills will enhance the contemporary law enforcement officer's professional abilities to more effectively serve their community (Pitts et al., 2015). Law enforcement training programs are normally conducted at police academies or public safety training centers regulated by governmental standards, and have historically reflected a regimented approach to education (Oliva & Compton, 2010). A militaristic and structured behavioral environment in police training may be effective when teaching technical and procedural skills, but it does little to promote the acquisition of essential non-technical competencies (i.e. problem solving, judgment, and leadership) (Birzer, 2003). All of which are principles related to this research in relating autocratic leadership to performance, morale, job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement personnel.

Current Content

As a reminder, Peel's principles are still relevant today and have greater validity throughout the United States as training academies and law enforcement leadership trainings are reminding executives of those principles. Law enforcement has drastically changed in the early part of the 21st century, and the previous concepts and ideas of leading police organizations have changed as well (Schneider, 2020). Police performance and actions have recently come under increased scrutiny in response to high profile events including Ferguson, Staten Island, and Baltimore (Nix & Wolfe, 2016). Thus,

communities may have to rely on alternative means—such as increased scrutiny through protests, media coverage, or additional monitoring (e.g., cop-watch groups)—to raise awareness and advocate for their preferred policing allocation (Battaglini et al., 2020; Ouss & Rappaport, 2020). The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing was created by an executive order signed by United States President Barack Obama in December 2014 (Babic, 2014). This order sought to help ease the unrest across the country regarding highly televised incidents involving law enforcement such as Ferguson, Missouri. As our nation becomes more pluralistic and the scope of law enforcement's responsibilities expands, the need for more and better training has become critical (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). This living document brings policing into the current scope regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction elements.

In essence, it is extremely important for law enforcement leaders to understand the significance of how certain management styles impact an officer's performance. Establishing specific requirements and expectations are necessary but should be done tactfully (Woodard, 2017). President Donald Trump previously signed an executive order in January of 2020 establishing the Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (Altaai, 2020). This commission was assisted by working groups targeted to examine numerous issues that plague law enforcement led by experts in the profession of law enforcement. The United States Department of Justice (2020) explained one critical element the group would be examining is the recruitment, training, and retention of officers. As each element is related to performance, morale, and job satisfaction.

Autocratic leadership

The autocratic leadership style is determined by the leader's power due to the fact that the leader has absolute power in a group or organization (Chukwusa, 2018). Fiedler found that authoritarian leaders can be viewed as successful in certain task situations allowing for the extremes of consideration and ruthlessness, depending on the situation (Leonard, 2018). Autocratic leadership style opined Maqsood and Bilal (2013) is known for individual control over all decisions and little input from staff (Chukwusa, 2018). Decision-making is done by autocratic leaders; however, inputs from staff may be sought in the process, but hardly taken into consideration (Chukwusa, 2018). The inability of leaders to effectively delegate responsibility and over indulgence on autocratic leadership style or pattern may lead to organizational failure. This is due to the fact that motivation environment is produced by creating a structured set of rewards and punishments (Cherry, 2018). This may also be as a result of management's inability to effectively plan, organize and control (Chukwusa, 2018). Nothing meaningful can be effectively achieved when a certain type of leadership style is used (Chukwusa, 2018). Ovarhe's (2016) explained that leadership is supposed to be a shared responsibility which no one should lay claim to within an organization.

Performance

Leadership must be competent in organizations to enhance growth and performance (Mosindi, 2020). By President Obama helping to assist in creating a standing order to increase law enforcement leadership and performance by training helped spark a movement across the United States. The notion of effective leadership is tied primarily to the leadership styles or philosophy operational in an organization.

Leadership is one of the core components of organizational behavior (Mosindi, 2020). It helps people make new connections, gain new perspectives, stay on top of trends, set an example by taking initiative for growth, and deepen knowledge and expertise (Giusto, 2020). Placing the burden of performance in the field on leaders allowed for that area to be viewed from a different point of view, not with a liability lens. Continuing education keeps professionals sharp and relevant in their respective fields and is a large basis for performance measurements. Even the most seasoned law enforcement executives can benefit from continuing their education to help increase their performance. Leaders have been for the most part ignoring staff by following outmoded set of principles about them for the reason that it adhered to Theory X when actually most staff could be closer to the Theory Y set of principles (Chukwusa, 2018). There are many terms associated with various elements of 21st century leadership traits and abilities, including: transformative leadership, servant leadership, authentic leadership, principle-centered leadership, and collaborative leadership, to name a few (Vanek, 2016).

Another element of performance that is of focus is the educational standpoint for not only executives or managers, but also for line officers. The education of police executives has been a priority of criminal justice agencies for more than 40 years to address the need to professionalize law enforcement in America (Harrison, 2019). Training is an element of performance that cannot be taken for granted although in a controlled environment it normally entails the broken-down elements of incidents to assist in mentally training officers, which can increase their performance. The Wickersham Commission's (1931) reports led to the creation of the first national police

leadership training program (Harrison, 2019). Leaders understand that a highly trained and educated officer is a good quality officer to have in an organization.

Morale

Officers know that leadership matters and that great leadership will result in motivated employees and better productivity for their organizations (Soler, 2020). In this century or era of policing the wages and benefits are not what interest the professionals attracted to the job. It is the camaraderie and sense of belonging or purpose to the community along with leadership that drives morale up or down. Often times the issues that become large leadership issues often begin because of a lack of attention to smaller issues that, in the moment, appeared unimportant or were simply ignored (Mason, 2020). Officers want to know and be able to observe other intangibles from members of leadership such as followership or their ability to be servants. Serving the followers lets them know the managers truly care, and it provides much more incentive for productivity and morale to increase across the board (McLean, 2020). As times are not always of the brightest a certain level of emotional intelligence will often times get a person through most situations, whether good or bad. Humor is perceived and delivered differently by everyone, and some people are naturally wittier than others. This social skill can work wonders with trust and morale if executed in a timely and appropriate manner (McLean, 2020). An improved understanding of emotional intelligence also can act as a counter measure to the ever-present volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA) demands of the 21ˢᵗCentury police officer (Javidi & Ellis, 2016).

Job Satisfaction

When progressive law enforcement agency leaders explore all available tools at their disposal to combat the current social disdain toward the police profession, a clearer understanding of emotional intelligence becomes essential (Conroy, 2018). Job satisfaction is a combination of employee feelings towards the different facets of job such as the nature of the work itself, level of pay, promotion opportunities, and satisfaction with co-workers (Maurya & Agarwal, 2015). In the 21st century the workplace is filled with generational difference that leaders must learn how to mesh together for performance and morale considerations. Long gone are the surly sergeants who would bark orders at the patrol officers or lieutenants and captains who are the only ones heading specialized groups and having little to no contact with the operations division (Schneider, 2020). Changes with the para-military structure of law enforcement are needed to address generational gaps in the workforce. These changes are needed due to technological trends that have impacted leaders' ability to effectively communicate with newer generations (Vargas, 2016). These elements provide a true sense of job satisfaction across all generations as each one has their weaknesses countered by another's strengths. Leaders need to be fluid in their supervisory approaches and adapt to different personalities, personal problems, and other social characteristics that may affect the productivity and output (Vargas, 2016).

Education and Training

Learning is the important factor of educational management. Persons involved in education have attempted to find educational method in educational management for the learners to change their learning processes (Bovornkijprasert & Rawang, 2016). Bovornkijprasert and Rawang (2016) explained that law enforcement officers are still lacking of understanding, skill, experience, and leadership to effectively do the job. Societal changes have increased the need for training for law enforcement in "soft" skill competencies. As the roles of police organizations evolve from the singular role of agencies of law enforcement to include community partners and advocates, law enforcement requires the new skills and educational opportunities to develop these competencies (Sereni-Massinger & Wood, 2016).

The role of law enforcement has moved from merely enforcing the law to becoming a problem solver within the community. However, the education provided at academies has not reflected this evolution (Sereni-Massinger & Wood, 2016). The suggested new education would go beyond the traditional applied skills and incorporate critical thinking and interpersonal communication skills. Agencies that implement Community-Oriented Policing (COP) will find this problem-based learning highly beneficial to assist both their recruits and current officers (Sereni-Massinger & Wood, 2016). Bovornkijprasert and Rawang (2016) explained that the significant factors found to be effective for law enforcement officers were policy, leadership, incentive, and networking. All of which are principles related to this research in relating autocratic leadership to performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement personnel.

Theoretical Framework Literature

The theoretical framework that serves as the groundwork for this qualitative modified Delphi study is relevant to theories that describe the broad working relationship within leadership between leaders and followers. A theoretical framework or theoretical underpinning is a systematic tool with several contexts and is used to make intangible differences and organize concepts (Ravitch & Riggan, 2016). The following five theories lay the foundation for this study: Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX), Organizational Support Theory (OST), Job Characteristic Model (JCM), Social Learning Theory (SLT), and Autocratic Leadership Theory (ALT). This section provides understanding through theory about how an employee's perception of their value and performance can impact their performance, morale, and job satisfaction within an organization. Leaders frame strategy, implement decisions, manage available skills, create the enabling environment for future capabilities, and conduct themselves with great personal dexterity (Mosindi, 2020). Personal dexterity is imperative for leaders because to be successful, they must know what the expectations are and how to accomplish it efficiently (Ulrich & Smallwood, 2012). Leaders share distinguishable characteristics that affect change and are inspired by commitment and service (Engel & Worden, 2003). To improve leadership skills, law enforcement leaders are encouraged to understand how organizational culture influences behavior (Woodard, 2017).

Leader Member Exchange Theory

As always it has been the leaders job to not only influence the follower but also learn their characteristics and what motivates them. Healthy relationships between these two is what generates the best working environments but also high performing employees

in correlation with other theories mentioned. Babic (2014) explained that this would require leadership changes that foster relationships and accompany ethical burdens and responsibilities, as making a change in people may influence not only their working lives, but also the lives of people around them. Law enforcement lacks the ability to trust from within between leaders and members of the respected organization. Babic (2014) explained that trust, therefore, plays a central role in developing relationships with employees during the process of change management. Managers are usually expected to manage subordinates' affect/emotions and maintain a ''emotionally healthy'' organization (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002). Research on abusive supervision has found various aversive events/experiences as antecedents of abusive supervision, such as supervisors perceived organizational injustice and interpersonal conflicts (Aryee et al., 2007). Leadership research has long recognized the close link between leaders' emotions and leadership (Gooty et al., 2010). Research considers leadership as an emotion-laden interpersonal process, where supervisors express emotions they experience and affect subordinates' emotions, attitudes, and behaviors (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002).

More specifically, supervisors may interact with their subordinates by engaging in certain leadership behaviors to express their feelings; and it is such expression that connects supervisors' feelings and subordinates' work-related outcomes (Pan & Lin, 2018). Further, subordinates are usually less satisfied with their jobs when they work with abusive supervisors (Bowling & Michel, 2011). Although the notion that supervisors' emotional experiences will influence the types of leadership behaviors they display has been widely discussed, only a few studies were conducted to empirically test

this idea (Pan & Lin, 2018). Research found that when supervisors had higher positive mood, they showed more transformational leadership behaviors (Jin et al., 2016).

Organizational Support Theory

One of the biggest factors for law enforcement officers leaving the organization is not feeling supported or social interaction from supervisors. Baran et al. (2012) explained that organizational support theory demonstrates the connection between employees and their supervisors based on a healthy social exchange. An unhealthy work relationship between employers and their subordinates can lead to stress, a hostile work environment and a dysfunctional organization (Baran et al., 2012). Most law enforcement officer's careers are affected by work related stress and their perception of how they are valued by the organization's leaders. OST suggests that if employees feel valued by their organization, they will feel an increased obligation to fulfill organizational obligations (Woodard, 2017). Although, employees are expected to work hard and become a productive member of the organization that accomplishment is rarely obtained due to the mental and emotional struggle for social acceptance. The organizational culture found within some law enforcement organization can be influenced and altered as in all other professions (O'Toole et al., 2006). The framework for OST sets the foundation for future construction of its meaning and how it applies to law enforcement leaders and the impact of autocratic leadership within the law enforcement community (Woodard, 2017).

According to organizational support theory (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), employees view the organization as a powerful being with life-like characteristics that include a favorable or unfavorable orientation toward them. Organizational support theory helps explain how favorable treatment by the organization and its agents gets

translated into the perception that the organization is caring and supportive, and how such

perceptions of support lead to positive HR outcomes such as engagement, performance,

and retention (Shanock et al., 2019). If leaders are effective at providing guidance and

instruction regarding employees' roles (initiating structure), employees might take that as

a sign that the organization can achieve its goals (Kim et al., 2016). Law enforcement

leaders are encouraged to become well educated on various leadership styles to improve

leadership skills and consider their employee's needs. Great leaders will put the needs of

others above their own (Greenleaf, 2002).

Job Characteristics Model

In law enforcement the hardest things to track are performance, morale, and job

satisfaction. As neither characteristic has a predictable outcome which can be standard

across the board. All of these traits are geared toward the type of leadership style

deployed by the organizations. Hackman and Oldham (1976) proposed the JCM, which is

widely used as a framework to study how particular job characteristics impact on job

outcomes, including job satisfaction. The job characteristics model provides five core job

characteristics along with critical psychological states that can impact the employee

within the organization. Hackman and Oldham (1976) described these characteristics as

skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback which impact three

critical psychological states experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for

outcomes and knowledge of the actual results.

All of these factors play heavily into the aspect of how employees view leadership

along with its effectiveness. Autocratic leadership can have a negative impact on these

characteristics. Hackman and Oldham (1976) explained that the five characteristics are

combined to form a motivating potential score, which can be used as an index of how likely a job was to affect an employee's attitudes and behaviors. A large body of research provides evidence that the way jobs are designed impacts outcomes that are important to workers (e.g. job satisfaction) and to employers (e.g. productivity) (Singh et al., 2016). As shown, for example, by Faragher et al. (2005) in a meta-analysis, explained persons who are satisfied with their job show higher subjective well-being and are healthier than unsatisfied workers. In particular, being discontent with one's job was strongly associated with mental problems like burnout, depression, and anxiety (Blanz, 2017).

Judge and Klinger (2007) differentiated between three research traditions in the study of job satisfaction. The first one focuses on the relation of job satisfaction to personal characteristics, such as self-esteem, the locus of control, and neuroticism (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). The second one concerns the interaction between personal factors and work conditions (like working hours). Finally, the third approach, which is in the foreground of the present article, deals with the influence of job characteristics (like the degree of autonomy) on job satisfaction (Blanz, 2017).

Herzberg's two-factor theory of work motivation (Herzberg et al., 1966) was one of the first approaches, which distinguished work conditions from aspects of the work itself (Blanz, 2017). Based on the work by Turner and Lawrence (1965), the JCM predicts work-related outcomes (like job satisfaction and work performance) to be influenced by five job characteristics (i.e., skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) through three psychological states (i.e., experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results) (Blanz, 2017). Indeed, it correlates with a variety of desirable outcomes, such as commitment,

engagement, citizenship behaviors, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, burnout, and stress (Hu & Hirsh, 2017a). For job characteristics, task significance and social support suggest work carried out in and with the service of others (purpose) whereas task variety, feedback, and autonomy likely promote meaning by expressing and cultivating the self (realization) (Simonet & Castille, 2020).

Social Learning Theory

Bandura's social learning theory emphasized the importance of *observational (vicarious) learning,* or learning that occurs in the absence of overt performance by the learner (Bandura, 1977; Bandura & Walters, 1963). The application of developing social-cognitive approaches to leadership showed that for both leaders and followers, how they interpreted leadership processes and outcomes was a critical mediating process linking leaders and followers (Lord et al., 2016). It put attribution processes at the heart of leadership dynamics (Green & Mitchell, 1979; Martinko & Gardner, 1987), and it also emphasized that the match of perceived characteristics to the implicit theories of leaders (Eden & Leviatan, 1975) and followers (Sy, 2010) affected perceptions of leaders and followers, and descriptions of, as well as reactions to, their behavior (Lord et al., 2016).

For example, followers' performance affected their supervisor's leadership style (Lowin & Craig, 1968), and situational factors explained far more variance in leader decision making style than did individual differences (Hill & Schmitt, 1977). Thus, research showed that leadership style was a flexible, social, and task-dependent process (Lord et al., 2016). It retains the assumptions of SLT—that people learn by watching others' behaviors and that behaviors are learned in a social context—and further takes into account the social and environmental influences on the learning process

(Bandura, 1986). SCT further emphasizes reciprocal *determinism*, which is the idea that personal factors (e.g., self-efficacy), behavioral factors (e.g., positive/negative responses to behaviors), and environmental factors (e.g., facilitating conditions) affect each other reciprocally. Social learning theory specifically acknowledges that most human behavior is learned observationally through modelling (Decker, 1986).

Social learning theory is a psychological perspective on human functioning that emphasizes the critical role played by the social environment on motivation, learning, and self-regulation (Schunk & Usher, 2019). Social learning theory explained human behavior in terms of the reciprocal interactions between the individual and the environment, as well as human abilities to learn through social action, to perceive effectiveness, and manage and control oneself. Second, intrinsic motivation theory maintains that motivation is particularly potent when individuals engage in activities that they enjoy and/or consider meaningful (Alves & Manz, 2006). As used in this study, *motivation* refers to the processes that instigate and sustain goal-directed activities (Schunk et al., 2014). In this conceptualization, motivation comprises internal (personal) processes that manifest themselves overtly in goal-directed actions (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020).

Earlier views of social cognitive theory, which often were labeled "social learning theories," emphasized the importance of motivation and social variables in human behavior (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020). Merriam and Caffarella (1999) suggested that, behavior is a function of the interaction between the person with the environment. Making it a reciprocal concept in that people can influence their environment, which in turn influences the way they behave. Social learning theory is an important learning

theory for leadership development (Allen, 2007). Leadership development opportunities should help participants better understand their environment and how it affects those within in it. After all, people are products of their environment and have learned what is, and is not, socially acceptable within their organization (Allen, 2007).

Autocratic Leadership Theory

In law enforcement, a paradigm shift has occurred regarding leadership theories. The concept of autocratic leaderships comes from older philosophical views of how humans should interact and dispose of authority and power. Shaw (1955) explained that a leaders role was to coerce and govern followers because people have an intrinsic aversion for work and will refrain from working when possible. Shaw (1955) explained that people must be mandated through force, intimidation or authority, and controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to accomplish the organizational tasks and assignments. Autocratic styles can have affects on the pure characteristics of employees than can be influenced and passed down to other employees. Throughout history, a paradigm shift has occurred regarding leadership theories but autocratic leadership styles are mostly used by the military and law enforcement organizations (Medina, 2007). *Authoritarian*, or autocratic leadership relies on authentic, coercive, and reward power to influence others (Medina, 2007).

However, while this method of leadership often works well with unmotivated or problem employees; a continuous use of this style can cause employees to become irritated and unproductive (Lambert & Lambert, 2001). According to the leadership literature (Yukl, 2010) autocratic leaders are certainly strong and directive, but also have four general qualities: (i) they make all the important decisions; (ii) they are primarily

53

concerned with task accomplishment rather than the happiness or satisfaction of followers; (iii) they maintain considerable social distance from followers; and (iv) they motivate followers by punishment or the threat thereof rather than by rewards.

Leadership Theories

The study of leadership dates back 100 years and has yielded a vast array of collected literature (Kaiser et al., 2008). Past definitions of leadership were molded by stimuli such as society, societal parameters and ethics (Grint, 1997). Other leadership schools of thought interpret leadership as the center of group developments (Bass, 1990). The leader influences group change and sets the tone for the group (Northouse, 2004). Leadership is one of the most misconstrued yet most studied phenomena in the world (Neilson & Pate, 2008). Leaders have a great amount of influence throughout their organization (Bass, 1990). The influences in an organization can be both positive or negative depending on the leader's characteristics (Woodard, 2017).

There are several factors that can affect a law enforcement organization, such as internal and external influences (Kingshott, 2006). There is general consensus that successful leaders have shared characteristics and traits, such as integrity, honesty and innovation (Bennis, 2007). More importantly, leaders are bestowed with authority and power. In this context, power should not be construed in a negative way because leadership without power is useless (Bishop, 2009). Selecting the appropriate leadership style or a mixture of leadership styles can be a contributing element for organizational success or failure (Bennis, 2007).

Autocratic Leadership

The leader unilaterally exercises all decision-making authority by determining policies, procedures for achieving goals, work task, relationships, control of reward, and punishment (Van Vugt et al., 2004). Wren (2005) added the autocratic leader acts alone, sometimes causing discontent among the subordinates; whereas, the democratic leader involved the subordinates in decisions. Wren (2005) further noted that autocratic leaders are strict and uses their positions to offer or withhold rewards and punishment. Autocratic leadership style is found to be more dominant and exhibits significant negative relationship with employees' motivation (Fiaz et al., 2017). Asrar-ul-Haq and Kuchinke (2016) is of the view that the kind of leadership style exhibited by managers to a large extent influences, organizational valued outcomes such as low employee turnover, reduced absenteeism, customer satisfaction and organizational effectiveness. Similarly, leadership style controls interpersonal, reward and punishment that shapes employee behavior, motivation and attitude which impacts on organizational performance (Puni et al., 2014).

Most research in leadership has focused on autocratic and democratic leadership styles, since laissez faire leadership is usually perceived as the lack any meaningful leadership (except in cases where the followers are motivated and knowledgeable experts concerning the task at hand). Traditionally, the distinction between the other two forms of leadership has involved a dichotomy between people and task. Democratic leaders have been seen as those who are principally concerned with the people they lead; autocratic leaders are perceived as being primarily concerned with the accomplishment of a job or mission (Gustainis, 2004). Although the autocratic approach was once the dominant form

of leadership in human affairs, it has fallen out of favor in the present age (with some notable exceptions), often replaced by more democratic or humanistic styles. But it is unacceptably simplistic to say that autocratic leadership is "wrong" at all times and in all circumstances, and it is just as inaccurate to argue that democratic leadership is always "right" (Gustainis, 2004).

More precisely, autocratic leadership is usually seen as having four characteristics: (1) the leader makes all important decisions; (2) the leader is primarily concerned with task accomplishment, not the happiness or satisfaction of followers; (3) the leader maintains considerable social distance from followers; (4) the leader motivates followers by punishment (or the threat thereof), rather than by rewards (Gustainis, 2004).

Situational Leadership

An effective leader is an individual who has changeability, can readily adapt and overcome adversities in numerous situations (Robbins, 2008). The philosophy postulates that adaptable leadership styles are warranted for different situations and leaders must be able to alter their leadership to the situation (Robbins, 2008). Situational Leadership is based on an interplay among the amount of direction (task behavior) a leader gives, the amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader provides, and the "readiness" level that followers exhibit on a specific task, function, activity, or objective that the leader is attempting to accomplish through the individual or group (Blanchard et al., 1993). This means that the influence of situational leadership style on employee performance will be greater if through motivation (Style, 2019), which has a direct correlation to morale and job satisfaction.

Hersey and Blanchard (1969) based their situational leadership theory on previous studies of leader behavior. They identified four leadership behaviors: telling, selling, participating, and delegating, which are measured by the LEAD (leadership effectiveness and adaptability description) instrument. The theory predicts that the extent to which these behaviors are effective depends upon subordinates' task maturity and subordinates' psychological maturity. Subordinates' task maturity is measured using such factors as ability, education, and experience, whereas subordinates' psychological maturity is measured using such factors as willingness, self-esteem, and motivation (Ayman & Hartman, 2004). All leadership contingency models and theories acknowledge the role of the situation.

However, two key factors make them different. First, some use the leader's traits, whereas others use the leader's perceived behavior as reported by direct reports. Second, some have shown validity for predicting employee satisfaction and job stress, and others have shown validity for predicting team effectiveness and morale. The theory predicts that when subordinates are able and willing, a leader should delegate. When subordinates are willing and unable, a leader should sell (that is, decide on a course of action and "sell" it to the subordinate). When subordinates are unwilling but able, the leader should engage in participative decision making. When subordinates are unwilling and unable, the leader should tell them what to do. Although the situational leadership theory is popular, it has received limited empirical examination, and the results have been mixed at best (Bass, 1990).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leaders encourage their followers to sign-on or commit to the accomplishment of a common goal, which is beyond their own interests (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al., 2013;). Transformational leadership is focused more on development and progress by transforming follower's interests to advance the goals and vision of the organization, create enabling environment for trust and relationship forming to facilitate shared visions (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al., 2013). Four key elements underline transformational leadership: idealized or charismatic influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Followers trust and respect transformational leaders; thus, they embrace their values and yield leadership power and authority to them (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al., 2013). Transformational leaders exhibit the five characteristics or practices for exemplary leadership. These are: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act and take a risk, and lastly encourage the heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Posner, 2016). The transformational theory makes for the mutual learning and growth of leaders and followers, respectively (Bass et al., 2013; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002).

The transformational component focuses on inspiring followers to go beyond mere transactional exchanges and consists of four roles: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Hooijberg, 2013). The first I relates to idealized influence, which is when leaders behave as role models for their followers; induce admiration, trust, and respect; demonstrate high ethical standards; consider the needs of others above their own; share risks; and delegate tasks. The second I refers to inspirational motivation, where leaders provide meaning and challenge

to their followers thereby motivating and inspiring them, stimulate team spirit, are enthusiastic and optimistic, and engage their followers when thinking about the future. The third I is for intellectual stimulation, which is when leaders stimulate innovation and creativity by questioning assumptions and looking at problems from different perspectives, encourage creativity, discuss mistakes privately rather than publicly, engage team members in finding creative solutions to problems, and encourage risk taking. The fourth I pertains to individualized consideration, whereby leaders coach and mentor their subordinates to help them meet their personal and organizational needs to achieve and grow. This is characterized by delegating tasks; creating new, challenging learning opportunities in a supportive climate; accepting individual and different needs for attention, encouragement, autonomy, and structure; and listening.

Transformational leadership is about inspiring followers to achieve results and go beyond what is expected. At the team level, one should explore how the transformational roles help a group of individuals become a coherent team, how a coherent team becomes a highly performing team, and how a highly performing team can maintain its performance even when its members are not physically co-located. And at the individual level, one should explore how the transformational roles help functional experts become general managers, and how general managers can acquire a global mind-set.

Transformational leadership is a form of influence based on a developmental relationship that elevates others to higher levels of moral and professional development, promotes adaptability and change, and results in performance beyond expectations (Sosik, 2007). For groups, transformational leadership produces enhanced collective confidence, morale, and cohesion. It results in enhanced group productivity,

59

effectiveness, and creativity, and satisfaction with the leader and task. It can also build shared leadership, defined as "leadership by the team," in which leadership functions are distributed among members (Sosik, 2007). Organizational outcomes that result from transformational leadership include innovation, retention, organizational commitment, business unit goal attainment, unit financial performance, market share and customer satisfaction, and occupational safety (Sosik, 2007). Certain environmental conditions promote the effectiveness of transformational leadership. Organizations with strategic plans that encourage adaptation and boundary spanning support transformational leadership's focus on promoting change and making connections with customers and suppliers (Sosik, 2007).

Transactional Leadership

The central theme of transactional leadership theory is the interaction(s) between a leader and a follower for the exchange of goods for rewards (Bass et al., 2013). This theory of leadership consists of four significant subconstructs: contingent reward, active management by exception, passive management by exception, and laissez-faire (Xirasagar, 2008). Transactional leadership is a form of influence based on an exchange relationship in which the leader provides direction and rewards in exchange for a follower's delivery of agreed-upon performance (Sosik, 2007). One of the first transactional theories of leadership, the concept of idiosyncrasy credit, was put forth by the social psychologist Edwin Hollander in 1958 (March & Simon, 1958). Drawing on social exchange theory, Hollander held that group members are bonded in a relationship in which they give and receive credit from one another (Seyranian, 2010).

Transactional leaders benefit from the exchange system to realize outcomes with a focus on employee's goals accomplishment, rather than on their needs (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al., 2013; Sanders & Davey, 2011). Transactional leadership theory perceives the resulting interaction between the leader and followers as an exchange of goods for rewards, with a focus on the *what* of things than the *why* of things (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al., 2013;). Transactional leadership does not foster loyalty from followers, engenders mediocrity, brews dissatisfaction among followers and costs organizations more over time than it benefits them (Sinek, 2009). Transactional leaders engage their followers in a relationship of mutual dependence, in which the contributions of both are acknowledged and rewarded. Stated more simply, transactional leaders give followers something they want in exchange for their compliance (Gordon, 2008).

The hallmark of the transactional leadership theories is the idea of equitable exchange. Every day, individuals engage in an exchange process whereby one valued benefit, resource, or commodity is exchanged for another (Seyranian, 2010). The transactional approach characterizes effective leadership as a reciprocal and mutually beneficial process of give and take between leaders and followers. Leaders manage valued resources (e.g., information, support, consideration) and provide rewards or punishments to assist followers to achieve goals (Seyranian, 2010). In return, followers reciprocate with loyalty and compliance to the leader's requests while bestowing status on the leader. In 1948, Ralph Stogdill conducted an influential review of traits research and concluded that traits alone could not fully explain the leadership phenomenon (Seyranian, 2010).

In 1985, Bass applied Burns's ideas to management contexts and explained that

the study of leadership as an exchange process in organizations emphasizes a

transactional relationship in which followers' needs can be met if their performance

measures up to contracts with their leaders (Bass & Bass, 1985; Gordon, 2008). Gordon

(2008) emphasized that Bass and Bass (1985) added that transactional leadership includes

"supervisory and subordinate relations in which leaders: (1) recognize and obtain

resources that followers need for effective performance; (2) exchange rewards for effort;

and (3) are responsive to their followers' immediate self-interests if these interests are

related to the completion of work" (p. 11). Another important transactional approach to

leadership effectiveness, the vertical dyad linkage model, was proposed by George Graen

and colleagues in 1973 (Cummings & Schwab, 1973). In 1982, it was renamed and

expanded into leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Seyranian, 2010). Transactional

leaders engage followers in instrumental exchanges that satisfy the self-interests of both

the leader and the followers. Furthermore, such leaders are guided by modal values such

as honesty, responsibility, and fairness (Seyranian, 2010).

Servant Leadership

Servant leader theory of leadership is premised on the aspiration of individuals to

a leadership position to serve others and not their self-interests (Russell & Stone, 2002;

Stone et al., 2004; Van Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leadership practitioners submit

themselves to the services of followers and or co-workers rather than being their leader

(Russell & Stone, 2002; Stone et al., 2004). Servant leaders exhibit a strong commitment

to follower's well-being and growth; thus, they can build a community of servant leaders

by nurturing each follower personal, professional potentials and spiritual growth (Parris & Peachey, 2013).

Servant leadership is characterized by a focus on followers' growth and empowerment, and on leaders' altruism, empathy, sense of ethics and community stewardship (Greenleaf, 1977). Compared with related leadership styles, servant leadership is unique in that the leader is viewed as a 'servant' attending to followers' needs (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leadership's central premise is that servant leaders influence organizational outcomes by fostering followers' growth and well-being, specifically through the process of satisfying followers' needs (Liden et al., 2008). By conscious choice, one then aspires to lead, while embodying ethical imperatives and a deep commitment to put one's subordinates' "highest priority needs" before one's own (Chiniara & Bentein, 2016).

Van Dierendonck (2011) identified seven key characteristics behaviors of servant leaders. These are: (1) uses persuasive efforts of engagement, relationship, and communication to influence followers rather than the use of power or position, (2) good self-awareness and awareness for others, (3) an ability to make things whole, (4) healing through persuasion and visionary engagement, (5) advocates understanding and the acceptance of others, (6) empathy, and (7) excellent listening skills and a strong emphasis on communication. Servant leaders position themselves to serve followers and to develop the kind of relationship, which promotes follower's growth, healthy functioning, freedom, and risk-taking propensity (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002).

Greenleaf articulates his vision of how servant leaders act as role models, inspire trust, and communicate on a one-to-one basis to understand followers' abilities, goals,

desires and potential (Liden et al., 2008). Servant leaders use that knowledge to actively

try to satisfy their followers' needs in order to bring out the best in their followers and

allow them to achieve their potential. Servant leaders provide direction and challenging

responsibilities, while offering empathy, emotional support, feedback and resources

(Chiniara & Bentein, 2016). Liden et al. (2008) identified seven dimensions that

effectively capture the essential characteristics of a servant leader: (1) emotional healing,

which emphasizes caring and showing sensitivity to followers' personal well-being,

(2) empowering, entails encouraging and facilitating others' ability to take on

responsibilities and handle difficult situations in their own way, (3) help subordinates

grow and succeed by demonstrating genuine interest in their subordinates' career

development and goals, (4) put subordinates first by placing subordinates' best interests

and success ahead of their own, (5) creating value for the community, reflects how

servant leaders are involved in helping those in the community outside the organization,

(6) conceptual skills by being fully knowledgeable about the organization, its goals and

the task at hand, and (7) behave ethically in that they act and interact openly, fairly and

honestly with others.

Self-Leadership

The theoretical foundation of self-leadership is built upon social learning theory

(Bandura, 1977) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1986). The self-leadership concept

first appeared in a 1983 practitioner-oriented book (Manz, 1983) that expanded upon the

existing concept of self-management (Manz & Sims, 1980). The seminal academic work

on self-leadership appeared three years later in the Academy of Management Review

(Manz, 1986). One of the primary aims of *self-leadership* is to achieve higher

performance and effectiveness through behavioral and cognitive strategies that individuals use to influence themselves. It is a comprehensive view of self-influence that considers behavior to be a result of factors both internal and external to the individual (Alves & Manz, 2006).

If professionals do not have the capacity to self-regulate in unpredictable business environments, they will not only become less satisfied with their job, as they are less likely to perform adaptively when confronted with unexpected events (Baard et al., 2014). Job satisfaction prevents psychological problems such as depression and anxiety (Faragher et al., 2005) and promotes workplace productivity (Judge et al., 2001). Job satisfaction is considered a fairly stable individual appraisal of one's job and is linked to several attribute-like features such as self-efficacy, locus of control and self-esteem (Judge et al., 2001).

Self-leadership is a self-influence process through which people achieve the self-direction and self-motivation necessary to perform (Manz, 1986; Manz & Neck, 2004). Self-leadership consists of specific behavioral and cognitive strategies designed to positively influence personal effectiveness (Neck & Houghton, 2006). They aim at helping individuals develop pleasant and enjoyable feelings that build intrinsic motivation (Neck & Houghton, 2006). Either by positive task modelling and/or suppressing task negative aspects, i.e., the exacerbation of positive issues and avoidance of those that are unpleasant through purposefully ignoring them; or by the proactive transformation of the environment and the nature of the task so that they become more satisfying to accomplish (Neck & Houghton, 2006). Self-leadership strategies are usually grouped into the three primary categories of behavior-focused strategies, natural reward

strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies (Manz & Neck, 2004; Manz & Sims, 1980; Prussia et al., 1998).

Behavior-focused strategies strive to heighten an individual's self-awareness in order to facilitate behavioral management, especially the management of behaviors related to necessary but unpleasant tasks (Manz & Neck, 2004). Behavior-focused strategies include self-observation, self-goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment and self-cueing. Self-observation involves raising one's awareness of when and why one engages in specific behaviors (Neck & Houghton, 2006). These include self-observation (i.e., individuals monitoring their own behaviour and deciding if their current actions are effective or need adaptation), self-goal setting (i.e., individuals adaptation of their professional and personal goals to fit changes in the work environment), self-reward (i.e., attributing rewards to oneself as a way to promote or discourage certain behaviours) and self-cueing (i.e., using memos, alarms or images to remember things that must be accomplished, and consequences of good or bad performance) (Marques-Quinteiro et al., 2018).

Self-rewards may be something simple or intangible such as mentally congratulating oneself for an important accomplishment, or something more concrete like a special vacation at the completion of a difficult project (Manz & Neck, 2004; Manz & Sims, 1980). Constructive thought pattern strategies regard questioning beliefs and assumptions (i.e., individuals assessing their own values and beliefs and determining if they should change them or not), self-dialogue (i.e., engaging in self-dialogue as a way to structure thoughts) and visualizing successful performance (i.e., building a positive mindset towards the task, and mentally simulate the process of doing the task) (Marques-

Quinteiro et al., 2018). Finally, concrete environmental cues can serve as an effective means of encouraging constructive behaviors and reducing or eliminating destructive ones (Manz & Neck, 2004; Manz & Sims, 1980).

Considered to be an advanced form of the self-influence process, self-leadership reflects three important premises: (1) leadership is considered as an ongoing dynamic, (2) what an individual thinks and does is not without consequences, and (3) all individuals have the ability to, and do, exercise leadership, at least over themselves, although they may not be skillful in their self-leadership practices at a given point in time (Alves & Manz, 2006).

Rational Systems Theory

The rational structure focuses on channeling and coordinating employee behavior to accomplish the goals of the organization (Scott & Davis, 2007). The rational system theory emerged in the early 1900s because of the increased rationality of modern life (Scott, 2003). The key characteristics of rational system are goal specification, formal structure and effectiveness and efficiency. Each of these characteristics makes an important contribution in the formation of organization (Kandhro, 2015). The rational system describes the organization with formal rules, and set goals and it focuses on the normative structure of the organization (Kandhro, 2015). The goals specify the task to be performed, what personnel to be employed, how resources should be allocated amongst the personnel (Scott, 2003). It is considered one of most important elements in the rational system of organization and it establishes visible structure of relationships amongst the set of roles that governs the behavior of the system (Kandhro, 2015). The

roles and relations in the formal structure are well prescribed independently along-with occupying positions in the organization (Scott, 2003).

From the rational system perspective, Scott (2003) explained how organizations are more focused toward the pursuit of relatively specific goals and displaying highly formalized social structures. The rational systems theorists exerted their efforts on formalization and goal specificity of organizations because they are critical elements of the rationality of organizations (Jones, 2010; Scott & Davis, 2007). The rational organizational structure emphasizes the command-and-control approach, which contributes to organizational inflexibility and unresponsiveness (Robertson et al., 2007). The rational system can contribute to unsatisfied employees, low morale, and decreased productivity (Woodard, 2017). The rational system embeds information, efficiency, optimization, implementation and design frequently. The set of terms also occurs in this perspective that indicates the intellectual limitations of the individual decision maker (Kandhro, 2015). The terms such as constraints, authority, rules, directives, jurisdiction, performance, and co-ordination imply that the rationality behavior within organization takes place within clearly specified limits (Scott, 2003).

Open Systems Theory

The external environment effects most organizations, including law enforcement organizations. Open systems have some resemblance with multiple subsystems that specialize in certain system activities. The parts of the organizations are loosely coupled and have the capability of taking semi-autonomous action (Kandhro, 2015). The open systems perspectives emerged in the 1960s to explain interrelationships with organizations and their external environment (Scott, 2003). The open system, views

organizations as a system in which participants with various interests have partnership to serve their interests (Kandhro, 2015). In the open system perspective, the organization and environment are interdependent on each other. According to this perspective, an organization as a open systems can possesses the capability to survive in the environment by managing their resources received from the environment (Kandhro, 2015). The organization as an open system works in certain environments and possesses the capability of adjusting itself in environments (Kandhro, 2015). The interdependencies and connection between subsystems embeds the survival capability to the entire system of the organization (Scott, 2003).

From the open systems perspective, Scott (2003) explained how organizations lack interdependent flows or structure, which link shifting groups of personnel embedded in wider material-resource or institutional environments. Current organizational perspectives combine the open system models with rational systems models because of some theoretical overlap (Scott, 2003). Furthermore, open system rational models include theories such as bounded rationality (March & Simon, 1958), and contingency theory (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). In contrast, open system models include theories such as organizational population ecology (Hannan & Freeman, 1977) and resource dependence (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).

The criminal justice system is similar to an open system because the system consists of several subsystems that operate independently from the other (Woodard, 2017). The normative structure is consisting of norms, values and roles that provides the general rules to govern the behavior of the system. The structure is hierarchical, and its components are loosely coupled at both the individual and group level. The Open system

perspectives see organizations both as hierarchical and loosely coupled systems (Scott, 2003). Future research should concentrate on expanding the theories of open policing systems and successful implementation strategies (Wolf et al., 2008).

Methodology Literature

There is previous existing research of law enforcement officers, autocratic leadership and the relationship between leadership and stressors such as burnout. Adams and Mastracci (2018) in a mixed-method cross-sectional study sampled 271 police officers in the United states and found that burnout is associated with perceived organizational support. The data was collected using surveys, as Adams and Mastracci (2018) administered to groups of patrol officers in five departments during preshift briefings and trainings. Adams and Mastracci (2018) explained that burnout factors were collected from patrol officers, investigative officers, and commanders, as they all had varying factors. Response rate was high (96.7%), with few surveys returned blank ($n = 8$), and most questionnaires completed in full, allowing us to minimize nonresponse error (Adams & Mastracci, 2018). The findings of this study suggested that perceived organizational support decreases burnout.

Parker (2015) applied a descriptive phenomenological approach in a study of 12 retired police officers regarding stress and autocratic leadership from the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area previously employed by city, county, state, and federal agencies regarding stress, burnout and perceived organizational support. Semi-structured interviews conducted face-to-face were the primary collection vector to encourage participants to share their experiences. The purpose of this particular study was to explore the meaning that the participants attributed to their stress. The major findings of this

study centered on the specific factors within departments that either encouraged or discouraged the interview participants in seeking stress intervention services. The attitude of leadership and management was a critical factor, as was the police subculture itself (Parker, 2015).

Woodard (2017) in a qualitative narrative study examined the perceived impact of autocratic management practices and stress on 10 retired law enforcement officers. For this study the principal investigator used field notes, transcripts, and recorded interviews and placed the data into themes. The findings recommended that law enforcement leaders should prioritize education and take a proactive approach to understanding how management styles impact officers; implement daily shift briefing that seeks officer input and listening to concerns; encourage a culture or atmosphere of trust and supportability; hold supervisor's accountable for their misbehavior; become more engaged with the mental and physical challenges of their LEOs; and implement a leadership awareness seminar to educate supervisors on their leadership styles (Woodard, 2017).

Research Design Literature

The background of the Delphi Technique goes back thousands of years, specifically the Oracle at Delphi (Adler & Ziglio, 1996). The Delphi method is a creation of the RAND Corporation in the 1950s to facilitate the future prediction of a studied phenomenon and to aid the improvement of decision making in line with the resulting predictions (RAND, 2011). The Delphi design got its name from Delphi, a Greek city known for the oracular power of Pythia, a priestess renowned for predicting the future (Helmer, 1967a). The Delphi technique is applicable under the following conditions: (1) when the research goal is not to solve presented problem analytically, (2) when the

research objective is to secure or obtain a subjective opinion from experts in a specialized

area, and (3) when it is not possible to assemble all the study participants in one place or

geographical location (Grisham, 2009). The Delphi method is of two kinds: classical and

modified. Classical Delphi process requires the researcher to meet in person and

individually with each study participants, while modified Delphi approach entails using

technology to gather needed data for a study (Helmer, 1967; Hsu & Sandford, 2007a).

The original research was a classified military effort involving a group of multi-

disciplinary experts whose goal was to try and forecast the effects of future warfare on

the United States (Gordon & Helmer-Hirschberg, 1964). The process involved a series of

questionnaires "interspersed with information and opinion feedback" (Helmer,

1967). Prediction theory is the theoretical framework supporting research using the

Delphi Technical. From a theoretical perspective in more modern times, one of the

earliest words on prediction was by McGregor (1938). McGregor examined the concept

of predictions as a form of psychological inference. "Any argument from a premise to a

conclusion is an inference, and those that are expressed in the future tense are classified

as predictions" (p. 179). Cantril (1938) elaborated on McGregor's work, also dealing

with the issue of validity and the certainty of predictions. The theoretical foundation of

the accuracy of prediction (prediction theory) appears to depend on a wide set of

variables, including the individual and that individual's knowledge background,

preferences, and biases (Davidson, 2018).

The Delphi method is a name that has been applied to a technique used for the

elicitation of opinions with the object of obtaining a group response of a panel of experts

(Brown, 1968). The Delphi Technique is one traditional research method now being

operationalized via the Internet (Cole et al., 2013). The Delphi is used to systematically combine expert opinion in order to arrive at an informed group consensus on a complex problem (Linstone & Turoff, 2002). Delphi replaces direction confrontation and debate by a carefully planned, orderly program of sequential individual interrogations usually conducted by questionnaires (Brown, 1968). In principle, the Delphi is a group method that is administered by a researcher or research team who assembles a panel of experts, poses questions, syntheses feedback, and guides the group toward its goal—consensus (Cole et al., 2013).

The Delphi is a technique for organizing conflicting values and judgments through facilitating the incorporation of multiple opinions into consensus (Powell, 2003). Claims of generalizability are often mum within Delphi application, with result validity rooted in the iterative process of expert opinion development and consensus building as opposed to statistical significance (Cole et al., 2013). Traditional Delphi studies are paper-based with communications, surveys, and reports distributed by regular postal mail (Green et al., 1990). Difficulty determining adequate consensus aside, the considerable time commitment required is identified as perhaps the most significant limitation for both the researcher and participant (Wagner, 1997). For Delphi participants, the iterative, paper-based survey completion exercise is demanding by nature and can be a deterrent to participation acceptance and continuance (Cole et al., 2013). The time required to complete several rounds of surveys is further complicated by the traditionally long waits between survey rounds which can produce diminishing interest and frustration (Cole et al., 2013). For these reasons, high attrition has been widely reported in the literature (Sinha et al., 2011).

The knowledge that can be gained from the consensus of 15 active law enforcement can help shape the future of law enforcement leadership and its relationship to performance, morale, and job satisfaction through education and training. Ellis and Levy (2009) described the specific problem statement is at the heart of indicating the research method and design of the study (Woodard, 2017). In order to educate readers on the impact of autocratic leaders and its relationship to performance, morale, and job satisfaction of law enforcement officers, this study will enhance the knowledge of future leaders and provide an in-depth understanding through consensus from active law enforcement officers. Also, this study could contribute to future research and education and training of law enforcement leaders on the impact of autocratic management practices.

The payoff of a Delphi study is typically observed through expert concurrence in a given area where none existed previously (Sackman, 1975). Hence a qualitative modified Delphi study provided great benefits via the internet and several rounds of questionnaires to participants which eliminates any conflict involving COVID-19. Cole et al. (2013) recognized that using the Internet for Delphi research presents a new and exciting research frontier. They ascertain that the e-Delphi could provide a promising alternative that may reduce time, costs, communication difficulties, consensus monitoring challenges, and participant attrition (Cole et al., 2013).

Conclusions

A review of the historical and current literature of policing and how leadership interacts with performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police officers provided readers with an overview of how leadership within policing has evolved throughout the years. There is increased demand for accountability, advancements in technology, emergence of new crime types, austerity measures, organizational reforms, increasing need for community engagement, and a plethora of additional challenges. (Pearson-Goff & Herrington, 2014). Law enforcement organizations continue to evolve based on continued education and research (Woodard, 2017). Police leadership and especially staff who continuously work on developing a moral compass (Normore et al., 2014) and the skills of deliberate leadership (Keis & Javidi, 2014) build and establish healthy working relationships with the people they serve (Ellis, 2016).

Organizational Support Theory (OST) was discussed in chapter two. An unhealthy work relationship between employers and their subordinates can lead to stress, a hostile work environment and a dysfunctional organization (Baran et al., 2012). When officers perceive their departments do not have their backs or when officers feel mistreated, these perceptions can have real consequences (Reynolds et al., 2018). When employees feel leadership neither cares about their welfare nor appreciate their efforts, they are less likely to perceive that their organization supports them (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Eisenberger et al. (1986) theorized when considering a healthy social exchange, employees offer a commitment and effort to the organization for tangible incentives such as fringe benefits and salary (Woodard, 2017).

The theoretical framework section of this literature review examined leadership theories, such as autocratic, situational, transactional, transformational and servant leadership. Various styles are mixed and matched within the everyday elements of policing while trying to display effective leadership geared toward organizational success. Autocratic leadership is the leadership style that has evolved throughout the years and is indirectly being used today (Vargas, 2016). In today's law enforcement the troops doing the most work can benefit the organizations leadership more by being involved, thus requiring a bottom to top leadership flow. Leadership from the bottom up will assist police administrator in moving closer to an efficient, well-managed, and well-led organization (Ward, 2019). As explained by Voon and Ayob (2011) certain leadership styles create unnecessary stress on employees as leaders have to be able to recognize that and adjust accordingly.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a review of the related literature on Organizational Support Theory (OST), Leader-member Exchange Theory (LMX), Job Characteristics Model (JCM), Autocratic Leadership Theory (ALT), and Social Learning Theory (SLT) and their implication on autocratic leadership in relation to policing. Along with the aspects of Open Systems Theory and Rational Systems Theory. Babic (2014) explained that trust, therefore, plays a central role in developing relationships with employees during the process of change management. Managers are usually expected to manage subordinates' affect/emotions and maintain a ''emotionally healthy'' organization (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002). The organizational culture found within some law enforcement organizations can be influenced and altered as in all other professions (O'Toole et al., 2006). Hackman and

Oldham (1976) explained that the five characteristics are combined to form a motivating potential score, which can be used as an index of how likely a job was to affect an employee's attitudes and behaviors. The application of developing social-cognitive approaches to leadership showed that for both leaders and followers, how they interpreted leadership processes and outcomes was a critical mediating process linking leaders and followers (Lord et al., 2016). Throughout history, a paradigm shift has occurred regarding leadership theories but autocratic leadership styles are mostly used by the military and law enforcement organizations (Medina, 2007).

Chapter 3 provides a detailed explanation of the research method for the qualitative modified Delphi study of 15 active, Texas, law enforcement officers who are employed by local, state, and federal agencies within Texas. The research methodology, research design, and research appropriateness are discussed. Chapter 3 also includes the research questions, the study target population, sampling, informed consent and confidentiality, trustworthiness, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, and summary. It includes details of the research method used in gathering and analyzing data collected for this study. The modified Delphi technique was used to gather subject matter expert opinion to determine consensus regarding autocratic leadership and its relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction of active Texas law enforcement officers. This study was conducted via three rounds of the iterative questionnaires and addressed the central research question.

Chapter 3

Research Methodology

The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi technique was to gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes to the profession through education and training of future leaders. The goal of this chapter was to accurately define and describe the research design, methodology, trustworthiness of the research method, study population and selection procedure, ethical considerations, and the reiteration of the research question. The final sections of this chapter focused on instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, and summary. A qualitative research design is suitable for the examination of qualities or characteristics of a research question not amenable to quantification (Salkind & Rasmussen, 2013). Qualitative research offers general comprehension or knowledge of a designated area of interest by analyzing individuals or groups for standardized answers within the framework of collected data (Kelan, 2012). Through the application of a modified Delphi technique, participants answered questions on significant autocratic leadership strategies and practices that may affect the performance, morale, and job satisfaction of law enforcement officers in Texas. After researching and considering various research designs, a modified-Delphi technique was selected.

The statement of the problem outlined in Chapter 1 supports the choice of the modified Delphi technique. This technique was appropriate because this study intended to ascertain expert consensus on opinions regarding the role autocratic leadership might play in Texas law enforcement in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction for

now and the future. The central research question served as a guide to collect and comprehend the opinions of expert panel members regarding autocratic leadership and its affect on performance, morale, job satisfaction of police personnel in Texas.

Research Method and Design Appropriateness

Every research work uses experimental or non-experimental approaches for research (Altaai, 2020). Researchers use both, or individual method of approaches according to their need (Smith, 2018). A qualitative research method that includes the rationale research study, which is based on modified-Delphi method is accepted (Altaai, 2020). Qualitative data collection tools, such as observation, questionnaires, and surveying, are used in the research study (Altaai, 2020).

The purpose of this qualitative modified-Delphi study was to investigate the concerns autocratic leaders pose on Texas law enforcement in relation to the performance, morale, and job satisfaction of officers. Additionally, identify the existing knowledge gaps and current issues that become relational through consensus-based research of expert panelist. A qualitative research method is appropriate for this research study as it provides a profound understanding of issues and describes general levels to a phenomenon (Levitt et al., 2018). The use of qualitative and quantitative research methods, better known as a mixed method, was not adequate for this study since the in-depth investigation regarding the topic is not essential. Since the focus is on SME input and feedback and random electronic questionnaires for data collection, the chosen research strategy is suitable (Altaai, 2020).

The research goal of this qualitative modified Delphi study was to obtain knowledge and understanding of the consensus regarding performance, morale, and job

satisfaction in Texas law enforcement with autocratic leadership. Research methodology constitutes a whole range of strategies and procedures which include developing a picture of an empirical world, asking questions about that world and turning these into researchable problems and finding the best means of doing so through the choice of methods, development and use of concepts, and the interpretation of findings (Blumer, 1969). It further allows researchers to effectively engage panelists using contemporary research technology: internet or web-based survey providers. The essence is to focus the thought process of the expert panelist on the core tenets of the study (Hsu & Sandford, 2007a).

Qualitative Research

The objective of a qualitative method focuses on simplifying and generalizing what is observed during a research study (Levitt et al., 2018). Qualitative method is appropriate to use when researchers are trying to connect ideas and perceptions; when attempting to draw conclusions based on conclusions previously established from other research (O'Neil & Koekemoer, 2016). In a quantitative research method, researchers are not trying to discover a single or ultimate truth, but rather the interpretation of multiple perspectives held by different individuals (Altaai, 2020). In a qualitative method, the biases of researchers and participants are not known and perhaps hidden intentionally (Apuke, 2017). This research study sought the experience and opinions of subject matter experts, which can be obtained from interviews and observation. Therefore, the qualitative research method was deemed appropriate for this research study.

Quantitative Research

The objective of a quantitative research method focuses on information using primarily numeric data, which can be measured with statistical observations where findings are less generalizable (Apuke, 2017). The quantitative method is appropriate to use when researchers need to quantify or tell how many; used to measure the size of a market or to prepare a volume estimation (Altaai, 2020). Research usually presented with various statistics to prove a point that answers and links the research questions or hypotheses (Zyphur & Pierides, 2019). When using a quantitative research method, key terms are used within the design, data collection, and analysis. These key terms are visible such as, factual data points, statistical analysis, mean, median, mode, variation, and pivot tables (Furlan, 2017).

In a quantitative method, the biases of researchers and participants may be known and visible in the study and findings (Apuke, 2017). There are two types of quantitative research designs, experiment, and survey, where it expands into various types of experimental and survey designs (Furlan, 2017). True experimental, quasi-experimental, ex post facto research, Correlation research, prospective, and cohort studies are an example of the various quantitative research designs (Apuke, 2017). The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi study was to investigate autocratic leadership and its affect on performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement officers using subject matter experts to generate consensus. Therefore, the quantitative method was rejected for this research study, and the qualitative research method was deemed appropriate.

Mixed Method Research

The objective of a mixed method is using both qualitative and quantitative for the same phenomenon, illustrating the same point of hypothesis, but approaches the results from multiple perspectives (Ngulube & Ngulube, 2015). The mixed method is often used when two different questions are being answered, and the appropriateness of using mixed methods requires necessity within the research design. A combination of the interpretation of multiple perspectives while also using statistical data to provide related information on the topic (Sendall et al., 2018). The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi study was to investigate autocratic leadership and the affect on the performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement officers using subject matter experts to generate consensus. Therefore, the quantitative method was rejected for this research study, and the qualitative research method was deemed appropriate.

Research Design

The most commonly used qualitative designs are, namely narrative inquiry, case study designs, grounded theory, participatory action research, phenomenology, and Delphi (O'Neil & Koekemoer, 2016). The two designs researched to complete this qualitative study were a case study and Delphi. Boblin et al. (2013) indicated that case study design is suitable to conduct in-depth studies in various organizational settings (Boblin et al., 2013; Pathiranage et al., 2020). Case studies provide in-depth investigations of a given social unit resulting in a complete well-organized picture of that unit (Apuke, 2017). According to Yin (2014), case study designs are suitable when questions being asked are lead with "what or how" explore a contemporary set of events, and which the investigator has little or no control. A case study is an empirical

82

investigation that examines a contemporary phenomenon in detail and within its real-life context, particularly when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are indistinct (Pathiranage et al., 2020). Yin (2014) explained that the case study research design involves three basic approaches: explanatory, exploratory, and descriptive. The explanatory case study approach was not suitable for the study since it is used to explain causal relationships and develop theories through detail explanation of the phenomenon (Yin, 2014). The descriptive case study approach was not suitable for the study since it is mainly served for cause and effect analysis (Yin, 2014). Therefore, leaving the exploratory case study method being suitable to explore situations and processes that surround performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement officers with autocratic leadership. Welch et al. (2013) indicated that case study research design is the most prevalent method in business management research (Pathiranage et al., 2020; Welch et al., 2013).

Action research is often used for problem-solving among groups, and characteristics are that the group identifies the problem, gathers the data, develops a plan, analyzes the best action, selects the best course of action and cooperates in applying what has been learned (Apuke, 2017). Phenomenology design is supported by a social philosophy of human equality, where the researcher investigated an entire group, where the researcher is looking for a group of people with a shared value, culture or norm to understand certain behaviors or qualities (Gentles et al., 2015). The Delphi technique was developed by Dalkey and Helmer (1963), two research scientists at the Rand Corporation in the 1950s, is it widely used to obtain knowledge from experts in specific areas of expertise (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017). The modified Delphi process can be used if specific

83

information is obtained and information is present and functional, where a second and a third round of surveys are needed to obtain answers to the research question and problem (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017). The Delphi process has gone through various stages of modification and evolution (Sadiq, 2020). As a result, there are eight different types of Delphi techniques namely classical (original Delphi), modified, policy, decision, real-time, e-Delphi, technological, and the disaggregative Delphi (Davidson, 2013).

Only one of the above-discussed designs seemed to be aligned with the purpose of this research study, which was the Delphi design with a modified process. The rest of the qualitative research designs lack the flexibility and instrumentation needed for the complexity this problem presents in this study. This research study sought consensus from the experiences and opinions of subject matter experts, where data can be obtained from participants while not being face to face. Therefore, the qualitative modified-Delphi design was deemed appropriate for this research study.

The research design refers to the procedures used by a researcher to select a sample, administer the instruments, and analyze the data, (Ogula, 2005). The study focuses on the use of existing, current, and future prospects as a part of defining the rationale of the current inputs of the organizations in order to achieve the set goals of sustainable development (Hsu & Sandford, 2007a). The common requirements for all the Delphi techniques are the anonymity of the panelists and iteration of the process over several (usually three to five) rounds (Davidson, 2013). The modified Delphi technique provides a scientific methodology that is well suited for complex issues, through the iterative process of asking knowledgeable and expert contributors to individually respond to a set of questions until convergence is achieved (Grisham, 2009).

The analysis of the different perspective experiences carried out in the world has made it possible to verify that the methodology most commonly used in this type of research is the Delphi method. This method has been used in Japan since 1971 and has been adopted by European countries such as Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Austria (Breiner et al., 1994). Developed to use the expertise to predict or predict how a phenomenon would behave in the future, it was initially designed as a prospective method and then adopted in cross-sectional studies (Altaai, 2020). This technique is specialized in the evaluation of the future methodology of both qualitative data are obtained as quantitative (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017). In both cases, the Delphi contrasts and combines individual opinions and arguments put forward by experts and allow decisions to be neither objective nor desirable, to assume unilaterally by the investigator (Altaai, 2020).

Rationale of the Study

A Delphi study is comprised of qualitative data collection from survey questionnaires to be analyzed and provided feedback results over two or three rounds until consensus is achieved (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017). However, the questionnaires contain questions for the responsible participants with the absolute requirements of confidentiality and integrity of the sources (Hasson et al., 2000). Additionally, Delphi design provides an effective way of collecting qualitative data from an assorted sample of participants that are not restricted by location or resources (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017). Researchers can effectively modify a Delphi method to meet the needs of the given study to suit the circumstances and research questions (Hasson et al., 2000).

The Original or Classical Delphi

   The Delphi method is a process that involves a collection of experts coming together to deliberate on research problem by providing responses to a series of questionnaires which are iterated several times and the final data aggregated to reflect consensus on each of the questionnaires (Davidson, 2013). Delphi is a structured methodology for collecting systematically expert judgment on a problem, processing information, and through statistical resources, building a general group agreement (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017). The term expert is ambiguous and defined as such a person whose previous training and experience has allowed to achieve mastery over a subject that exceeds the average level of his peers, and who is in a position to present his views on that subject for that are used as conclusive judgments (Altaai, 2020). It is considered apt to issue accurate criteria, by which it is requested (Hasson et al., 2000). The expert label extends to well refer to an individual, group of individuals or an organization and do not consider successful because it is always a particular individual in ultimately offering his opinion as a member of the group or organization in question and in that case, it is their membership in this grouping the criterion of their selection (Altaai, 2020). Therefore, the Delphi method is a systematic and iterative process aimed at obtaining the opinions and, if possible consensus, from a group of experts. The negative influences of the dominant members of the group are avoided thanks to the anonymity of the participants (Altaai, 2020).

   As mentioned by Sadiq (2020), Strasser (2017) was of the view that the variation of the Delphi method is irrelevant provided the research method design meets the following generic characteristics of Delphi listed below:

1.   Anonymity of the participants

2.   Facilitate feedback

3.   Iterative process and

4.   Statistical aggregation of the final round

The modified Delphi technique provides a scientific methodology that is well suited for complex issues, through the iterative process of asking knowledgeable and expert contributors to individually respond to a set of questions until convergence is achieved (Grisham, 2009). Hsu and Sandford (2010) corroborated Grisham's view by stating that the Delphi technique is a broadly used and acknowledged method for collecting data from respondents within their field of expertise. The technique is designed as a cluster communication process, which aims to attain alignment of opinion on a specific real-life issue (Sadiq, 2020).

Modified Delphi Method

The modified Delphi method is selected for this research due to the flexibility associated with screening, recruitment of experts and facilitation of the Delphi rounds using a web-based online platform (Sadiq, 2020). As an online platform was used for this study, identified as SurveyMonkey as it also meets COVID-19 guidelines for social distancing. Although the selected research design method is referred to as the modified Delphi method, it meets all the criteria for the e-Delphi method (Sadiq, 2020). Davidson (2013) explained there is crossover definition of most Delphi applications owing to the flexibility associated with the execution (Sadiq, 2020). As an example, most of the Delphi applications can be administered online or using web-based tools (Sadiq, 2020).

Subject matter experts for this research problem were selected from a population pool of Texas law enforcement officers who have the necessary training, education and experience to assess the problem within the study. Hanafin (2004) explained that using the Delphi technique becomes appropriate when faced with social problem or conditions that could not be easily solved with precise analytical processes or where ethical and social considerations outweigh economic and technical considerations (Sadiq, 2020). The complexity of this problem has several connecting elements of organizational leadership practices, safety climate, safety culture and safety performance, which dictate the choice of a platform which enables participants who understand the associated intricacies of the problem to engage, discuss and arrive at a common decision under a facilitated environment (Grisham, 2009).

Research Questions

The key element from the research question surrounds leadership characteristics, work climate, worksite culture and the way all these elements translate into performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement officers. The central research question served as the reference point for generating interview questions that resulted in the responses received from the experts.

This research was aimed at obtaining consensus and knowledge regarding the affect of autocratic leadership within Texas law enforcement for the future performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police personnel. The targeted research population of this study was active law enforcement officers that currently work in the state of Texas. The central research question for this study was referred to as RQ1.

RQ1. What is the consensus among a panel of active Texas law enforcement officers, on leadership strategies to increase performance, morale, and job satisfaction in relation to education and training?

Research questions should align with the purpose of the research study and enhance the explanation of the current situation along with offering new information about the studied phenomenon (Lipowski, 2008). Answering the above research question may help provide the needed awareness to various stakeholders like employers, employees, policymakers, government regulators and researchers on the perceived influence that leadership characteristics have over Texas law enforcement officers and their performance, morale, and job satisfaction.

Population and Sample

The modified Delphi design is based on the opinion of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in the field of law enforcement. Mikkelsen (2020) and Rutberg and Bouikidis (2018) identified population as the full set of conditions from which the sample was selected. According to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (2020) there are approximately 80,088 certified peace officers within Texas. As in the study, the population consisted of a group of SMEs each with at least seven years of experience in law enforcement a high school diploma or equivalent and or have a post-secondary degree, being an active sworn Texas peace officer, holding a current leadership position with a minimal rank of Sergeant and a maximum rank of Chief of Police or Sheriff or the federal designation with supervisor responsibilities and authority. Along with having attended and graduated from some additional form of leadership training such as Federal Bureau of Investigations National Academy (FBI-NA), Federal Bureau of Investigations

Law Enforcement Executive Development Association (FBI-LEEDA) Supervisor, Command, or Executive Leadership Institute, The Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas (LEMIT) Leadership Command College (LCC), Institute for Law Enforcement Administration (ILEA), or the Senior Management Institute for Police (SMIP) through the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF).

Recruitment of Participants

The SME's were selected from the principal investigators own personal and professional network of law enforcement professionals that have been engaged through various leadership training and development courses for law enforcement executives and supervisors. Invitations were only sent to Texas law enforcement officers through a purposeful sampling process. A letter of invitation was used for recruitment and was communicated via email to the potential SMEs to participate in this research study (Appendix B). Once the SMEs respond to the invitation letter and accepted the invitation, a form of informed consent was sent out to the participants via email using SurveyMonkey notification, explaining the nature of the study, demographic form (Appendix C), the principal investigator's contact details, and the instructions needed along with ensuring confidentiality. A signed informed consent form was electronically accepted or declined through SurveyMonkey before an SME could participate in this research study (Appendix A). The experience of the experts is important to develop an understanding of the key issues surrounding autocratic leadership and the affect it has on Texas law enforcement officer's performance, morale, and job satisfaction.

Sampling Frame

Sampling is focused on balancing the participants in order to find a rationale sample of the participants that can represent the whole study location and have the best impact on the study as well (Hasson et al., 2000). According to Keeney et al., (2011), Delphi researchers do not have guidelines on the requirements for the selection of panel members, nor the size of the panel itself (Sadiq, 2020). The definition of the term expert in Delphi literature remains ambiguous (Keeney et al., 2011). Most Delphi researchers come up with their own definition and interpretation of an expert (Sadiq, 2020). Sampling, by purpose, is based on the assumptions that the investigator's knowledge about the sample can be used to select representative cases for the sample (Altaai, 2020). Adler and Ziglio (1996) outlined four requirements to guide the identification and selection of an expert for Delphi study. They are:

1.   Knowledge and experience of research study

2.   Capacity and willingness to participate in the study

3.   Ability to devote time to participate

4.   Ability to communicate with other panelists effectively.

For the present investigation, the panel of experts were selected according to their education, years of experience in the field of law enforcement, leadership role within a law enforcement organization, and past training or certifications obtained in leadership. According to Steele et al. (2008), a panel size ranges from 15 to 35 is the typical size for a Delphi study, with the expectation that 35% to 75% of the population will participate (Altaai, 2020). The Delphi literature recommends a panel size range from 10-18 participants (Weimer & Securing, 2008).

Therefore, the appropriate sample size was selected from the population of 35 SMEs, which was 15 participants. The sample was determined upon the answers of section I of the first-round questionnaire, which is the demographic and general information of participants. Sample SMEs must have a high school diploma or equivalent and or have a post-secondary degree, at least seven years of experience in law enforcement, be an active sworn Texas peace officer, hold a current leadership position with a minimal rank of Sergeant and a maximum rank of Chief of Police or Sheriff or the federal designation with supervisor responsibilities and authority. Along with having attended and graduated from some additional form of leadership training such as FBI National Academy, FBI-LEEDA Supervisor, Command, or Executive Leadership Institute, The Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas (LEMIT) Leadership Command College, Institute for Law Enforcement Administration (ILEA), or the Senior Management Institute for Police (SMIP) through the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF).

Expert purposive sampling was utilized for this study with experts in the field of law enforcement being selected. It is a nonrandom technique that does not need underlying theories or a set number of participants (Etikan et al., 2016). The purposive sampling technique, also called judgment sampling, is the deliberate choice of a participant due to the qualities the participant possesses (Etikan et al., 2016). Expert sampling is a positive tool to use when investigating new areas of research, to garner whether or not further study would be worth the effort (Etikan et al., 2016). The idea behind purposive sampling is to concentrate on people with particular characteristics who will better be able to assist with the relevant research (Etikan et al., 2016).

Informed Consent and Confidentiality

Townsend et al. (2010) identified the principle-based approach to conducting ethical research as the most often cited framework for ensuring human subject protection (Sadiq, 2020). The principle-based approach include respect for independence and autonomy of the research participants, protection of the welfare (beneficence) and from any form of injury of the research participants during the cause of the research study (Sadiq, 2020).

Informed Consent

Informed consent is central in social research, and it is up to the participants to weigh the benefits and risks associated with participating in the research and deciding whether to take part or not, (Howes & Moses, 1999). According to Ricketts et al. (2019) informed consent continues throughout the participants involvement in the study and is the foundation of individual protection (Kehr, 2020). This study allows for the confidentiality of each participant by acknowledging and respecting the participant's priorities, experiences, and motivations. The principal investigator informed the participants about their participation in and what the research entails, the requirements of the study and its importance, to get their consent before proceeding with data collection. The informed consent form will clearly state the purpose and intent of the study, define the participants level of involvement, and identify their right to withdrawal without penalty (Lindsley, 2019). The principal investigator also ensured that the confidentiality of the respondents was manifested. All identified participants received an informed consent form to review and accept or decline before they engaged in the first round of questioning via SurveyMonkey as it was embedded into the instrument giving the option

for participants to agree or disagree (Appendix A). The researcher ensures confidentiality

by asking the respondents to not indicate their names on the questionnaires. The

researcher only then was permitted to carry out the study (Collis & Hussey, 2003).

Confidentiality

The key element to minimizing risk is to protect the confidentiality of data

(Surmiak, 2018). Researchers should use consent forms and do everything possible to

ensure the privacy and confidentiality of the study data and the participant's identity such

as coding data and safeguarding all documents or recordings, and avoid using identifying

records and lists longer than necessary (Berg, 2009). After the approval of IRB, potential

participants were recruited through email invitation that required an electronically

accepted informed consent. Participants were asked to complete the online consent form

which, was the first page of the online survey before being able to take part in the study.

The participant could withdraw their consent anytime during the study as data would be

withdrawn and deleted immediately. As stated by Violanti, (2011) assurances of

confidentiality and anonymity should reduce the officers' inhibitions, allowing a more

candid response (Woodard, 2017). Research privacy is vital to social sciences and ethical

codes in humanities (Surmiak, 2018).

Ethical considerations for this study included protecting the privacy of all the

participants by maintaining their confidentiality, which is one of the core requirements of

a modified Delphi technique. Information exchanges with all participants was stored in a

coded digital folder with each participant being identified by their alias identical to or

randomly generated number to protect unanimity. Informed consent and demographic

information were kept separate as well in digital folders assigned to the alias of the

participant. For example, panelist one was identified as LEP01 in all records of exchange where LEP stands for Law Enforcement Panelist and the 01 means Number 01.

Ethical issues can creep up in any part of the research process and may be found in data editing, sampling techniques or data analysis (Alsmadi, 2008). It is the researcher's obligation to operate in honesty and integrity (Poon & Ainuddin, 2011). The use of the internet to conduct electronic questionnaires creates several important ethical considerations that affect the data collection stage of research (Altaai, 2020). These ethical considerations can be minimized by utilizing detailed voluntary consent forms that address each issue and make the participants aware of any possible risks (Altaai, 2020). Each participant was asked to accept or decline an informed consent form that was visible to the principal investigator through the software platform. The Invitation Letter and the Informed Consent form used in this study are in Appendix A and B respectively.

Storing and Destroying Data

All electronic copies or transcribed data and email communications was stored on a personal, password protected computer solely dedicated to the principal investigator's use with no other login credentialed users. The gathered data was encrypted and securely stored online. A dedicated outlook digital folder was created for each expert for the storage of e-mail exchanges, informed consent, and demographic information. The digital folder was named with the expert's alias. After three years, all electronic files and digital folders will be deleted, and online accounts will be closed. If participants decided to withdraw at any time information was removed from the study and deleted immediately.

Information collected for the study was secured by applying the following steps.

1. E-mail exchanges between the principal investigator and the panelists were through secured and encrypted platforms to ensure confidentiality of the panelists.

2. Records of e-mail exchanges and other documents with personally identifiable information were stored on a dedicated outlook digital folder that were created for each Panelist as informed consent and demographic information was kept separate. The outlook digital folders were coded, and the panelists were only be identified with their aliases. For example, panelist 1 was identified as LEP01 in all records of exchange where LEP stands for Law Enforcement Panelist and the 01 means Number 01.

3. All personally identifiable information of the panelists was destroyed immediately after concluding round three of the data gathering process. The delay in destroying the personally identifiable information was to enable the principal investigator to follow up with the experts for reminders and clarification where required. If panelist withdraws, information was removed immediately and destroyed.

4. Names and email addresses of the panelist were uploaded unto the SurveyMonkey platform for administering the survey instruments throughout rounds 1,2, and 3.

5. The principal investigator was provided with a user name and password to be able to access stored information on SurveyMonkey.

6. Data through SurveyMonkey software was encrypted using secure TLS cryptographic protocols. SurveyMonkey data was also encrypted at rest.

7. Panelist were only able to access the survey instruments using a password provided to them through encrypted email message.

8. The panelist's computer IP address were blocked to prevent the collection of the panelist's computer IP address data.

9. Each panelist member remained anonymous to other panelists throughout the study.

10. Personally identifiable information data was destroyed at the end of Delphi round 3 by deleting from the online storage deleting from the computer database.

Townsend et al. (2010) explained that application of justice as part of research ethical requirements include offering participants a fair and equitable distribution of burdens and benefits of the research (Sadiq, 2020). For this study, the principle of beneficence was demonstrated by highlighting the significance of the study and the anticipated benefits to each panel member during the recruitment process (Keeney et al., 2011).

Geographic Location

Expressly, with the pandemic of COVID-19 there are anticipated challenges associated with gathering subject matter experts from across the State of Texas at one location. To address this challenge, a modified Delphi technique was the selected qualitative research method for this study. A total of 35 potential participants were invited and asked to express their interest to participate in the study and to complete a short demography questionnaire after informed consent was agreed to. The demographic questionnaire (Appendix C) was used as a screening tool for the final selection of the 15

modified Delphi panelists from all the potential participants invited for the screening. Information from the demographic questionnaire was used to evaluate the relevance of the industry experience, leadership role, knowledge, and understanding of leadership. This was used to ensure a diverse representation of the modified Delphi panelist.

Instrumentation

This section describes the instrumentation that was used for this study, which was a qualitative modified Delphi. Qualitative study focuses on analyzing data that is pertinent to the accessible sources and figuring out the possible levels of the current findings, the impact towards the study purpose, and the success level of the study (Altaai, 2020). Survey questionnaires were developed for this study as data collection instruments for subject matter experts. The modified Delphi survey questionnaire was communicated to participants via email using SurveyMonkey. The research approach facilitated a controlled interaction with the participants without introducing any psychological biases (Francoise et al., 2009).

Davidson (2013) defined the Delphi technique as a process that involves a collection of experts coming together to deliberate on research problem by providing responses on a series of questionnaires that are discussed and reviewed separately. In the study, the pattern of the answers from the questionnaires observed to ensure validity and knowledge of each subject matter expert (Altaai, 2020). The modified-Delphi method has observation as a requirement, especially from the group of experts based on the prospects of ensuring that the submitted information is relevant and accurate (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017). Available information from databases and online resources like previous

researches are appropriate in defining the historical information and the comparison that presents the level of progress (Tharenou et al., 2007).

Field Test

A field test was conducted to increase the transferability of the study (Daniel, 2018). Testing the instrument allowed the principal investigator to determine possible issues that could develop during the actual study. The field test was conducted with participants who have knowledge of the research topic and were asked to confirm that the instrument questions are clear, concise, and impartial. The number of participants for the field test was solidified at two using the committee members. The purpose of the field test was to ensure that interview questions align with research question. While methodological literature provides useful theoretical frameworks to guide the transformation process of field data into plausible findings, learning how to analyze and interpret qualitative data relates to the transformation of the researcher as the primary instrument for understanding the phenomenon being studied (Barrett, 2007). Data was not collected during the field test, but the responses from the field test participants were used in finetuning the instrument for the actual modified Delphi rounds.

Davidson (2013) defined the Delphi technique as a process that involves a collection of experts coming together to deliberate on research problem by providing responses on a series of questionnaires that are discussed and reviewed separately. The validity of instruments and credibility of the data was assured by comparing data gathered during each round to data from the reviewed literature on the research questions and notes taken during the reiterative rounds of the modified Delphi technique (Sadiq, 2020). A field test of the questionnaire improves the survey, data collection, and result

quality (Hilton, 2015). Additionally, it will pinpoint any weaknesses in the questions and ensures that questions aligned with the purpose of the study (McCarthy et al., 2018).

The questions from the field test were directly provided to participants in round one to start the collection of data. There were 12 questions relating to central research question one (RQ1). The purpose of the twelve questions was to obtain the experiences or observations of participants while providing them the opportunity to elaborate on answers providing data that would help create the questionnaires for the following rounds and obtain consensus. The goal of the questions was to later during data analysis be able to thematically analyze responses of participants in regard to the literature from Chapter 2. The alignment of questions to participants were based off the review of literature and only used to generate responses to obtain consensus and corroborate the theoretical framework of this study.

<div align="center">

Trustworthiness

</div>

For all qualitative research, qualitative rigor is the assurance of excellence in thoroughness and accuracy in qualitative research studies (Thomas & Magilvy, 2011). Qualitative research provides a deep understanding of an organization or event, rather than a general description of a large population (Abdalla et al., 2018). As a principal investigator, one should ensure their study is credible, dependable, and trusted.

The concept of credibility is tested when the results were analyzed as the appearance of a found reality that allows for the interpretation of meaning (Abdalla et al., 2018). Credibility is defined as the authenticity and truthfulness of a study's results (Abdalla et al., 2018). Truth value is described as the trustworthiness of research findings and if they are believable by the individuals participating in the study (Petty et al., 2012).

Utilizing the participants to test the believability, or credibility of a qualitative research study is known as member checking (Petty et al., 2012). This process involves participant's examination of descriptions and themes identified by the researcher in order to evaluate if this is an accurate reflection of their perspectives (Naidu & Prose, 2018; Varpio et al., 2017). Practices such as using an audit trail and reflexive journaling, which include efforts to eliminate researcher bias and consider opposing views contribute to demonstrating researcher credibility (Flatt, 2020). The participants in this research study were selected through purposive sampling and the researcher evaluated the trustworthiness of the study findings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2009). Again, to ensure credibility, the researcher fully disclosed the steps taken to recruit participants, how the instruments would be conducted, and how data will be collected and analyzed (Kehr, 2020).

Transferability

Transferability in qualitative research is achieved by describing a phenomenon in detail (Daniel, 2018). Transferability does not advocate for generalizability, instead, it advocates that the findings gained from a specific context can offer valuable information or lessons to other similar settings (Kehr, 2020). Internal factors that depict the validity of the instruments include the positioning of secondary sources which should verify the information provided (Smith, 2018). Transferability in qualitative research is the quantitative equivalent of outside validity or generalizability to other situations or populaces (Denzin & Lincoln, 2009). According to Denzin and Lincoln (2009) establishing transferability of discoveries transpire during the descriptive segment of data analysis (Woodard, 2017). Researchers must be thorough in describing the theoretical

framework and the underlying suppositions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2009). The researcher

must ensure the findings of the study truthfully reflect the perceptions of participants

involved in the study (Daniel, 2018).

Transferability was achieved by expressing the details about the study participants

as Hannes (2011) explained as demographic information and their experiences. Further,

to demonstrate transferability, as Forero et al. (2018) explained the principal investigator

ensured the recruitment and selection of a sample were based on expert knowledge from

participants in Texas law enforcement.

Dependability

Dependability in qualitative research is akin to reliability in quantitative research,

which is described as the repeatability of the study where variations can be understood

(Petty et al., 2012). Compounding this issue is the fact research data collection and

analysis is a dynamic, unfolding process performed by the researcher and as such is

subject to change (Petty et al., 2012). This does not imply dependability is unachievable

in qualitative research. Dependability in qualitative research can be demonstrated by the

researcher employing practices such as maintaining an audit trail (Guest et al., 2013;

Petty et al., 2012) and a reflexive journal throughout the study (Petty et al., 2012) which

was utilized in this study. The audit trail is primarily utilized in the data analysis stage

and documents coding and analysis processes employed and aids in providing

transparency to others (Guest et al., 2013). The audit trail also serves to assist the

researcher in performing an internal review and can facilitate an accurate replication of

procedures (Guest et al., 2013). The journaling process can also increase self-awareness,

provide a foundation for creating ideas, and permits critical reflection by the researcher (Coghlan, & Brydon-Miller, 2014).

Confirmability

Confirmability was achieved through data saturation. Data saturation is reached when there is enough information to replicate the study (O'Reilly & Parker, 2012), when the ability to obtain additional new information has been attained (Guest et al., 2006), and when further coding is no longer feasible (Guest et al., 2006). Data saturation was achieved by ensuring the data had both of what Dibley (2011) explained as quantity and quality through multiple surveys posing the same questions to participants. Mason (2010) explained the extent of data saturation in qualitative research. As Petty et al. (2012) explained member checking was utilized in this study as another strategy to show confirmability. The expert thematic data analysis approach by Braun and Clarke (2006) regarding themes and coding was utilized for this study to show confirmability. Confirmability refers to the extent to which other individuals can substantiate the discoveries (Denzin & Lincoln, 2009). Schreiber and Asner-Self (2011) stated that confirmability occurs when the research can provide examinable evidence. Moreover, Neuman (2014) added that triangulation is a tool used to ensure the study's confirmability. Confirmability in qualitative research relates to the degree that the research findings reflect the focus of the exploration; which can be compromised by researcher bias (Petty et al., 2012). In addition to practicing reflexivity in attempts to reduce researcher bias (Byrne, 2017; Petty et al., 2012), additional strategies by the researcher to address these challenges include; admission and inclusion of the researcher assumptions and beliefs, identification of any shortcomings of the research method

including any possible effects, and by providing detailed descriptions of the research method and analysis (Farquhar, 2012). Through reflexivity, researchers acknowledge the changes brought about in themselves as a result of the research process and how these changes have affected the research process (Palaganas et al., 2017). Participant feedback expanded the principal investigators knowledge on the ability to be flexible in leadership practices and approaches as one particular approach is not the best for every situation encountered.

Data Collection

The Delphi technique usually involves three rounds with interspersed feedback to panel members in between. Keeney et al., (2011) explained that round one usually starts with open-ended questions designed to generate ideas from the panelists' responses regarding the subject of the study (Sadiq, 2020). The process for this study was based off principles explained by Strauss and Corbin (1998) as themes or coding were utilize once answers are provided for the open-ended questions. In one or two undetermined rounds a Likert-type scale was used to provide a ranking of how participants feel regarding the consensus of answer provided and themes generated from those. This is based on the Strauss and Corbin (1998) regarding the research questions connection to the design and method used to obtain the information from participants that may connect to the theories used in the literature to support the study. Strauss and Corbin (1998) explained that data collection is followed by analysis as analysis leads to concepts that generate questions which in turn leads to more data collection.

For the purposes of this study, the panelists were provided with a list of questions based on a validated research instrument. Data collection in the qualitative Delphi

research method consists of multiple related iterations or rounds of surveys or questioning. This study anticipated utilizing three rounds of questioning. This study relied on technology in conducting multiple rounds of open-ended and Likert-type qualitative questionnaires of participants through the internet utilizing the program SurveyMonkey, a secure and commonly used instrument in qualitative research. The individual rounds built upon each other which contributed to the success of the qualitative Delphi research method (Hsu & Sandford, 2010). The number of rounds of questioning in a Delphi studies cannot be predetermined and varies. While three rounds of data collection are typical, it is not always necessary to achieve a point of data saturation for determining consensus (Nashir et al., 2015). Data saturation is an elusive concept and standard in qualitative research since few concrete guidelines exist (Marshall et al., 2013). Marshall et al. (2013) stated data saturation is the point when information within the data becomes repetitive. Strauss and Corbin (1998) defined saturation as being when no new concepts are emerging and when all major categories are fully developed, show variation, and are integrated. If saturation was not reached at 14 of the participants additional participants were to be recruited. Saturation was not reached, as 14 participants did not generate the desired consensus therefore one additional participant was recruited to ensure saturation and provided consensus using an odd number of participants.

The data collection process involved three rounds with interspersed feedback to panel members in between each round. The principal investigator subscribed to a SurveyMonkey payment plan to use the platform to invite Delphi panelists for the study and document their responses. The principal investigator was provided with a username and password to be able to access stored information on SurveyMonkey that is generated

by the principal investigator and not shared with anyone to maintain confidentiality. Data

through SurveyMonkey software was encrypted using secure Transport Layer Security

(TLS) cryptographic protocols. SurveyMonkey data was also encrypted at rest. The goal

of encryption for data at rest is to safeguard the data when it is in storage (Rjaibi, 2020).

The panelists' email addresses were uploaded to the SurveyMonkey site for delivery of

survey instruments for each of the rounds. An email was sent out to the consented

participants informing them with the instructions of accessing the SurveyMonkey URL of

the research study questionnaire, and instructions on how to answer each section of the

questionnaire, along with the informed consent form embedded within SurveyMonkey.

Only the principal investigator was able to access the personal identifier information of

all the panelists. The computer IP addresses of all the panelists were blocked to prevent

the collection of the panelists' computer IP address data. Each panelist remained

anonymous to other panelists throughout the study.

All participants were asked to respond to the instrument within one week after

receipt. If the responses were not received within seven days, the participants with

instruments not completed were contacted through email message. For participants who

did not respond to their instrument by the second day after the deadline, additional

contact was made until the responses were received or a deadline was reached thus

terminating participation and moving forward with participants who provided data.

Round One

The first round was accompanied by an explanation of the presentation, including

the modified-Delphi objectives, the practical conditions of the survey development

(response time, confidentiality guarantee and other), and details on the topic of

performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leaders in Texas law enforcement. The instrument was sent to all panelists via SurveyMonkey software by the principal investigator. As round one's questions (Appendix H) were to be the commencement of the data gathering process as confidentiality of panelist was to be maintained by using aliases identified as Law Enforcement Panelist (LEP) and a designated number starting at 01. The panelists were provided with passwords for each round along with an invitation email for the specified round (Appendix D). Panelists were given up to one week to complete their questionnaires. The panelists were sent email reminders at the end of week one and three days prior to the beginning of week two and prior to termination within the study. Responses from the round one panelist were recorded and securely stored using the aliases of panelist. A dedicated digital folder was named with the panelist's alias allowing the principal investigator to properly log information while maintaining confidentiality as informed consent, demographic information were kept separate. For example, panelist 1 was identified as LEP01 in all records of exchange where LEP stands for Law Enforcement Panelist and the 01 means Number 01. This process was assigned for each panelist throughout the study and remained connected to the specified panelist throughout the study. Data were gathered, analyzed, and then prepared in readiness for the second round of deliberation by the panelists.

Round Two

The responses from round one panelist were analyzed and used to create the questionnaire or Likert-type scale for the round two. The panelists were sent an invitation email and informed consent pertaining to round two to gain entry and continue with the

study (Appendix E) that was sent by the principal investigator. Where there was a consensus of the panel members on a question, that question was removed from the subsequent rounds. The guideline for consensus, which was considered acceptable for this study, was set at 75% as it was not indicative to the total population of law enforcement but allowed better understanding regarding consensus for the principal investigator. As an example, Grisham (2009) recommended that consensus is achieved when 80% of the panel members agreed on a question (Sadiq, 2020). Keeney et al. (2011) stated that due to the inability of researchers to agree on what is considered an acceptable level of consensus, researcher can set consensus between 51% and 80% (Sadiq, 2020). From here, the panelists were asked to re-evaluate their responses while considering the opinions of the rest of panelists and that they can maintain or change responses as needed. Also, panelists were asked to rate the round one's responses in order of importance using a Likert scale of 1 – 4 where 1 is strongly agree, and 4 is strongly disagree. Round 2 used the following four-point rating scale: 1= *Strongly Agree*, 2 = *Agree*, 3= *Disagree*, and 4= *Strongly Disagree*. Only panelists who completed the previous round were invited to the next round.

Round Three

The responses from round two were analyzed and used to create the questionnaire for round three. The panelists were sent an invitation email and informed consent pertaining to round three to gain entry and continue with the study (Appendix F). Panelist statements that received the desired consensus in round two were not provided in round three. During round three, the panelists had the opportunity to adjust their responses to their round two's questionnaire or Likert-type scale. The panelist were asked to rate the

108

responses from round two using a Likert scale rating of 1 – 4 where 1 is absolutely

necessary, and 4 is not necessary. Round 3 used the following four-point rating scale: 1=

Absolutely Necessary: Required for employee performance, morale, and job satisfaction,

2 = *Recommended: Contributes highly to employee performance, morale, and job*

satisfaction, 3 = *Optional: Not essential, does add some value to employee performance,*

morale, and job satisfaction, 4= *Not Necessary: Has no impact on employee*

performance, morale, and job satisfaction. The questionnaire or survey intended to

establish the consensus of knowledge surrounding current issues regarding leadership,

knowledge gaps of leadership and its affect on Texas law enforcement officer's

performance, morale, and job satisfaction. The primary data collection approach helped

to gather all relevant data regarding leadership and its affect on Texas law enforcement

officer's performance, morale, and job satisfaction, which will affect the conclusions and

recommendations of this study in regard to future education and training. Upon

completion of the study panelists were sent a Thank You email (Appendix G).

Data Analysis

Without ongoing analysis, the data can be unfocused, repetitious, and

overwhelming in the sheer volume of material that needs to be processed. Data that have

been analyzed while being collected are both parsimonious and illuminating (Merriam &

Tisdell, 2016). For this qualitative study, which utilized the Delphi method, the analysis

was inductive with subject matter experts as participants and sought to allow their

experiences, feelings, and understanding of the research questions to drive the study. The

inductive approach, on the other hand, involves working exclusively from the participant

experiences that drive the analysis entirely (Azungah, 2018). The expert approach for this

qualitative study was thematic analysis and will based on the phases or steps mentioned by Braun and Clarke (2006). The six phases of thematic analysis as mentioned by Braun and Clarke (2006) were identified as familiarization, coding, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and writing the report. Braun and Clarke (2006) explained that thematic analysis provides and accessible, systematic, and rigorous approach to coding and theme development (Howitt, 2010). The data was stored in tables in order to make the analysis task much easier for the development of reasonable recommendations and conclusions (Seers, 2011).

Data analysis begins with the data coding process to aid in identifying themes (Silver & Lewins, 2014). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained that data analysis is about making sense out of the data and it is about identifying themes, categories, patterns, or answers to the research questions. The coding process can occur either inductively or deductively. Inductive coding was utilized in the study. Inductive coding involves generating codes from the data itself (Silver & Lewins, 2014; Walker & Solvason, 2014). Utilizing computer software for qualitative data analysis is an essential tool for researchers (Flick, 2014) and eliminates the arduous time consuming task of manually coding (Paulus et al., 2014). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained that options for organizing can be done by hand, computer software designed for qualitative research, or a mix of both. SurveyMonkey and NVivo software was utilized in this study to code the data collected. This will aid in keeping research material organized and readily available (Flick, 2014). A word cloud tool included in the software was used to aid the principal investigator during the data coding process.

Qualitative researchers use Delphi techniques to understand and interpret the social environment from which the data was collected (Mathison, 2005). The modified-Delphi method provide anonymity, coordinated feedback process, and several statistical analysis techniques to decipher the collected data (Hsu & Sandford, 2010). Thomas and Magilvy (2011) recommended that the interpretation of data or responses must not in any way cause problem for the participants and their organizations or professional bodies (Sadiq, 2020). As to ensure the data was not lost in translation, the principal investigator's understanding of the data was shared with the participants to provide the opportunity for any critiques and allow validation of the analyzed data. Statistical analysis is not required from the panel members to make general observation without undue pressure from the group (Brewer, 2007). The iterations process allows panel members to focus on their objectives and maintain individual opinions without conforming to social norms (Hsu & Sandford, 2010). Clarifying researcher's bias is an important aspect of assuring the integrity and quality of any research (Sadiq, 2020).

To ensure the integrity of the data, the principal investigator disclosed upfront about his background as a law enforcement professional, education, and training. The demographic information (Appendix C) of participants was used as a screening tool for the final selection of the 15 modified Delphi panelists from all the potential participants invited for the screening. Information from the demographic questionnaire was used to evaluate the relevance of the industry experience, education, leadership role, knowledge, and understanding of leadership in relation to this research study. The demographic information was also used to ensure a diverse representation of the modified Delphi panelists.

Role of The Researcher

The role of the researcher in qualitative research is to attempt to access the thoughts and feelings of study participants (Sutton & Austin, 2015). Qualitative research is used to gain insights into people's feelings and thoughts, which may provide the basis for a future stand-alone qualitative study or may help researchers to map out survey instruments for use in a quantitative study (Sutton & Austin, 2015). Sutton and Austin (2015) explained that the data being collected is the primary responsibility of the principal investigator as it should be safeguarded for the protection of the participants. Bias was also minimized through practices of reflexivity. Reflexivity refers to the researcher's awareness of the influence they are having on what they are studying and, simultaneously, of how the research process is affecting them (Probst & Berenson, 2014). This description incorporates both concept (a state of mind) and practice (a set of actions) (Mackieson et al., 2019). The principal investigator is also a certified practitioner in the field of law enforcement.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 includes the research method, design appropriateness, trustworthiness, population and sampling, informed consent and confidentiality, data collection procedures and rationale, and data analysis. The study includes the use of a qualitative modified Delphi to solicit for expert's opinion on the affect autocratic leadership has on Texas law enforcement officers in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction. The modified Delphi experts were selected from a population pool of the principal investigator's personal network of Texas law enforcement supervisors and executives that fulfilled the screening criteria of relevant education, experience, knowledge of the

subject, and professional qualifications. The experts were a combination of mid and upper-level managers within Texas law enforcement to ensure a diverse perspective.

This study involved three rounds of engagement by the panelists with interspersed feedback to enable all the panelists to review their earlier positions against other panelists. Round one started with a list of theme-based questions created from the review of literature on the research topic and validated through a field test — this questionnaire comprised of open-ended questions that were broad to allow the panelists to rank the questions. Rounds two and three, questionnaires were developed using the responses received from the experts in the round that preceded it. The panelists accessed the encrypted surveys through SurveyMonkey software platform. Passwords were provided in each round to the experts to access the survey. As informed consent was accepted or denied before each round in order to participate.

The appropriate data collection involved the use of questionnaires, observation, and available information. The databases that provide current and existing information are regarded as the primary sources of information in the collection process. The validity of data was achieved using modified-Delphi study where the collected data was presented to a panel of experts in stages to verify its validity. Data analysis involved the use of qualitative analysis methods, which defined the conclusions based on the tabulated data for definition. During the whole process of collection and analysis of data, there was a need to consider the appropriate ethical and legal considerations of the participants in the research. Analyses of the data collected from the three rounds were recorded in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

Analysis and Results

The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi technique was to gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes to the profession through education and training of future leaders. The objective of this study was to gain in-depth knowledge and understanding of the consensus regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas law enforcement for the future of police personnel. Over two-months, thirty-five actual experts were invited to participate in the study. Of the thirty-five experts invited, only twenty-seven experts responded to the invitation, out of which fifteen fulfilled the inclusion criteria to participate in Round 1. The expert panel members were asked to complete an informed consent followed by a demographic questionnaire as induction of their willingness to participate in the study. Fifteen experts in Texas law enforcement participated in Round 1.

Round 1 set of questions focused on performance, morale, job satisfaction, education and training, and workplace climate. The experts shared their perspectives on 12 questions. Data gathered from the experts in round 1 were analyzed and used to create the questionnaire for round 2. The fifteen experts that participated in Round 1 were invited to participate in Round 2. The experts were asked to rate 77 statements using a Likert-type scale extracted from their responses in Round 1. In Round 2, the experts achieved consensus on 70 out of the 77 statements. Round 3, involved the experts reviewing their ratings of the statements from round 2 in which there was no consensus.

114

The experts were able to generate consensus on 3 of the 7 non-consensus questions from round 1 in round 2. Followed by ranking 77 statements again using a Likert-type scale based on consensus statements from round 2. The experts generated consensus on 38 of the 77 statements in round 3, which concluded the data collection. The experts had the opportunity to compare the individualized rating of each statement to the average rating of same statements by the panel of experts online. The latter part of chapter 4 covers the selection of expert panel members, demographic information of the experts, field test summary, data gathering, and analysis for each round of the modified Delphi process.

Research Questions

The key element from the research question was leadership characteristics, work climate, worksite culture and the way all these elements translate into performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement officers. The central research question served as the reference point for generating survey questions that resulted in the responses received from the experts.

This research is aimed to obtain consensus and knowledge regarding the affect of autocratic leadership within Texas law enforcement for the future performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police personnel. The targeted research population of this study was active law enforcement officers that currently work in the state of Texas. The central research question for this study was referred to as RQ1.

RQ1. What is the consensus among a panel of active Texas law enforcement officers, on leadership strategies to increase performance, morale, and job satisfaction in relation to education and training?

Answers from the above-mentioned research questions may help provide the needed awareness to various stakeholders like employers, employees, policymakers, government regulators and researchers on the perceived influence that leadership characteristics have over Texas law enforcement officers and their performance, morale, and job satisfaction.

Data Collection

The entire data collection process, including field test, lasted about two months. Before commencing the data collection process, potential participants for both the field test and study were identified by the personal law enforcement network of the principal investigator and committee members responsible for guidance of the study. Two committee members who are in a leadership role with oversight of this study were invited to participate in the field test, out of which both accepted and participated. For over two months, thirty-five potential participants were invited to take part in the study. Twenty-seven potential participants expressed interests in participating in the study, but only fifteen participants were chosen based off inclusion criteria and competed all three rounds of the study.

For this study a coding system was developed to protect the participants' confidentiality. Code LEP is used to represent the active LEOs in the study. Numbers were assigned based on the numerical order of their responses from round one and remained the same throughout the study such as LEP01, LEP02, LEP03 and so forth. At the start of each round the participant was provided informed consent in order to continue participation within the study. Each participant agreed to the informed consent and proceeded to the survey portion where data would be collected.

The Delphi rounds moved through a progression beginning with identification of factors that drive performance, morale, and job satisfaction, rating the performance, morale, and job satisfaction factors, and review of the factors necessity in performance, morale, and job satisfaction initiatives. The goal of the study was to identity key factors that may lead to future changes in education and training or leaders in the profession.

Demographics

The demographic distribution of the experts is presented in Table 1 below, as information was necessary to determine whether the individuals selected were a representative sample of the target population. The participants are all licensed certified Texas peace officers holding the rank of Sergeant and above, which is highlighted as a leadership position within law enforcement. All fifteen participants participated in round one questioning and agreed to the informed consent prior to providing demographic information. Demographic questions from round one questioning included the participant's number of years of experience in law enforcement, age range, gender, rank of position, level of education, and level of Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCOLE) license. All fifteen participants responded to the demographic questions as the ages bracket ranged from 30 and 60 years. The other demographic information is presented in summary format in Table 1. The participants all possessed Master level Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCOLE) certifications, which is the highest-level licensure for peace officers in Texas. Along with having attended a leadership training session as included in the inclusion criteria such as Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas (LEMIT). Two of the participants are female and thirteen are male. Of the fifteen participants only one participant holds a Doctorate degree, five

117

Master degrees, five Bachelor degrees, and four with only high school diplomas or

equivalents.

Table 1

Participant Demographic Summary

Panelist Code Identifier	Job Title	Education	Age Bracket	Experience in Law Enforcement	TCOLE	Gender
LEP01	Assistant Chief of Police	Master	40 – 49	11 – 20	Master	Male
LEP02	Assistant Chief of Police	HS diploma or GED	50 – 59	21 – 30	Master	Male
LEP03	Lieutenant	Master	40 – 49	11 – 20	Master	Male
LEP04	Chief of Police	Doctorate	30 – 39	11 – 20	Master	Male
LEP05	Chief of Police	Master	40 – 49	31 or more	Master	Male
LEP06	Captain	HS diploma or GED	50 – 59	31 or more	Master	Male
LEP07	Chief of Police	Master	40 – 49	21 – 30	Master	Female
LEP08	Chief of Police	Master	40 – 49	21 – 30	Master	Male
LEP09	Sergeant	Bachelor	50 – 59	11 – 20	Master	Male
LEP10	Lieutenant	Bachelor	40 – 49	31 or more	Master	Male
LEP11	Lieutenant	Bachelor	40 – 49	11 – 20	Master	Male
LEP12	Sergeant	Bachelor	40 – 49	0 – 10	Master	Male
LEP13	Commander	Bachelor	40 – 49	11 – 20	Master	Female
LEP14	Lieutenant	HS diploma or GED	40 – 49	21 – 30	Master	Male
LEP15	Chief of Police	HS diploma or GED	50 – 59	21 – 30	Master	Male

Data Analysis

Of the thirty-five solicitations sent out via email, only twenty-seven potential

participants responded, out of the twenty-seven only fifteen potential participants agreed

to participate in the study by replying to the principal investigator's recruitment email.

The fifteen participants included a blend of licensed, active, and sworn men and women

employed as Texas peace officers. For the purpose of identification, each participant was

assigned an alphanumeric code such as LEP01, LEP02, LEP03 and so forth. The data

collection process involved three rounds with interspersed feedback to modified Delphi

experts in between. The principal investigator subscribed to Survey Monkey payment

plan. The Survey Monkey platform was used to invite experts for the study and document

their responses. The experts were sent an encrypted secured password-protected link to

their e-mail to gain entry into each round. To ensure confidentiality of all the experts,

their computer IP addresses were blocked to prevent the collection of the expert's

computer IP addresses data. Only the principal investigator was able to access the

personal identifier information of all the experts for the reminder and follow up

correspondence. E-mail addresses of the experts were related to alphanumeric identifiers

used in this study to properly track data.

Modified Delphi Round One

The fifteen modified Delphi experts were provided with an encrypted weblink to

the round 1 survey through the Survey Monkey platform from November 19th, 2020 to

December 11th, 2020. Each expert was after that was provided with a password to access

and complete the survey. The first page of the round 1 survey contained the informed

consent form. The expert could only complete the survey after agreeing to the informed

consent form. E-mail reminders were sent intermittently to the experts who had not completed the survey before the closing date of the survey. The panel of experts generated 180 statements at the end of round one. These 180 statements were condensed to 77 statements and categorized into five themes. At the end of round 1 all fifteen experts had participated in the study, completing round 1. The round 1 questionnaire consisted of twelve open-ended questions as shown in Appendix H.

The purpose of round 1 questions was to extract the experiences and perceptions of experts on performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leaders in law enforcement. Questions 1 through 4 asked the experts about the experiences, perceptions, and strategies that influence performance, morale, job satisfaction, education and training. Questions 5 and 6 asked the experts about the experiences, perceptions, and strategies that influenced the expert to stay or leave an organization where there is or was an autocratic leader. Question 7 and 8 asked the experts about their feelings or emotions regarding autocratic leadership and its connection to the education and training of future leaders. Question 8 asked the experts about their feelings or emotions regarding other leadership styles and the connection to the education and training of future leaders.

Question 9 asked experts to provide examples of what influence autocratic leaders can have versus other leadership styles on education and training. Question 10 asked experts to provide examples of what information you have found helpful throughout their career regarding leadership practices. Question 11 asked the experts to provide any recommendations they have for other law enforcement leaders to improve their leadership. Question 12 asked experts if autocratic leadership was outdated in the profession of law enforcement, and if so, which leadership styles should be more

prevalent and the focus of education and training of future leaders. For ease of categorization and further analysis, the responses from the experts to the Round 1 survey were transferred into NVivo 12. The transferred information does not include any personal identifiers.

During the first round of the survey, background information of the participants was gathered from each participant. The data from the first-round survey included demography that includes the years of experience, education, employment status, current position or rank, and completion of any leadership training completed. The open-ended statements were analyzed as duplicates were not included in the statements to be included in round 2.

At the end of round one, responses from the modified Delphi panelists were analyzed as follows:

1. Identified statements that are similar or that have the same meaning

2. Grouped the statements into themes and subthemes

3. Identified unique statements and included as part of round two survey

4. Used the themes and the responses from round 1 to generate questionnaires for round 2.

Modified Delphi Round Two

The round 2 questionnaire contained a list of responses that the experts identified in the first round that could contribute to the performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement with autocratic leaders. These responses were content analyzed, and similar statements grouped to reduce repetition without losing the meaning of the responses. Responses from the experts in round 1 were condensed into 77 statements.

The fifteen experts that took part in round 1 of the survey were invited for round 2 of the survey from December 20th, 2020 to December 31st, 2020. The experts were provided with an encrypted weblink to the round 2 survey through Survey Monkey software. The experts were later provided with a password to access and complete the survey. All fifteen experts that participated in round 1 also completed the round 2 survey. For round 2, the experts were asked to rate each of the statements using the rating scale, from strongly agree – strongly disagree.

Rating Scale (1 – 4)

1 – Strongly Agree

2 – Agree

3 – Disagree

4 – Strongly disagree

Appendix K is a list of the statements the experts were asked to rate in round 2, using a Likert scale. The total number of statements rated in round 2 was 77.

The percentage of consensus was determined by the number of experts that gave a similar rating to each statement in round 2. Consensus rating was set at 75%. At the end of round 2, the experts achieved consensus on 70 out 77 statements in round 2. The 70 statements that received consensus ranking are presented in Appendix L with the percentage value of consensus by the experts. As experts were asked to further rate the groups statements focusing on important initiatives to decreasing autocratic leadership practices in round 3.

At the end of round two, responses from the panelists were analyzed using the same aspects from Round 1. The consensus value for each statement was set at 75%

agreement by the experts on each statement in round 2. Questions that the panelists were

not able to arrive at a consensus in round 2 were again included in round 3. In the second

rounds of the survey, panelists utilizing a Likert-type scale were asked to assess the

criticality of the results.

At the end of round two, responses from the modified Delphi panelists were

analyzed for consensus as follows:

1. Identified statements that are similar or that have the same meaning

2. Panelists rating of themes or coding from previous round

3. Grouped the statements into themes and subthemes

4. Identified unique statements and included as part of round three survey

5. Used the themes, ratings, and the responses from round 2 to generate

questionnaires for round 3.

Modified Delphi Round 3

The fifteen experts that completed the round 2 surveys were invited to take part in

the round 3 surveys from January 4th, 2021 to January 8th, 2021. Like in the previous

rounds, the experts were provided with encrypted secured weblink access to the survey

through Survey Monkey software. The password to gain access was sent to each of the

experts to access and potentially complete the survey.

The statements presented to the experts in round 3 were the same statements from

round 2. Round 3 involved the experts reviewing the groups overall rating of the

statements from round 2 in which there was no consensus on specific questions 22, 42,

69, 70, 71, 72, and 73. The experts were able to obtain consensus on 3 out of the 7,

namely questions 69, 70, and 71 as experts changed their answers from the previous

round. The experts had the opportunity to compare the individualized rating of each statement to the average rating of the same statements by the panel of experts. Survey Monkey software provided visual analytics of consensus rating within the question format. The experts achieved consensus on 38 of the 77 questions in round 3.

For round 3, the experts were asked to rate each of the statements using the rating scale, which contained unique statements of absolutely necessary: required – not necessary: has no impact.

Rating Scale (1 – 4)

1 – Absolutely Necessary: Required

2 – Recommended: Contributes highly

3 – Optional: Not essential, does add some value

4 – Not Necessary: Has no impact

With each statement experts were shown the overall group response from round two, presented as an abbreviation in parenthesis after each statement in round 3. These abbreviations matched the exact response categories as displayed in round 2 as:

Rating Scale (1 – 4)

1 – Strong Agree (SA)

2 – Agree (A)

3 – Disagree (D)

4 – Strongly Disagree (SD)

Appendix M is a list of the statements the experts were asked to rate in round 3, using a Likert scale. The total number of statements rated in round 3 was 77. The percentage of consensus was determined by the number of experts that gave a similar

rating to each statement in round 3. Consensus rating was set at 75%. At the end of round 3, the experts achieved consensus on 38 out 77 statements in round 3. The 38 statements are presented in Appendix O with the percentage value of consensus from the experts. Round 3 involved the panelists reviewing their ratings of the statements from rounds 2 in which there was no consensus. The panelists were given the opportunity to compare the individualized ratings of each statement to the average rating of the same statement by the other panel experts.

At the end of round three, responses from the panelist were analyzed using the same methods from Round 1 and Round 2. The consensus value for each statement was set at 75% agreement by the principal investigator on each statement in round 3. Questions that the panelists were not able to arrive at a consensus in round 3 were noted within the study. In the third round of the survey, panelists using a Likert-type scale were asked used assess the criticality of the results.

At the end of round three, responses from the modified Delphi panelist were analyzed for consensus as follows:

1. Identified statements that are similar or that have the same meaning

2. Panelists rating of themes or coding from previous round

3. Grouped the statements into themes and subthemes

4. Identified unique statements and included as part of round four survey

5. Used the themes, ratings, and the responses from round 3 to help generate consensus.

Upon completion of the study panelists were sent a Thank You email (Appendix G).

<center>**Results**</center>

Modified Delphi Round One Analysis

   The first round resulted in all fifteen participants participating in the round. Five themes emerged after conducting content analysis of the responses received from the experts at the end of round 1. Similar responses were consolidated to minimize repetition without losing their original meaning. The themes were further analyzed in the context of the research questions. Participant responses aided in theme development and pattern identification. The following were common themes identified from the analysis of responses to the round one questionnaire:

   1. Performance is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

   2. Morale is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

   3. Job satisfaction is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

   4. Education and training is influenced strategies and practices of leaders

   5. Leadership strategies and practices influence every officer differently

   Round one of this study consisted of 12 open-ended questions designed to obtain the experiences and perceptions of autocratic leadership practices from the participants. A queried word frequency of participant responses provided additional ideas on organizing the data for coding. Figure 1 illustrates the results of the word cloud query of the most frequent words contained in the participants' responses.

Figure 1

Word Cloud Query Results

Round 1 questions allowed the participants to share their experiences and perceptions about their law enforcement interactions in terms of autocratic leaders influence on performance, morale, and job satisfaction. The principal investigator imported the SurveyMonkey questionnaire into NVivo 12 for content analysis. The principal investigator used NVivo 12 software to generate the word cloud compromised of the 100 most frequent words used by participants in responses to round one questions. A frequency analysis is a common qualitative analysis tool for understanding qualitative data. For this research, the most used words were calculated. Content analysis began with reading the statements of participants, which generated themes through a general impression as a whole.

The size of the word "leadership" and "autocratic" in the word cloud are significantly different from others. This indicates that participants mentioned leadership and autocratic quite often throughout the questionnaire for round one. This indicates that autocratic leadership is an important topic within the law enforcement community. Other

frequently used words include *leader, training, education and decisions*. The research

questions themselves were not included in the word frequency analysis. The word cloud

is a visual representation of the word frequency generated by the participants.

Theme One: Performance is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

Responses from the expert panelist confirmed a need for changes in regard to the

autocratic leadership style within law enforcement. The leadership style and performance

measurement expressed by experts was very narrow. Where the desired scope should be

broad enough to allow for self-expression, decision making, trust, and future growth or

relationship building. The expert panelist clearly expressed the role that leadership plays

with performance and in the field, decision making that could pose life or death results if

mismanaged as Law Enforcement Panelist. LEP02 noted that "leaders would detail steps

to be taken in an investigation and set firm times during to report which influenced

performance by showing the lack of trust to make decisions." Another expert panelist

agreed with this statement, indicating the "do as you are told" mentality quickly rises to

the top as it is clearly expressed by leaders to those under their command. LEP01, noted

that "Micro-management in its truest form "Do as you are told" mentality Creates

isolation and erodes trust." Trust is very important in terms of performance as employees

know the importance of communication and clear guidelines that provide empowerment.

Dysfunction can come into the equation when important information is not relayed

properly or provided to those certain clique affiliated officers leaving no input or

discussion for the others. LEP04, noted "autocratic leaders would create and implement

policies and procedures without receiving any input from their rank and file, which led to

dysfunction."

Other experts agreed with this statement as they highlighted the strict policies and guidelines that may garner compliance but are also self-serving to the leader. Experts panelist LEP08, noted "autocratic leaders strict policies and guidelines are a hope for compliance, which is probably most effective for new officers or an academy setting." As LEP11 took a more direct approach noting that "strategies by autocratic leaders are ultimately self-serving." The panelist also talked about the dynamic influence that autocratic leaders have over others in terms of performance and decision making. Second guessing decisions can alter the performance of an officer as they may know what needs to be done but will contact a supervisor due to potential of corrective action or ridicule of their independent decision. LEP10 noted, "officers would call supervisors to get an answer to the simplest things so they would not have to be told they made the wrong decision." This aspect increases second guessing as LEP14 noted, "fear of decisions that officers make while performing can be a huge factor in how they respond, out of line decisions with the leader along often times handicaps progression in law enforcement."

Theme Two: Morale is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

To the expert panelist, effective morale strategies and practices included factors rooted in the organizations mission, vision, and purpose. The ability to express creative thoughts or future practices that may impact the organizational process was critical to morale. As decision-making was strongly connected to the aspect of morale. Retention of employees was believed to be connected to the level of morale that organizations uphold starting with the leader in general. The expert panelist expressed their experiences and perceptions of morale as LEP03 noted, "The aforementioned micromanagement often has a negative impact on morale. Also, the second guessing has a negative impact on

morale." As LEP06 agreed and noted, "I have seen this type of leadership and at times it will drive the moral of the department down because the officers feel they have no part of the decision this will cause issues among the ranks."

Other expert panelist provided more direct responses related to clarifying the influence that morale has on Texas law enforcement officers with autocratic leaders. Having a voice within the organization even if it is small is not simply a bargaining tool but a relationship building tool as well. Expert panelist felt that leaders of this style often times talking more than following the rules and standards they have set themselves causing confusion throughout the ranking structure. LEP07 noted, "Hurts morale." As LEP08 noted, "It diminishes morale as the followers have no input into the decision making and feel the leader is strictly talking and not acting or having to follow the same rules." Whereas LEP11 noted, "In my experience, all strategies and practices used by leaders influence the morale of their Officers. Specific to autocratic leadership, the most impactful strategy / practice affecting Officers' morale is micromanagement. Autocratic leaders tend to have a high need for control."

Expert panelist also took into consideration the aspect of younger officers who are not experienced and are trying to find a department that fits their needs. Autocratic leaders influence the younger officers, as it can be aggressive causing them take issue with the style. Middle ground on leadership styles was encouraged to sustain the development of officers while also building morale. As panelist also expressed the style is inherit due to the dangers of law enforcement, as LEP09 noted, "It is difficult to increase morale of the younger officer with this style of leadership, as younger officers

take issues with abrasiveness of the style. Autocratic leadership is needed but meeting in the middle is more beneficial."

The ability to freely think and provide rationale approaches to improvements or processes within the organization is a communication trait that officers believe connects them to leaders. If opinions or options to change things are viewed as unwanted, officers quickly get the feeling their opinions are not valuable. This feeling eventually influences the initiatives to perform along with free thinking that ultimately influences morale causing officers to seek employment elsewhere. Dictatorship was strong characteristic expressed by expert panelist as it related to the feeling where the previous factors mentioned were dismissed. LEP12 noted, "Autocratic leaders influence morale in officers because most officers feel their opinion is not valuable. Most officers in my department started to find employment elsewhere because they could not deal with the negative, I'm always right attitude." LEP13 noted, "Leads to a lack of initiative and free thinking which leads to loss in moral or feeling of inclusion."

LEP14 noted, "Morale can be severely affected by autocratic leaders, officers become discouraged that they do not have a voice within the organization ultimately leading to withholding opinions or seeking employment elsewhere. As LEP15 noted, "You will have a poor morale when your employees feel they are under your thumb and you dictate every move."

Theme Three: Job satisfaction is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

Expert panelist displayed a strong characteristic trait of autocratic leaders lacking the ability to oversee fair processes in terms of promotions and training opportunities for officers. Panelist expressed the direct authority that autocratic leaders in forcing

subordinates to always "do as I" to avoid consequences or other infractions that may arise. Fair promotional processes are a key factor in job satisfaction as the most qualified officers is not always promoted due to the needs and wants of the leader for those of the same mindset. Protection for loyalty to the leader creates an atmosphere that negates trust, hurts morale and job satisfaction practices as expert panelist described. LEP01 noted, "If you do how I say, you will be taken care of. Fair promotional processes, and the ability to grow, opportunities for training." As LEP10 noted, "Lack of fair promotional processes." Whereas LEP11 noted, "The autocratic strategy with the greatest effect on job satisfaction is "do as I say, not as I do". Leadership that directs without accountability forfeits the ability to inspire."

Decision-making abilities and support from leaders was a highly touted factor. As expert panelist indicated autocratic leaders lacked the ability to provide effective officer discretion skills. Due to the mindset of officers feeling the leader would ridicule them as it influenced job satisfaction. LEP03 noted, "The inability to effectively exercise officer discretion and the constant second-guessing results in low job satisfaction." LEP06 noted, "I have seen some officers who do not want to make that tough decision because they are afraid of the lawsuits or repercussions, it gives them peace of mind because someone else made the tough call and told them how to handle the situation."

Relationship building was another influence factor of autocratic leaders as often times it more about results than other factors. LEP04 noted, "A boss who barks orders at his employees without getting to know them or hearing their ideas will influence job satisfaction and morale in a negative way." Subordinates often times can become conditioned to this treatment that influences their job satisfaction levels, which can

132

influence creativity. Expert panelist expressed the strict and constant rules manual to follow as a guiding means used by autocratic leaders to control the organizational process. LEP08 noted, "Autocratic leaders tend to wear down subordinates as it is a constant rules manual to follow." LEP07 noted, "Impairs creativity." As expert panelist LEP15 took a more distinct stance on job satisfaction and its relationship to autocratic leadership providing the following the response. LEP15 noted, "In my opinion the only officer that will have a satisfaction under this leader are those of the same style."

Theme Four: Education and training is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

To the expert panelist, education and training surrounded the thoughts and beliefs of the autocratic leader. In terms of which officers attended trainings, how the training benefited the leader and department. Along with the training aligning with the beliefs and direction the leader wants to see the organization move toward. With this style of leadership officers selected for education and training are those closely aligned with the leader of this particular style. LEP01 noted, "Only mirror what that leader has completed, new educational ideas must be "sold" to that leader before consideration." As LEP02 noted, "Only the officers hand-picked by the leader have the opportunity which leaves a vast pool of qualified officers lacking training that can directly benefit the organization. This style of leader does not promote education and training." Other experts agreed as LEP03 noted, "The controlling practices of an autocratic leader generally seeps into what training officers attend. They will generally select the training and it is geared towards the leaders interests."

Expert panelist made clear distinctions that education and training in the 21st century were none debatable in terms of law enforcement. As national attention has highlighted the need for additional training and oversight of leadership in terms of training made available to all officers. Although certain training may be missed by the leader of this style if deemed nonessential. LEP05 noted, "If you want to succeed in law enforcement in the 21st century education and training is a must." LEP13 further noted, "All state mandated training will be handled as it is in black and white, however beneficial outside training may be missed or underutilized if not accepted or allowed."

Motivating future leaders to seek education and training was not a highlighted practice of influence by the autocratic leader according to expert panelist. As other styles were indicated to provided better alignment of education and training practices necessary in the profession. LEP02 noted, "The transformative leader will search for and motivate future leaders of the department and direct them in the paths that will benefit them and the department." The respect and service history of the autocratic leader is often times viewed as controversial as times have changed since the leader has done certain particulars of the job. Expert panelist explained that those of the autocratic style have been in law enforcement for decades or longer and are outside the belief of college education being a benefit in comparison to on-the-job training. As they often fear being replaced therefore operate under such scrutiny in terms of education and training. LEP14 noted, "Most autocratic leaders have been in the profession for some decades and did not start wen education was a common practice. They do not believe in college education unlike on-the-job training." Another expert was more direct as LEP15 noted, "They will

not influence training and education from a fear of being replaced or someone having different ideas of how to accomplish goals."

Theme Five: Leadership strategies and practices influence every officer differently

To the expert panelist, leadership strategies and practices held potential to influence officers differently if utilized properly. Primarily expert panelist focused their attention on styles outside of the autocratic approach while indicating how the style impacted their careers at certain points. The ability to listen, inspire, and collaborate with others was a highlighted aspect of how leaders should operate in the profession, thus grooming others to replace them while maintaining and high sense of pride and accountability. While managing the elements of performance, morale, and job satisfaction within the organization surrounded by the practices of leadership styles and theories. LEP02 noted, "An autocratic leader retired from the first department of employment, extending a career by 26 years that were joyous compared to the first couple under the autocratic leader. The current department practices transformative leadership and welcomes feedback from everyone." Other experts agreed with that stance as LEP08 noted, "I feel that the autocratic leadership at my previous organization played a huge role in my decision to leave that organization. After basically being told this is how we are going to do it and your opinions don't matter it forced me out."

Expert panelist expressed how different leadership theories could influence the factors expressed in the research. LEP01 noted, "Transformational leadership fosters collaboration, inspires shared vision, and promotes career development and teamwork." As LEP08 noted, "It can be used in certain situations, but I feel that there are many other styles such as democratic, authoritative, and servant leadership. If you are serving others

135

many other characteristics will fall into place." Whereas LEP11 took a more direct stance and noted, "Autocratic leadership is valuable as a manual for how not to run a Police organization. In my experience, ALL other leadership styles; transformational, transactional, management by walking around, etc., have vastly more traits in the plus column than autocratic leadership does."

Communication was essential as every leadership style has its place according to expert panelist. As decision-making also came to the forefront as LEP03 noted, "Leaders should be able to listen to their people, consider as many possible factors as possible. There is a time and a place for every style of leadership. Too much of one could be an issue just as too little as another, be balanced." Another expert agreed, as LEP14 noted, "I feel like a well-rounded leader does seek input from his employees but also is not scared to make a decision and will stand by that decision at the end of the day."

Providing a more decentralized command can show investment in personnel to carry out the mission and vision of the organization through education and training of different leadership styles. LEP04 noted, "I think that decentralized command is important, especially in law enforcement. You must invest in your personnel to ensure that they have the education and training needed to carry out the organizations mission and goals." Although, expert panelist had difference of opinions on their perceptions of autocratic leadership styles in regard to performance, morale, and job satisfaction for Texas law enforcement. LEP05 noted, "Many aspects are outdated but not all. Policing requires a rank structure so I believe that will always be in place. However, if you fall into the thinking of "that's the way we've always done it" you will be in trouble." As other experts agreed as LEP06 noted, "I believe there are times in your law enforcement

136

career when you have to become that autocratic leader, however you must also be able to realize to be successful as a leader you cannot be a dictator at all times." Other experts had different opinions on the topic as LEP07 noted, "Not the type of leadership 21st century policing needs at this time." As LEP14 also noted, "I have found throughout my career that no one style leadership is greater than another. I have learned that different situations and different employees call for different leadership styles to be exhibited to be effective."

Expert panelist also expressed the clear expectation of evolving in the profession and being able to be flexible with multiple styles of leadership. Predominately relying on one style could pose problems as mentioned with the autocratic style in terms of organizational health and performance where employees are happy. LEP09 mentioned "I feel that leaders are constantly evolving and not one style would be able to accomplish all goals within a given law enforcement department." A different perspective was taken by other experts as LEP14 noted, "It is imperative that future leaders study the different leadership styles and attempt to incorporate all the different leadership styles into their own personal leadership. No particular leadership style is greater than another, a leader needs to learn to be flexible."

Modified Delphi Round Two Analysis

The round 2 questionnaire was developed using the expert responses from round 1. The consensus rating for this study was preset at 75%. The percentage consensus was determined by the principal investigator based on the number of experts that gave a similar rating to each statement. The Likert scale rating of 1 in the study represents 'strongly agree' rating, 2 in the study represents 'agree' rating, 3 in the study represents

'disagree' rating, and 4 in the study represents 'strongly disagree' rating. The experts achieved consensus on 70 out of the 77 statements. Achieving a value of equal to or greater than 75%, means the panel of experts agreed that the statement is very important in regard to performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement with autocratic leaders. Rating of performance, morale, and job satisfaction factors experiences indicated participants viewed the statements as very important with 90% of statements having at least 75% of panelist developing consensus within the individual statements. Consensus statements for round 2 with 75% or higher rating found that performance, morale, and job satisfaction factors are prevalent within the profession. Statements where consensus was not obtained were restated in round 3 to attempt to gain consensus.

Modified Delphi Round Three Analysis

Due to the high level of consensus from round 2, the participants were asked to indicate if performance, morale, and job satisfaction factors should be required, recommended, optional, or not necessary to provide initiatives regarding changes in leadership styles predominately those autocratic in nature. Statements that did not obtain consensus from round 2 were again asked to be completed. Of the 7 statements that did not receive consensus, 3 of the 7 statements did receive consensus in round 3 that were restated from round 2. From the final ratings, 38 of the 77 total round 2 statements reached consensus. Consensus statements for round 3 with 75% or higher rating found that performance, morale, and job satisfaction initiatives are vital to future potential changes regarding autocratic leadership within the profession and how initiatives can be formed to generate change.

Chapter Summary

Chapter four presented the data collection process and analysis conducted through three rounds of questioning in this modified qualitative Delphi study. The participants' responses from the open-ended questions in round one identified themes and developed the questions for round two. Also included in this chapter is the demographic information of the panel of experts. The panel of experts generated 180 statements at the end of round one. These 180 statements were condensed to 77 statements and categorized into five themes. Round two questions utilized a four-point Likert scale and was compromised of 77 statements from round one. Seven statements that did not reach a consensus level of 75% in round 2 were represented to the panel of experts for reassessment in round 3. At the end of round 3, the panel of experts achieved consensus only in 38 out of the 77 statements. Chapter five discusses these findings, the limitations of this study and provides recommendations to leaders and practitioners as well as recommendations for future research.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study was conducted based on established methodologies and explored the

perceptions and experiences that have resulted in performance, morale and job

satisfaction factors with autocratic leaders in Texas law enforcement. Through the study,

the principal investigator provided insights into the most consistent factors that

influenced Texas law enforcement officer's performance, morale, and job satisfaction

with autocratic leaders. The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi technique was to

gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale,

and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes

to the profession through education and training of future leaders. The objective of this

study was to gain in-depth knowledge and understanding of the consensus regarding

performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas law

enforcement for the future of police personnel.

The interpretation of the results of the study may contribute to the knowledge and

understanding of how leadership styles and practices influence performance, morale, and

job satisfaction of law enforcement. There is the expectation that identifying the

perceptions of employees, who are active-duty officers that hold leadership positions,

may provide some information about why they have encountered as reasoning for their

performance, morale, and job satisfaction factors with autocratic leaders.

Chapter five reiterates the purpose of this study, discusses the study's findings

and its limitations. Chapter five also includes recommendations to leaders and

practitioners as well as recommendations for future research. Recommended future

research designs are presented with a rationale for the recommended research designs. Chapter five concludes with a summary and the principal investigator's reflection.

Research Questions

The key element from the research question is leadership characteristics, work climate, worksite culture and the way all these elements translate into performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement officers. The research question served as the reference points for generating interview questions that will resulted in the responses received from the experts.

The research is aimed to obtain consensus and knowledge regarding the affect of autocratic leadership within Texas law enforcement for the future performance, morale, and job satisfaction of police personnel. The targeted research population of this study was active law enforcement officers that currently work in the state of Texas. The central research question for this study was referred to as RQ1.

RQ1. What is the consensus among a panel of active Texas law enforcement officers, on leadership strategies to increase performance, morale, and job satisfaction in relation to education and training?

Discussion of Findings

The first round of the modified Delphi study resulted in five themes on the performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leaders in Texas law enforcement. The first theme was performance strategies and practice factors that influences trust and decision-making. The second theme was morale strategies and practice factors that influences micromanagement along with the lack of creativity. The third theme was job satisfaction strategies and practices that influences organizational

processes and relationship building. The fourth theme was education and training strategies and practices that influences leaders' thoughts and beliefs. The last theme was leadership strategies and practices that influences every officer. Round 2 survey was developed using responses received from the experts from Round 1 survey.

In round 2, the expert panelist were asked to rate the 77 statements from round 1 using a Likert scale from 1 – 4, where 1 represents strong agree, and 4 represents strong disagree. The experts achieved a consensus on 70 out of the 77 statements. The seven states that did not reach a consensus level of 75% in round 2 were represented to the panel of experts for reassessment in round 3. In round 3 expert panelist were asked to rate 77 statements from round 1 using a Likert scale from 1 – 4, where 1 represents absolutely necessary, and 4 represents not required. At the end of round 3, the panel of experts achieved consensus on 3 out of the 7 statements represented from round 2 and 38 out of the 77 statements presented initially in round 3 from statements generated from responses in round 1 survey. The themes that emerged from the experts demonstrated a need for a broader scope of future training and education in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leaders in Texas law enforcement.

Theme One: Performance is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

The main difference in the literature is in what type of activities are seen as most effective in supporting or directing employees and achieving better performance (Klijn et al., 2020). Monitoring performance of employees is then crucial to implement this form of leadership. Thus, in the transactional leadership perspective leaders/managers mostly rely on rational incentives (Klijn et al., 2020). Leadership styles can affect the behavior of employees, job satisfaction, and work performance, which may also affect the level of

organizational commitment (Patiar & Wang, 2016). Yiing et al. (2009) have suggested

leadership styles influencing organizational commitment and the outcome of such

influence, and it affects the performance of workers (Mohd & Arshad, 2019). In this

study it was also found that organizational commitment is a mediating factor between

leadership style and worker performance (Mohd & Arshad, 2019). Law enforcement

officers need management and organizational support to improve and enhance their

commitment (Mohd, 2017), which in turn implies the performance of work (Mohd &

Arshad, 2019). High work performance will contribute to the achievement of goals,

mission, and vision of the organization and thus the level of public trust towards law

enforcement and the integrity organizations will increase (Mohd, 2017). Tabassi et al.

(2017) revealed that leadership plays a vital role in teamwork and productivity

performance (Mohd & Arshad, 2019).

Theme Two: Morale is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

When the goals of individuals in the team are aligned with the goals of the

organization, then commitment to the organization will exist and thus create motivation

and continue to stay with the organization (Mohd & Arshad, 2019). Furthermore, it has a

positive impact on the performance of workers (Almutairi, 2016; Che Omar et al., 2017).

Research findings indicate the common factors of low morale to be low pay, poor job

benefits, and so forth (Goleman, 2017). Research indicated that when poor leadership

was employed within police departments, officers tended to feel disgusted with the job

(Goleman, 2017). Leadership is the central force in this study relating to morale as it

pertains to those who fall under leaderships command (Minto, 2019). Leaders in the

police force have direct and indirect connection to the overall morale of the law

143

enforcement community (Minto, 2019). Continually, understanding morale and the relationship between leaders and morale must be at the heart of leadership in order for leadership to remain successful (Minto, 2019). Leadership appears to have a relationship with morale, regardless of whether or not the leader sees or understands this (Brayboy, 2019). Leadership impacting morale among police officers is an issue at the forefront of law enforcement (Brayboy, 2019). Therefore, the critical importance of understanding leadership from both the viewpoint of the leader and the subordinate is vital to solving issues and circumstances of poor leadership and low morale (Brayboy, 2019).

Theme Three: Job satisfaction is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

That is remarkable since both general leadership literature (Avolio et al., 1991; Bass & Bass, 1985; Zehndorfer, 2013) and leadership literature about the public sector (Keulemans & Groeneveld, 2020) emphasize the importance of leadership for the behaviour of employees (Klijn et al., 2020). Law enforcement leaders can transform by encouraging subordinates to adapt to emotional orientation by establishing relationships within communities and organizations (Mohd, 2017). Workers who experience satisfaction work with their leaders will cause them to remain engaged in organizational activities (Mohd, 2017). Leaders are required to determine and influence the commitment of workers (Almutairi, 2016; Che Omar et al., 2017). Leadership styles can affect the behavior of workers, job satisfaction, and work performance, which may also affect the level of organizational commitment (Che Omar et al., 2017). As research has illustrated, police officers, just like other employees, desire satisfaction on the job, and most know their value to other agencies as they gain knowledge, training, and experience within the field (Brayboy, 2019).

Today's law enforcement leaders are the driving force within law enforcement agencies (Minto, 2019). Whenever job satisfaction reaches low levels, high performers are more inclined to quit their job or transfer to another organization much quicker than poor performers (Brayboy, 2019). Authors suggested social researchers could benefit from further explorations into causalities of job satisfaction and assist police administrators with enhancing work climates, including stress reduction for officers, improving productivity, decreased attrition, and enhancing morale by ascertaining what internal conflicts exist that contribute to job dissatisfaction (Julseth et al., 2011). Increasing overall job satisfaction should consist of learning what is required to enhance internal working climates, which could ultimately enhance overall productivity via increased job satisfaction (Brayboy, 2019). Previous research has suggested the need for law enforcement management and human resource divisions to learn what is required to retain its human capital instead of replacing it at high costs (Yongbeom, 2013). Job satisfaction is a phenomenon that is as complex as the factors that affect overall satisfaction for employees, such as structural, psychological, and economical factors in relation to voluntary employment turnover (Brayboy, 2019). Higher levels of job satisfaction induce stronger employee commitment to their organization, which leads to higher levels of organizational performance (Yongbeom, 2013).

Theme Four: Education and training is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders

Effective leaders endeavor to learn by pursuing higher professional training and education, which can better their officers and agency by sharing their newly gained knowledge and training (Garner, 2014). Education and family status have had major roles

in police officer job satisfaction and retention (Brayboy, 2019). Police officers realize and understand public safety is not for becoming wealthy, but they want to be appreciated (Brayboy, 2019). Appreciation can easily be expressed through tokens of appreciation such as letters of accommodation, certificates of appreciation, employee of the month, educational and merit raises, opportunities for lateral and upward advancement, and specialized training, etc. (Brayboy, 2019).

By wanting to learn more, officers may be inclined to desire career development opportunities, including attending formal specialized training, becoming a part of a specialized police unit, or pursuing higher degrees of education to prepare them for leadership and succession (Brayboy, 2019). Individuals try explicitly or implicitly to maximize their total economic returns by acquiring productive education, training, and experience on the job, under constraints of personal ability, capacities, and financial opportunities (Becker, 1993). Therefore, there is a positive relationship between education and officers being able to do a better job (Alfonso, 2019). According to Becker (1993) there are two important forms of human capital investment: schooling and on-the-job training (Alfonso, 2019). Schooling provides a general purpose of knowledge by teaching conceptual tools and information, useful in a variety of occupations and industries (Bae, & Patterson, 2014).

However, current leadership training strategies fail to focus on leadership development at the local government level (Wang, 2014). As a result, officers participating in leadership development training demonstrate their commitment to be better officers, to their organization and the community they serve and protect (Alfonso, 2019). The study may be helpful in discovering elements of leadership and exploring the

benefits of offering leadership training to police officers (Alfonso, 2019). A given officer might not be a supervisor in their agency, but leadership training might enable that officer to be more effective in mobilizing citizens, coordinating peers, and facilitating the efficient operation of their agency (Schafer, 2009a).

Theme Five: Leadership strategies and practices influence every officer differently

Thomann et al. (2017) explained the importance of leaders in the work of law enforcement. This importance is echoed by leadership literature that focuses on the public sector (Keulemans & Groeneveld, 2020). As every style of leadership was mentioned by participants the idea of flexibility and combining styles was also highlighted. Goleman (2017) explained that flexibility is difficult to put into action but has its benefits if done correctly. Throughout the study of leadership, it is clear to see how leadership plays an influential role on whether or not a person decides to leave or stay at a job (Minto, 2019). In the study of leadership, one must examine the relationship between leadership and morale, and how morale often determines if an individual decides to leave or stay within a law enforcement agency (Minto, 2019). At the heart of leadership, one cannot assume that a hierarchy of leadership means good leadership. Effective leadership was not defined by how well it was organized within an organization or agency, but rather defined by leadership's correlational relationship with its subordinates (Brayboy, 2019). However, to comprehend the full potential of leadership in public organizations, we need to identify relevant leadership strategies for this sector. (Jensen et al., 2019)

In contrast with a transactional style of leadership that is more top-down oriented, servant leadership puts the leader less central and is more horizontally oriented. The more transactional leadership is, the more inspectors need to accommodate to performance

indicators set by their leaders in order to get rewards and positive performance

evaluations (Klijn et al., 2020). It is difficult to predict the net effect of transactional

leadership style on the accommodative dimension of enforcement style but leaders expect

that the net effect is not significant (Klijn et al., 2020). A servant leadership style is more

horizontal and directly aimed at helping the officer, thus the expectation is that a servant

leadership style encourages officer to pay more attention to their superiors and their

fellow officers (Klijn et al., 2020). On the other hand, leaders expect a developmental

culture be positively correlated to a servant leadership style (Klijn et al., 2020). In this

leadership conceptualization by Burns (1978), transactional leaders motivate subordinates

to attain organizational objectives by appealing to subordinate self-interest (Jensen et al.,

2019). Under transactional leaders, the supervisor–subordinate relation is mainly

instrumental, characterized by a value exchange of resources for rewards (Northouse,

2018; Yukl, 2010).

Studies have confirmed positive relationships between transformational

leadership style components and individual personal performance for job satisfaction,

individual and teamwork performance, and the commitment of employees and teams

(Mohd, 2017). Creating a leadership environment that is positive and that supports high

morale will result in an environment where people feel good at work (Brandi, 2014).

Drawing from transformational leadership theory, the focus was on the attitudinal

responses brought about by the supervisors' role model function and the supportive

leader behaviors they display (Keulemans & Groeneveld, 2020). Public administration

research often suggests that improving leadership in the public sector is a key to

increasing organizational performance (Rainey, 2014). As transformational leaders

become legitimate leaders for attitude change by capitalizing on the supervisor–subordinate social relation (Keulemans & Groeneveld, 2020).

Transformational leaders may not succeed in transforming the employees, but transformational leadership behaviors are characterized by an ambition to foster a shared understanding among employees of how the organization should contribute to what is seen as desirable outcomes (Jensen et al., 2019). The leader's attempts to (a) formulate the organizational goals as a desirable future (a vision), (b) share this understanding with employees, and (c) sustain the vision in the long run. This set of behaviors, that is, behaviors aimed at developing, sharing, and sustaining an organizational vision, is theoretically seen as logical parts of the same latent concept capturing the efforts to make employees share organizational goals and transcend their own self-interest (Jensen et al., 2019). Previous studies have supported the importance of transformational leadership in delivering excellent results on work performance not only in the organizations but also among law enforcement agencies in achieving a mission of criminal justice (Mohd & Arshad, 2019). Besides communication competency, self-leadership, a personal factor, is another important factor influencing organizational performance. Self-leadership refers to the thinking and behaviour strategies collectively used to exercise self-influence, and emphasizes that autonomy is an internal fundamental inclination of human beings (Yu & Ko, 2017). Servant leaders are as proactive, ambitious, and driven as any other leader. They just have a different focus and set of motivation that guide their leadership and decision-making (Gandolfi & Stone, 2018).

The theoretical framework for this study emphasized that performance, morale, and job satisfaction are greatly influenced by the characteristics of leaders. Those actions

have the ability to prolong careers in public safety or force personnel to seek employment

elsewhere with an organization that meets their emotional, mental and physical needs

through the actions of leaders. Table 2 represents the mapping of the findings from this

study to the theoretical framework.

Table 2

Mapping of study findings to theoretical framework

Theoretical Framework Elements	Summary of Findings	Details	Theory of Relation
Performance	Theme 1	Performance is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders	Leader Member Exchange Theory
Morale	Theme 2	Morale is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders	Organizational Support Theory
Job Satisfaction	Theme 3	Job satisfaction is influenced by strategies and practices of leaders	Job Characteristics Model
Education and Training	Theme 4	Education and training is influenced by the strategies and practices of leaders	Social Learning Theory
Leadership	Theme 5	Leadership strategies and practices affects every officer differently	Autocratic Leadership Theory

Limitations

The modified Delphi study identified factors that influenced performance, morale,

and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement officers with autocratic leaders from expert

panelist. The study was designed to explore how active law enforcement officers

described their experiences and perceptions regarding engagement with autocratic leaders

150

throughout their careers. This study had limitations related to the response times of participants for each round and recruitment of participants. The participants were given two weeks to complete each questionnaire, limiting the amount of time the principal investigator had to build the round 2 questionnaire. The response time was limited to ensure the study was completed within the two-month desired time frame established by the principal investigator. Recruitment of participants initially emerged as although emails were sent out to the potential respondents the responses were not coming back adequately, making initial attainment of participants difficult. Follow up emails were sent to the potential participants as answers were eventually provided and the number of desired participants was accomplished. Once 15 participants were obtained to begin the study, all participants remained throughout the completion of all three rounds of questioning.

Recommendations to Leaders and Practitioners

From the results of the study, leaders and practitioners may enhance performance, morale, and job satisfaction factors of Texas law enforcement officers by (1) promote effective leadership, (2) promote employee engagement opportunities (3) entrench performance, morale, and job satisfaction into the culture of the organization (4) develop training opportunities for all employees to promote learning, and (5) implement employee satisfaction surveys.

Promote Effective Leadership

Leadership styles are vastly becoming more flexible as the ability to be versatile has grown to the forefront. Promoting effective leadership should come in the form that is adequate to the organizations culture but also upholds the values and morals of the

organization. Certain employees within the organization are often informal leaders doing the work that is necessary to maintain performance, morale and job satisfaction with the utmost respect of their peers. Although, leaders may deem this employee as missing certain qualities they deem appropriate to be an effective leader. The reason being is that when leadership is ineffective, absent, or toxic the result is that people, organizations, communities, and even entire societies are impacted, sometimes in the most devastating ways (Gandolfi & Stone, 2016). With this recommendation the goal is promote effective leaders who can motivate and empower those around them without force or coercion while being step for step with those tasked with doing the laborious duties. Bestowing leadership on someone deserving who possess the unique qualities of what an effective leader should be can change the dynamics of an organization both internally and externally. Therefore, there must be a sense of urgency in the uncovering of the most desirable and effective methods for leading organizations (Gandolfi & Stone, 2018).

Promote Employee Engagement Opportunities

Often in law enforcement employees outside of the command staff structure are viewed in a subtle way of dismissive workers. The very ones who are tasked with being the face that is seen by a citizen, stakeholder, or council person while out in the field. Leaders must find ways to get creative and make work fun while still holding people accountable and providing the absolute best service possible. Employee engagement is considered a significant challenge because of increasing competitors' numbers and continuous innovation processes (Dagher et al., 2015). Competition is steadily growing among businesses and the struggle to stay competitive may cause leaders to focus more on employee productivity instead of employee engagement (Anand, 2017). With this

recommendation it is encouraged for leaders to think of productivity as an added boost to the organization when employees are happy to come to work knowing their needs for a workplace environment and culture are met by leaders first. As elements of performance, morale, and job satisfaction all merge back into productivity. A need exists to create more leadership strategies to increase employee engagement, which in turn may boost productivity (Anand, 2017). Opening the door for leader and follower interaction is critical for long term success and development.

Entrench Performance, Morale, and Job Satisfaction Into Organization Culture

Developing values or key characteristics that separate one organization from the next is not an easy task. Values should be identifiable and easily understood by employees throughout the organization. With this recommendation organizations should focus on aligning performance, morale, and job satisfaction initiatives to benefit the employees through leadership styles. The other important variable that had proven able to increase performance level of employees is job satisfaction (Rahayu et al., 2018). Job Performance of employees lays the foundation to achieve desired organizational goals and objectives (Hettiarachchi, 2014). Job satisfaction is such a psychological attribute, whose contribution to the concept of employee performance is much more (Rahayu et al., 2018). A satisfied employee would have an emotional bond with the organization and takes pride in their membership, which paves way to keep up industrial integrity and a high morale (Shaju & Subhashini, 2017).

Develop Training Opportunities For All Employees To Promote Learning

In public safety, organizations are tasked with sustaining a certain level of education and training to employees on a cycle. With the mandated training being a

requirement of licensure for Texas peace officers. The mandated course are required, although for this recommendation it is the non-required training that is essential to promote lifelong learning. Naqshbandi and Tabche (2018) explained the importance of empowering leadership and opening innovative avenues through promoting learning for all employees. Leaders should focus on having well-trained employees that can someday replace them within the organization and continue to move forward fulfilling the mission and vision of the organization. Leadership training and development are critical to incidents that cause discourse and other hardships that leaders may never experience or will but will have the necessary resources to understand what is happening before them. It is not merely about command staff being the most trained and qualified but an overall level of leadership training that starts well before officers are granted leadership authority due to rank.

Implement Employee Satisfaction Surveys

Employees remain one the most important assets for organizations to have. Organizational leaders must be able to instill a level of commitment to not only achieve organizational goals but also the goals of the employee, making them feel empowered and valued. Further developing employees to reach their true potential must be provided by the organization at every opportunity possible. The use of surveys within the workplace has become increasingly popular and effective (Derickson et al., 2019). Employees who have the opportunity to provide feedback whether constructive or destructive have an avenue for expression that can be done anonymously. Providing leaders with somewhat of a sense of what is really happening within the organization at every level. With this recommendation organizational leaders clearly have the

154

opportunity to identify problem areas to restructure process while providing an avenue for anonymous expression to the employees.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study explored the influence of performance, morale, and job satisfaction in Texas law enforcement with autocratic leaders using a modified Delphi methodology. Additional research on performance, morale, and job satisfaction of Texas law enforcement with autocratic leaders could be used to enhance current leadership practices, further retain employees, and train upcoming leaders on more desired principles of leadership in law enforcement. The first recommendation for future studies would be to use a substantial larger sample size to address the use of small sample size limitations in relation to this study. Another recommendation for future studies would be to consider the use of other research methodologies like a factor analysis. A factor analysis would help highlight and understand attitudes and behaviors as variables would be both unobservable and observable. In addition to factor analysis would be a case study research methodology, which allows the exploration with a clearly defined organizational boundary and timelines. The next recommendation for future studies would be to consider conducting similar studies in other industries, like information technology, education, or non-profits, foundations, and philanthropist. The study focused only on Texas law enforcement leaders as other studies should explore participant from other industries that may have similar challenges. The final recommendation for future research would be to explore leveraging the use of technology to launch initiatives to drive performance, morale, and job satisfaction programs that benefit other leadership styles and practices outside the expected autocratic style.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, an interpretation of the findings was discussed, limitations of the study were explained, and recommendations for leaders, practitioners, and future research were provided. The survey responses of expert panelist provided the necessary data to answer the research questions and met the purpose of the study. The factors that emerged from the themes and content analysis were presented and interpreted to provide a meaning within the context of this study. This study was different from other studies as it highlighted the experiences and perceptions of active law enforcement officers in Texas regarding autocratic leaders and the affect they have on performance, morale, and job satisfaction. This study provided new perspectives while supporting literature on how performance, morale, and job satisfaction initiatives can be influenced by leadership styles and practices.

References

Abdalla, M. M., Oliveira, L. G., Azevedo, C. F., & Gonzalez, R. K. (2018). Quality in qualitative organizational research: Types of triangulation as a methodological alternative. *Administration: Ensino e Pesquisa*, (1), 66.

Adams, I., & Mastracci, S. (2018). Police Body-Worn Cameras: Effects on Officers' Burnout and Perceived Organizational Support. *Police Quarterly*, *22*(1), 5–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611118783987

Adler, M., & Ziglio, E. (Eds.). (1996). *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi method and its application to social policy and public health.* London, UK: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Akwaboah, P. N. (2017). *Law Enforcement Perceived Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Burnout* (Doctoral dissertation). http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12087/5 (Cal baptist edu)

Al-Emadi, A. Q., Schwabenland, C., & Qi, W. (2015). The vital role of employee retention in human resources management: A literature review. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(3), 7–32.

Alessi, E. J., & Martin, J. I. (2010). Conducting an Internet-based survey: Benefits, pitfalls, and lessons learned. *Social Work Research*, 34(2), 122-128.

Alfonso, O. (2019). *The view of law enforcement supervisors on officers leadership training development* (Order No. 13806659). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2224602296). Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/view-law-enforcement-supervisors-on-officers/docview/2224602296/se-2?accountid=35812

Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational

    performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, *2018*, 1-10.

Allen, S. J. (2007). Adult learning theory & leadership development. *Leadership*

    Review, *7*(1), 26-37.

Almutairi, D. O. (2016). The mediating effects of organizational commitment on the

    relationship between transformational leadership and job performance.

    International Journal of Business and Management, 11(1), 231-241.

Alsmadi, S. (2008, June). Marketing research ethics: Researcher's obligations toward

    human subjects. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 6(2), 153-160. doi:10.1007/s10805-

    008-9060-1

Altaai, A. (2020). *A modified delphi study of adoption of sustainable development in the*

    workplace: An application of I-O psychology (Order No. 27740503). Available

    from Dissertations & Theses @ University of Phoenix; ProQuest Dissertations &

    Theses Global. (2385302042). Retrieved from

    https://search.proquest.com/docview/2385302042?accountid=35812

Alves, J., & Manz, C. (2006). Self-leadership. In J. H. Greenhaus & G. A. Callanan

    (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of career development* (pp. 728-729). Thousand Oaks, CA:

    SAGE Publications, Inc.

Anand, G. (2017). Corporate excellence through governance and employee engagement.

    Journal of Commerce & Management Thought, 8, 554-562. doi:10.5958/0976-

    478X.2017.00033.7

Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., Law, J., & Walker, R. M. (2009).

Centralization, organizational strategy, and public service performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19 (1), 57-80.

Apuke, O. D. (2017). Quantitative Research Methods A Synopsis Approach. *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 6(11), 40-47.

Aronson, J. (1995). A Pragmatic View of Thematic Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 2(1), 1-3.

Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L.-Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 191–201.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1), 76–86.

Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2016). "Impact of leadership styles on employees' attitude towards their leader and performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistani banks", *Future Business Journal,* Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 54-64.

Avella, J. R. (2016). Delphi panels: Research design, procedures, advantages, and challenges. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 11, 305-321.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four I′ s of transformational leadership. *Journal of European industrial training* 15 (4): 9–16. doi:10.1108/03090599110143366.

Ayman, R., & Hartman, E. (2004). Situational and contingency approaches to leadership. In G. R. GoethalsG. J. Sorenson & J. M. Burns (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 1430-1436). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Azungah, T. (2018). Qualitative research: deductive and inductive approaches to data analysis. *Qualitative Research Journal*.

Baard, S. K., Rench, T. A., & Kozlowski, S. W. (2014). Performance adaptation: A theoretical integration and review. *Journal of Management*, 40(1), 48-99.

Babic, S. (2014). Ethical leadership and leader member exchange (lmx) theory. *Centre for Research and Interdisciplinary Study*, 2014(1), 61-71.

Bae, S., & Patterson, L. (2014). Comparison and implications of human capital theory at the individual, organization, and country levels. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 18(1), 11-28.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory* Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963). *Social learning and personality development* Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.

Baran, B. E., Shanock, L. R., & Miller, L. R. (2012). Advancing organizational support theory into the twenty-first century world of work. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27 (2), 123-147.

Barrett, J. R. (2007). The researcher as instrument: Learning to conduct qualitative research through analyzing and interpreting a choral rehearsal. *Music Education Research,* 9 (3), 417-433.

Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications.* 3rd ed. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M., Riggio, R. E., & Conger, J. A. (2013). *The practice of leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Battaglini, M., Morton, R. B., & Patacchini, E. (2020). "Social Groups and the Effectiveness of Protests." Working Paper 26757. National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w26757.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report*, *13*(4), 544-559.

Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bennis, W. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world: Introduction to the special issue. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), pp. 2-5.

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences* (8th edition), Pearson Education Inc., Boston.

Berg, L. B. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for social sciences* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Birzer, M. L. (2003). "*The theory of andragogy applied to police training*", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 29-42.

Bishop, V. (2009). *Leadership for nursing and allied health care professions*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill International.

Blanchard, K. H., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. B. (1993). Situational Leadership® after 25 years: A retrospective. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *1*(1), 21-36.

Blanz, M. (2017). Employees' Job Satisfaction: A Test of the Job Characteristics Model Among Social Work Practitioners. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work*, *14*(1), 35–50.

Blasius, J., & Brandt, M. (2010). Representatives in online surveys through stratified samples. *Bulletin de Methodologie Sociologique*, 107, 5-2.

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method.

Boblin, S., Ireland, S., Kirkpatrick, H., & Robertson, K. (2013). Using stake's qualitative case study approach to explore implementation of evidence-based practice. *Qualitative Health Research*, 23, 1267-1275.

Bovornkijprasert, S., & Rawang, W. (2016). Integration of Environmental Education and Environmental Law Enforcement for Police Officers. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, *11*(12), 5698–5709.

Bowling, N. A., & Michel, J. S. (2011). Why do you treat me badly? The role of attributions regarding the cause of abuse in subordinates' responses to abusive supervision. *Work & Stress*, 25(4), 309–320.

Brandi, J. (2014). What's a positive leader? Retrieved from https://www.td.org/insights/whats-apositive-leader

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Brayboy, M. (2019). *Job dissatisfaction for police officers and what law enforcement leaders might do to enhance climates: A qualitative Delphi study of participants to gain a consensus of opinion* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of the Rockies).

Breiner, S., Cuhls, K., & Grupp, H. (1994, April). Technology foresight using a Delphi approach: a Japanese-German co-operation. *R&D Management*, 24(2), 141-153.

Brewer, E. (2007). Delphi technique. In N. J. Salkind (Ed.), Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics (Vol. 1, pp. 241-246). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:10.4135/9781412952644.n128

Brown, B. B. (1968). Delphi process: A methodology used for the elicitation of opinions of experts. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/papers/2006/P3925.pdf

Brutus, S., Aguinis, H., & Wassmer, U. (2013). Self-Reported Limitations and Future Directions in Scholarly Reports: Analysis and Recommendations. *Journal of Management*, *39*(1), 48–75.

Burnes, B. (2004a). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, *41*, 977-1002.

Burnes, B. (2007). Kurt Lewin and the Harwood studies: The foundations of OD. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *43*(2), 213-231.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Bye, D. (2007). *Are you a leader or a roadblock? The Hearing Review*, 14 (4), 32-35.

Retrieved from http://www.hearingreview.com/issues/articles/2007-

04_02.asp?mode=print.

Byrne, D. (2017). How can I ensure I will be safe when carrying out my research? Project

Planner. Retrieved from:

http://dx.doi.org.contentproxy.phoenix.edu/10.4135/9781526408594.n9

Campbell, S. (2015). Conducting case study research. Clinical Laboratory Science, 28(3),

201-205.

Cantril, H. (1938). The prediction of social events. The Journal of Abnormal and Social

Psychology, 33(3), 364-389. doi:10.1037/h0063206

Chappell, A. T. (2009). The philosophical versus actual adoption of community policing:

A case study. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 5-28.

Chenail, R. J. (2011). ERIC - Interviewing the Investigator: Strategies for Addressing

Instrumentation and Researcher Bias Concerns in Qualitative Research,

Qualitative Report, 2011-Jan. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ914046

Che Omar, R., Mohd Arshad, K. N., Halipah, A., Yusuff, A. S., Abdullah, M. A., &

Mohd Rasli, M. A. (2017). Forming Transformational Leadership Style And

Affective Commitment To Service Quality at Malaysian Private Universities: The

Mediating Role Of Leadership Communication. Journal of Governance and

Integrity, 1(1), 31-53.

Cherry, K. (2015). *Leadership styles.* Retrieved from

http://www.psychology.about.com/od/leadership.html

Cherry, K. (2018). Autocratic leadership: Key characteristics, strength, and weaknesses. Retrieved July 7 2018 from https://verywellmind.com/what-is-autocratic-leadership2795314

Chiniara, M., & Bentein, K. (2016). Linking servant leadership to individual performance: Differentiating the mediating role of autonomy, competence and relatedness need satisfaction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *27*(1), 124-141.

Chua, J., Basit, A., & Hassan, Z. (2018). Leadership styles and its impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, *6*(1), 80-94.

Chukwusa, J. (2018). Autocratic Leadership Style: Obstacle to Success in Academic Libraries. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, 1–10.

Cizanckas, V. I., & Hanna, D. G. (1977). *Modern Police Management and Organization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Coghlan, D., & Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). The SAGE encyclopedia of action research (Vols. 1- 2). London,: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781446294406

Cole, Z. D., Donohoe, H. M., & Stellefson, M. L. (2013). Internet-based Delphi research: Case based discussion. *Environmental Management, 51*(3), 511-523. doi:10.1007/s00267-012-0005-5

College of Policing. (2015). The Leadership Review, College of Policing, Ryton.

Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2003). Qualitative methods in Business Research; *A Practical Guide to Social research*. (2nd ed). London ECIY ISP. Sage Publishers.

Colquitt, J., Lepine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2014). *Organizational Behavior: Improving
Performance and Commitment in the Workplace (4e)*. New York, NY, USA:
McGraw-Hill.

Conroy, R. (2018). Emotional Intelligence and Law Enforcement: A Case for
Change. Retrieved from https://www.lawenforcementtoday.com/emotional-
intelligence-law-enforcement-case-change/

Coughlan, M., Cronin, P., & Ryan, F. (2009). Survey research: Process and limitations.
International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation, 16(1), 9-15.

Covey, S. R. (2013). *The 8th habit: From effectiveness to greatness.* Simon and Schuster.

Cozby, P., & Bates, S. (2012). *Methods in behavioral research* (11th ed). New York, NY:
McGraw-Hill.

Creswell, J. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods
approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cruickshank, D. (2012). Recognizing the true cost of low morale. *The Police Chief*,
79(9), 26.

Cummings, L. L., & Schwab, D. P. (1973). Performance in organizations: Determinants
& appraisal. Good Year Books.

Dagher, G. K., Chapa, O., & Junaid, N. (2015). The historic evolution of employee
engagement and self-efficacy constructs. *Journal of Management History*, 21,
232-256. doi:10.1108/JMH-05-2014-0116

Dalkey, N. C., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi Method
to the use of experts. Management Science, 9(3), 458-467.
doi:10.1287/mnsc.9.3.458

Daniel, B. K. (2018). Empirical verification of the "TACT" framework for teaching rigor

    in qualitative research methodology. Qualitative Research Journal, (3), 262.

Dansby, F. N. (2002). *An analysis of police corruption perception, subculture,*

    and recommendations. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses

    database.

Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of

    intentionality in leader–member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5),

    615–634.

Davidson, P. (2018). Research Methodology Group: Delphi Method. Retrieved from

    https://research.phoenix.edu/content/research-methodology-group/delphi-method

Davidson, P. L. (2013). The Delphi technique in Doctoral research: Considerations and

    rationale. *Review Of Higher Education & Self-Learning*, 6(22), 53-65.

Davis, C. (2017). *Police leadership: an exploratory study of the perceptions of police*

    officers (Doctoral dissertation, Nottingham Trent University).

Davis, C., & Bailey, D. (2018). "Police leadership: the challenges for developing

    contemporary practice", *International Journal of Emergency Services*, Vol. 7 No.

    1, pp. 13-23. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJES-04-2017-0022

Decker, P. J. (1986). Social learning theory and leadership. *Journal of Management*

    Development.

De Hoogh, A. H., Greer, L. L., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2015). Diabolical dictators or

    capable commanders? An investigation of the differential effects of autocratic

    leadership on team performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*(5), 687-701.

Denzin, K., & Lincoln, Y. (2009). *The landscape of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Derickson, R., Yanchus, N. J., Bashore, D., & Osatuke, K. (2019). Collecting and reporting employee feedback for large organizations: Tips from the Department of Veterans Affairs. *Psychologist-Manager Journal (American Psychological Association)*, 22(2), 74–90.

Dibley, L. (2011). Analyzing narrative data using McCormack's lenses. *Nurse Researcher, 18*(3), 13-19. Retrieved from http://nurseresearcher.rcnpublishing.co.uk/news-and-opinion/commentary/analysing-qualitative-data

Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14 (2003), pp. 729-768.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in Leadership: Meta-analytic funding and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 611-628.

Dodgson, J. E. (2017, March). About Research: Qualitative Methodologies. *Journal of Human Lactation*, 33(2), 355 - 358.

Durand, M. A., & Chantler, T. (Eds.). (2014). *Principles of social research: Understanding public health* (2nd ed.). London, UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Duron, A. (2018). *Generational differences among police officers* (Unpublished thesis). Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas. Retrieved from https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877/7390

Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales Journal of Applied Psychology, 60 (1975), pp. 736-741.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (3), 500–507.

Ellis, B. (2016). *Capturing the Moment: Counter-VUCA Leadership for 21st Century Policing.* Retrieved from https://www.lawenforcementtoday.com/capturing-the-moment-counter-vuca-leadership-for-21st-century-policing/

Ellis, T. J., & Levy, Y. (2009). Towards a guide for novice researchers on research methodology: Review and Proposed Methods. Issues in Informing Science & Information Technology, 6, 323–337. https://doi.org/10.28945/1062

Engel, R., & Worden, R. (2003, February). *Police officers' attitudes, behavior, and supervisory influences: An analysis of problem solving. Criminology, 41* (1), 131. 167.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, *5*(1), 1-4.

Faragher, E. B., Cass, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62, 105–112.

Farquhar, J. D. (2012). What is case study research? In Case study research for business (pp. 3-14). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446287910.n2

Fiaz, M., Qin, S., Ikram, A., & Saqib, A. (2017). Leadership styles and employees'

> motivation: perspective from an emerging economy. *Journal of Developing*

> *Areas*. 51, 4 (Fall 2017), 143-156.

Fiedler, F. E. (1972, December). The Effects of Leadership Training and Experience: A

> Contingency Model Interpretation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*(4), 453-

> 470. doi:10.2307/2393826

Flatt, T. (2020). *Budgetary misfires in law enforcement: A delphi study* (Order No.

> 27994022). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ University of Phoenix;

> ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2407320984). Retrieved from

> https://search.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/budgetary-misfires-law-

> enforcement-delphi-study/docview/2407320984/se-2?accountid=35812

Flick, U. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In Flick, U. The SAGE handbook of

> qualitative data analysis (pp. 170-183). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi:

> 10.4135/9781446282243.n12

Ford, J. K., Weissbein, D. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2003, March). Distinguishing

> organizational from strategy commitment: Linking officers' commitment to

> community policing to job behaviors and satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly*: JQ, 20

> (1), 159-185. ProQuest Social Science Premium Collection.

Forero, R., Nahidi, S., De Costa, J., Mohsin, M., Fitzgerald, G., Gibson, N., McCarthy,

> S., & Aboagye-Sarfo, P. (2018). Application of four-dimension criteria to assess

> rigour of qualitative research in emergency medicine. *BMC health services*

> *research*, *18*(1), 1-11.

Francoise, O., Bourgault, M., & Pellerin, R. (2009). ERP implementation through critical

    success factors' management. *Business Process Management Journal*, 15(3), 371-

    394.

Furlan, R. (2017). Reflections on method in human sciences: Quantitative or qualitative,

    theories and ideologies. *Psicologia USP*, 28(1), 83-92.

Gandolfi, F., & Stone, S. (2016). "Clarifying leadership: high-impact leaders in a time of

    leadership crisis," *Review of International Comparative Management*, 17 (3), pp.

    212 – 224.

Gandolfi, F., & Stone, S. (2018). Leadership, leadership styles, and servant

    leadership. *Journal of Management Research*, *18*(4), 261-269.

Garner, G. W. (2014). Basic handbook of police supervision: A practical guide for law

    enforcement supervisors. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Garner, R. (2017). Effective leadership in law enforcement: Current and past police chief

    perspectives. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *13*(2), 170-179.

Gentles, S. J., Charles, C., Ploeg, J., & McKibbon, K. A. (2015). Sampling in qualitative

    research: Insights from an overview of the methods literature. *The Qualitative*

    Report, 20(11), 1772-1789.

Gittelman, S., Lange, V., Cook, W. A., Frede, S. M., Lavrakas, P. J., Pierce, C., &

    Thomas, R. K. (2015). Accounting for Social-Desirability Biasin Survey

    Sampling. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 55(3), 242-254.

Giusto, H. (2020, Winter). Non-Traditional Pathways to Continuing Education. *FBI-*

    LEEDA Insider: Leading Through Change, (1), 22-23.

Goleman, D. (2006). The socially intelligent. *Educational leadership*, *64*(1), 76-81.

Goleman, D. (2017). *Leadership that gets results (Harvard business review classics)*. Harvard Business Press.

Gonos, J., & Gallo, P. (2013). Model for leadership style evaluation. Management, 18(2), 157168.

Gooty, J., Connelly, S., Griffith, J., & Gupta, A. (2010). Leadership, affect and emotions: A state of the science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 979–1004.

Gordon, R. (2008). Leadership, transactional. In S. R. Clegg & J. R. Bailey (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of organization studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 791-792). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Gordon, T. J., & Helmer-Hirschberg, O. (1964). Report on a long-range forecasting study. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/papers/2005/P2982.pdf

Green, H., Hunter, C., & Moore, B. (1990). Application of the Delphi technique in tourism. Ann Tour Res. 1990;17(2):270–279.

Green, S. G., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Attributional processes of leaders in leader–member interactions Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, pp. 429-458.

Greenleaf, R. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power*. Robert Greenleaf Center. Atlanta, Georgia.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Paulist Press, New York.

Grint, K. (1997). *Leadership: Classical, contemporary, and critical approaches*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1997), pp. 1-26.

Grisham, T. (2009). The Delphi Technique: A method for testing multifaceted topics. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 2, 112-130.

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods, 18*(1), 59-82. doi:10.1177/1525822X05279903

Guest, G., Namey, E., & Mitchell, M. (2013). Qualitative research: defining and designing. In Collecting qualitative data (pp. 1-40). 55 City Road, London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781506374680.n1

Gustainis, J. (2004). Autocratic leadership. In G. R. Goethals, G. J. Sorenson, & J. M. Burns (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 69-72). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). "Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 250-279.

Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (2009). *Leadership: A Communication Perspective* (5th ed.). Long Grove, IL, Waveland Press.

Hanafin, S. (2004). Review of literature on the Delphi Technique. Dublin: National Children's Office.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The Population Ecology of Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology.* 82: 929-964.

Harms, P. D., Wood, D., Landay, K., Lester, P. B., & Lester, G. V. (2018). Autocratic leaders and authoritarian followers revisited: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *29*(1), 105-122.

Harrison, B. (2019). "Command college – foresight as a foundation to police executive development", On the Horizon, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 24-34.

Hasson, F., & Keeney, S. (2011). Enhancing rigour in the Delphi technique research. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 78, 1695-1704.

Hasson, F., Keeney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. Journal of advanced nursing, 32(4), 1008-1015.

Helmer, O. (1967). Analysis of the future: The Delphi method. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/papers/2008/P3558.pdf

Helmer, O. (1967a). Analysis of the future: The Delphi method. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_memoranda/P-3558.html

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. Training and Development Journal, 23(5), 26–34.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1966). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2011). *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. 2 nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hettiarachchi, H. A. H. (2014). Impact of job satisfaction on job performance of IT professionals : with special reference to Srilanka. *International Journal of Research in Information Technology*, 2(4), 906-916.

Hill, T. E., & Schmitt, N. (1977). *Individual differences in leader decision making* Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19, pp. 353-367

Hilton, C. E. (2015). The importance of pretesting questionnaires: A field research

    example of cognitive pretesting the exercise referral quality of life scale (ER-

    QLS), *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 1-14.

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General*

    Psychology, 9(2), 169-180.

Hoggett, J., Redford, P., Toher, D., & White, P. (2019). Challenges for police leadership:

    Identity, experience, legitimacy and direct entry. *Journal of Police and Criminal*

    Psychology, *34*(2), 145-155.

Hooijberg, R. (2013). Transformational theory of leadership. In E. Kessler

    (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of management theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 897-899). Thousand

    Oaks,: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Howes, K. R., & Moses, M. M. (1999). *Ethics in education research. review of Research*

    in education.

Howitt, D. (2010). Introduction to Qualitative Methods in Psychology, Pearson Education

    Ltd, UK

Hoyle, J. R. (2012). Leadership Styles. Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and

    Administration. Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Reference Online.

    http://www.studysites.sagepub. com/northouse6e/

    study/materials/.../reference4.1.pdf

Hsu, C., & Sandford, B. (2010). Delphi technique. In Neil J. Salkind (Ed.), Encyclopedia

    of Research Design. (pp. 344-347). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

    doi: http://dx.doi.org.contentproxy.phoenix.edu/10.4135/9781412961288.n107

Hsu, C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007a). The Delphi Technique: Making sense of consensus. *Political Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 12(10), 1-8.

Hsu, C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007b). Minimizing non-response in the Delphi process: How to respond to non-response. Political Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 12(17), 1-8.

Hu, J., & Hirsh, J. (2017a). The benefits of meaningful work: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Proceedings, 2017*(1), 13866.

Hubbard, T. M. (2019). Millennials: Adapting Police Recruiting and Supervision Practices . The Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas, (), . Retrieved from https://shsu-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11875/2619/1843.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Huck, S. (2012). *Reading statistics and research*. Boston: Pearson.

Hudson, D. (2014). *Building Trust Between Communities and Local Police*. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2014/12/01/building-trust-between-communities-and-local-police

Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., & Haider, N. (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 5(5), 1-6 (Online).

Isenberg, J. (2017). *Police leadership in a democracy: Conversations with America's police chiefs*. CRC Press.

Javidi, M., & Ellis, B. (2016). Capturing the Moment: Counter-VUCA leadership for 21st Century Policing. Law Enforcement Today. 15 September. Retrieved

from https://www.lawenforcementtoday.com/capturing-the-moment-counter-vuca-leadership-for-21st-century-policing/

Jensen, U. T., Andersen, L. B., Bro, L. L., Bøllingtoft, A., Eriksen, T. L. M., Holten, A.-L., Jacobsen, C. B., Ladenburg, J., Nielsen, P. A., Salomonsen, H. H., Westergård-Nielsen, N., & Würtz, A. (2019). Conceptualizing and Measuring Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Administration & Society*, *51*(1), 3–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399716667157

Jessadawirote, S. (2005). *Integrated Teaching Management*. 2nd Edition. Bangkok: Book Point Ltd

Jiang, H., Chen, Y., Sun, P., & Yang, J. (2017). The relationship between authoritarian leadership and employees' deviant workplace behaviors: The mediating effects of psychological contract violation and organizational cynicism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 732.

Jin, S., Seo, M.-G., & Shapiro, D. L. (2016). Do happy leaders lead better? Affective and attitudinal antecedents of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 64–84.

Jones, G. R. (2010). *Organizational theory, design, and change*. (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 341–367.

Judge, T. A., & Klinger, R. (2007). Job satisfaction: Subjective well-being at work. In M. Eid & R. J. Larsen, R. (Eds.), The science of subjective well-being (pp. 393–413). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-

    job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review.

    Psychological Bulletin, 127, 376–407.

Julseth, J., Ruiz, J., & Hummer, D. (2011). Municipal police officer job satisfaction in

    Pennsylvania: a study of organisational development in small police

    departments. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *13*(3), 243-

    254.

Kaiser, R. B., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. B. (2008). *Leadership and the fate of organizations.*

    American Psychologist, 63(2), 96–110.

Kandhro, D. (2015). Organizational Theories: A Comparative Analysis of Key

    perspectives of Rational, Natural and Open System Views of Organization. *Case*

    Studies Journal ISSN (2305-509X)–Volume, *4*.

Keeney, S., McKenna, H., & Hasson, F. (2011). *The Delphi technique in nursing and*

    health research. John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9781444392029

Kehr, T. (2020). *Employee retention in a multinational organization: A delphi*

    study (Order No. 28029549). Available from Dissertations & Theses @

    University of Phoenix; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2436386728).

    Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/employee-

    retention-multinational-organization/docview/2436386728/se-2?accountid=35812

Keis, K., & Javidi, M. (2014). *Deliberate Leadership: Creating Success Through*

    Personal Style. Altona, CA: CRG Publishing.

Kelan, E. (2012). Rising Stars: Developing Millennial Women as Leaders. Palgrave

    Macmillan.

Keulemans, S., & Groeneveld, S. (2020). Supervisory leadership at the frontlines: Street-level discretion, supervisor influence, and street-level bureaucrats' attitude towards clients. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *30*(2), 307-323.

Kim, K. Y., Eisenberger, R., & Baik, K. (2016). Perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment: Moderating influence of perceived organizational competence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37,* 558–583.

Kingshott, B. F. (2006). The Role of Management and Leadership within the Context of Police Service Delivery, Criminal Justice Studies, 19:2, 121-137.

Klijn, E. H., de Boer, N., & Eshuis, J. (2020). Leading frontline enforcers: How supervisors' leadership style impacts inspectors' enforcement style. *Public Management Review*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1833610

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *The leadership practices inventory (LPI): Self instrument* (Vol. 52). John Wiley & Sons.

Kruth, J. G. (2015). Five qualitative research approaches and their applications in parapsychology. The Journal of Parapsychology, 79(2), 219-233.

Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support a meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management, 43,* 1854–1884.

Lambert, V. A., & Lambert, C. E. (2001). *Literature review of role stress/strain on nurses: An international perspective. Nursing & Health Sciences* (pp. 61–172).

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-47.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. (2010). E. 2010. Practical research: Planning and design. *Ohio, Merrill Prentice Hall*.

Leonard, K. (2018). Advantages of an autocratic leadership. Retrieved July 7 2018 from https://smallbusiness.chron.com/advantages-autocratic-leadership-style-2980.html

Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative metaanalytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA publications and communications board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 26-46.

Levy, C., Lamarre, E., & Twining, J. (2010). Taking Control of Organizational Risk Culture. *McKinsey Working Papers on Risk, February* (16). Retrieved from http://www. mckinsey.com/client _service/risk/people/Cindy_ levy.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *Journal of Social Psychology*, *10*, 271-299.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The leadership quarterly*, *19*(2), 161-177.

Lindsley, K. A. (2019). Improving quality of the informed consent process: Developing an easy-to-read, multimodal, patient-centered format in a real-world setting. Patient Education and Counseling, 102(5), 944–951.

Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (2002). The Delphi method: Techniques and applications. Retrieved from http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/delphibook.pdf

Lipowski, E. E. (2008). Developing great research questions. *American Journal of*

    Health- System Pharmacy, 65 (17), 1667-1670.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.),

    524 *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349).

Lord, R. G., Gatti, P., & Chui, S. L. (2016). Social-cognitive, relational, and identity-

    based approaches to leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*

    Processes, *136*, 119-134.

Lowin, A., & Craig, J. R. (1968). The influence of level of performance on managerial

    style: An experimental object-lesson in the ambiguity of correlational data

    Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3 (1968), pp. 440-458.

Mackieson, P., Shlonsky, A., & Connolly, M. (2019). Increasing rigor and reducing bias

    in qualitative research: A document analysis of parliamentary debates using

    applied thematic analysis. *Qualitative Social Work*, *18*(6), 965-980.

Manners, A. (2011). *Influence of transformational, autocratic, democratic, and laissez*

    Faire leadership principles of the effectiveness of religious

    leaders. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Phoenix. Phoenix, AZ.

Manz, C. C. (1983). *The Art of Self-Leadership: Strategies for Personal Effectiveness in*

    your Life and Work, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence

    processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 585–600.

Manz, C. C., & Neck, C. P. (2004). *Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for*

    Personal Excellence, 3rd ed., Pearson Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1980). "*Self-management as a substitute for leadership: a social learning perspective*", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 5, pp. 361-7.

Maqsood, S., & Bilal, H. R. (2013). Manager's leadership styles and employee job satisfaction. Retrieved from www.oricpub.com

March, J. C., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations,* New York: Wiley.

Marks, M., & Sklansky, D. (2008). Voices from below: unions and participatory arrangements in the police workplace. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, *9*(2), 85-94.

Marques-Quinteiro, P., Vargas, R., Eifler, N., & Curral, L. (2018). Employee adaptive performance and job satisfaction during organizational crisis: the role of self-leadership, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology.*

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research?: A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of computer information systems*, *54*(1), 11-22.

Martin, H. C., Rogers, C., Samuel, A. J., & Rowling, M. (2017). "Serving from the top: police leadership for the twenty-first century", *International Journal of Emergency Services*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 209-219. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJES-04-2017-0023

Martinko, M. J., & Gardner, W. L. (1987). The leader–member attribution processes. Academy of Management Review, 12, pp. 235-249.

Mason, M. (2010). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 11*(3).

Mason, M. A. (2020, Winter). Leadership is Simple. *FBI-LEEDA Insider: Leading Through Change*, (1), 42-43.

Mathison, S. (2005). *Encyclopedia of evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. doi:10.4135/9781412950558

Maurya, M. K., & Agarwal, M. (2015). Relationship between supportive leadership, mental health status and job satisfaction of civil police constables. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, *41*(3), 103.

Maxwell, J. C. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership: Follow them and people will follow you*. HarperCollins Leadership.

Maxwell, J. C. (2011). *The 5 levels of leadership: Proven steps to maximize your potential*. Center Street.

McCarthy, J. S., Ott, K., Ridolfo, H., McGovern, P., Sirkis, R., & Moore, D. (2018). Combining multiple methods in establishment questionnaire testing: The 2017 census of agriculture testing bento box. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 34(2), 341-364.

McDermott, P., & Hulse, D. (2012). *Focus on training: Interpersonal skills training in policy academy curriculum*. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. Retrieved from https://leb.fbi.gov/2012/february/focus-on-training-interpersonal-skills-in-police-academy-curriculum

McGlon, T. N. (2016). *Police integrity, leadership, and job satisfaction: A secondary dataset analysis* (Order No. 10248122). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1864676628). Retrieved from

https://search.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/police-integrity-leadership-job-satisfaction/docview/1864676628/se-2?accountid=35812

McGregor, D. (1938). The major determinants of the prediction of social events. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 33(2), 179-204. doi:10.1037/h0062931

McLean, K. (2020). 10 Essential Attributes of Effective Leaders. Retrieved from https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/10-essential-attributes-of-effective-leaders/

Medina, A. (2007). The role of personality and coping in police patrol officer stress and burnout. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68 (4), 266B. (UMI No. 3262580).

Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mersino, A. (2007). *Emotional intelligence for project manager: The people skills you need to achieve outstanding results. New York, NY: American Management Association Press.*

Mikkelsen, M. F. (2020). The complex project complexity: Identification of five ideal research types. *Journal of Modern Project Management, 7*(4), 1–24. doi: 10.19255/jmpm521

Minto, M. C. (2019). *A Correlational Study: Understanding the Relationship Between Leadership and Morale Within Law Enforcement Agencies* (Thesis, Concordia University, St. Paul). Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.csp.edu/cup_commons_grad_edd/398

Mohd, A. (2017). Gaya kepimpinan transformasional, komitmen organisasi dan prestasi

kerja berpasukan dalam kalangan penguatkuasa undang-undang di Malaysia.

Unpublished Doctoral (DBA) dissertation. Universiti Utara Malaysia

Mohd, A. H., & Arshad, K. N. M. (2019). The Implications of Transformational

Leadership Styles, Organizational Commitments and Teamwork Performance

Among Law Enforcement in Malaysia. *KnE Social Sciences*, 1130-1149.

Mosindi, A. U. (2020). *The Role of Risk Management Best Practice for the Prevention of

Corruption and the Promotion of Ethical Leadership in Nigeria: A Modified

Delphi Study* (Doctoral dissertation, Ashford University).

Naidu, T., & Prose, N. (2018). Re-envisioning member checking and communicating

results as accountability practice in qualitative research: A South African

community-based organization example. Forum: Qualitative Social Research,

19(3), 783–797. https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-19.3.3153

Naqshbandi, M. M., & Tabche, I. (2018). The interplay of leadership, absorptive

capacity, and organizational learning culture in open innovation: Testing a

moderated mediation model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 133,

156-167.

Nashir, I. M., Mustapha, R., & Yusoff, A. (2015). Delphi technique: Enhancing research

in technical and vocational education. Journal of Technical Education and

Training, 7(2)

Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and

research. *Journal of managerial psychology*.

Neilson, T. R., & Pate, L. E. (2008). Why is leadership so misunderstood? Inquiring

    minds want to know. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 16 (4).

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and*

    quantitative approaches (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Ngulube, P., & Ngulube, B. (2015). Mixed methods research in the south african journal

    of economic and management sciences: An investigation of trends in the

    literature. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 18(1),

    1-13.

Nix, J., & Wolfe, S. E. (2016). Sensitivity to the Ferguson effect: The role of managerial

    organizational justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 47, 12–20.

Normore, A., Javidi, M., Anderson, T., Normand, N., Scott, W., & Hoina, C. (2014).

    Moral Compass For Law Enforcement Professionals. Raleigh, NC: International

    Academy of Public Safety, Inc.

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA:

    Sage Publications.

Northouse, P. G. (2015). Leadership: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

    publications.

Northouse, P. G. (2018). Leadership: Theory and practice, 8th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA:

    SAGE Publications, Inc.

Obodo, P. A., Okonkwo, E. A., & Aboh, U. J. (2019). JOB CHARACTERISTICS AND

    JOB SATISFACTION AMONG POLICE OFFICERS IN ENUGU

    URBAN. *Practicum Psychologia*, *9*(1).

Ogula, P. A. (2005). *Research methods: Self -study materials*. Nairobi. CUEA

    Publications.

Oliva, J. R., & Compton, M. T. (2010). What do police officers value in the classroom? :

    A qualitative study of the classroom social environment in law enforcement

    education. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies &*

    Management, *33*(2), 321–338. https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511011044911

O'Neil, S., & Koekemoer, E. (2016). Two decades of qualitative research in psychology,

    industrial and organisational psychology and human resource management within

    south africa: A critical review. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 42(1), 1-16.

    doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v42i1.1350

O'Reilly, M., & Parker, N. (2012, May). Unsatisfactory saturation: A critical exploration

    of the notion of saturated sample sizes in qualitative research. *Qualitative*

    Research Journal, 1-8. doi:10.1177/1468794112446106

Ortmeier, P. J., & Meese, E. (2010). *Leadership, ethics, and policing: Challenges for the*

    21st century. Prentice Hall.

O'Toole, S., Vitello, C. J., & Palmer, S. (2006). Stress and Law Enforcement. Retrieved

    from: http://www.virginiacops.org/Articles/Stress/LEOstress.htm

Ouss, A., & Rappaport, J. (2020). "Is Police Behavior Getting Worse? Data Selection and

    the Measurement of Policing Harms." *The Journal of Legal Studies* 49 (1): 153–

    98. https://doi.org/10.1086/708705.

Ovarhe, O. J. (2016). Leadership skills development theories, styles and types of

    leadership. The Pointer, September 2, p.5

Palaganas, E. C., Sanchez, M. C., Molintas, M. P., & Caricativo, R. D. (2017). Re exivity
in Qualitative Research: A Journey of Learning. The Qualitative Report, 22(2),
426-438. Retrieved from https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss2/5

Pan, S.-Y., & Lin, K. J. (2018). Who Suffers When Supervisors are Unhappy? The Roles
of Leader-Member Exchange and Abusive Supervision. *Journal of Business
Ethics*, *151*(3), 799-811.

Paoline, III, E. A., & Gau, J. M. (2020). An empirical assessment of the sources of police
job satisfaction. *Police Quarterly*, *23*(1), 55-81.

Parker, K. A. (2015). *A paradigm of police stress from the lens of retired police officers:
A phenomenological study* (Order No. 3718153). Available from ProQuest
Dissertations & Theses Global. (1712387167). Retrieved from
http://search.proquest.com/docview/1712387167?accountid=35812.

Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). "*A systematic literature review of servant
leadership theory in organizational contexts*", Journal of Business Ethics,
Vol. 113No. 3, pp. 377-393.

Pathiranage, Y. L., Jayatilake, L. V. K., & Abeysekera, R. (2020). Case Study Research
Design for Exploration of Organizational Culture Towards Corporate
Performance. *Review of International Comparative Management / Revista de
Management Comparat International*, *21*(3), 361–372.
https://doi.org/10.24818/RMCI.2020.3.361

Patiar, A., & Wang, Y. (2016). The effects of transformational leadership and
organizational commitment on hotel departmental performance. International

Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 28(3), 586–608.

doi:10.1108/ijchm-01-2014-0050

Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles,

CA: SAGE.

Paulus, T. M., Lester, J. N., & Dempster, P. G. (2014). Analysing textual data. In Digital

tools for qualitative research (pp. 114-140). London,: SAGE Publications Ltd doi:

10.4135/9781473957671.n7

Pearson-Goff, M., & Herrington, V. (2014). Police leadership: A systematic review of the

literature. *Policing, 8* (1), 14–26.

Peng, J., Li, D., Zhang, Z., Tian, Y., Miao, D., Xiao, W., & Zhang, J. (2016). How can

core self-evaluations influence job burnout? The key roles of organizational

commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 21(1), 50–59.

Petty, N. J., Thomson, O. P., & Stew, G. (2012). Ready for a paradigm shift? Part 2:

Introducing qualitative research methodologies and methods. Manual Therapy,

17(5), 378-384. doi:10.1016/j.math.2012.03.004

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations*. New York,

NY.

Pitts, S., Glensor, R., & Peak, K. (2015). *The Police Training Officer Program: A*

Contemporary Approach to Post-academy Recruit Training.

Platt, T. (1982). *Crime and Punishment in the United States: Immediate and Long-Term*

Reforms from a Marxist Perspective.

Poon, J. M., & Ainuddin, R. A. (2011). Selected ethical issues in the analysis and

    reporting of research: Survey of business school faculty in Malaysia. *Journal of*

    Academic Ehics, 9(4), 307-322. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9142-3

Posner, B. Z. (2016). Investigating the reliability and validity of the Leadership Practices

    Inventory®. *Administrative Sciences*, *6*(4), 17.

Powell, C. (2003). The Delphi technique: myths and realities, Journal of Advanced

    Nursing 41(4) 376-382.

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). Final Report of the President's

    Task Force on 21st Century Policing. Washington, DC: Office of Community

    Oriented Policing Services.

Probst, B., & Berenson, L. (2014). The double arrow: How qualitative social work

    researchers use reflexivity. *Qualitative Social Work*, *13*(6), 813-827.

Prussia, G. E., Anderson, J. S., & Manz, C. C. (1998). Self-leadership and performance

    outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational*

    Behavior, 19, 523–538.

Pulakos, E. D. (2009). *Performance management: A new approach for driving business*

    results. John Wiley & Sons.

Puni, A., Agyemang, C. B., & Asamoah, E. S. (2016). Leadership styles, employee

    turnover intentions and counterproductive work behaviours. *International Journal*

    of innovative research and development, *5*(1), 1-7.

Puni, A., Ofei, S. B., & Okoe, A. (2014). "The effect of leadership styles on firm

    performance in Ghana", *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, Vol. 6, No.

    1, pp. 177.

Rahayu, M., Rasid, F., & Tannady, H. (2018). Effects of Self Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Work Culture Toward Performance of Telemarketing Staff in Banking Sector. *South East Asia J. Contemp. Business, Econ. Law*, *16*(5), 47-52.

Rainey, H. G. (2014). Understanding and managing public organizations (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass & Pfeiffer Imprints.

RAND. (2011). Delphi method. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/topics/delphimethod.html

Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Ravitch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2016). *Reason & rigor: How conceptual frameworks guide research*. Sage Publications.

Reid, T. S. (2006). *Crime and criminology* (11th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Reitz, O. E., & Anderson, M. A. (2013). A comparison of survey methods in studies of the nurse workforce. Nurse Researcher, 20(4), 22-27.

Reynolds, P. D., Fitzgerald, B. A., & Hicks, J. (2018). The expendables: A qualitative study of police officers' responses to organizational injustice. *Police Quarterly*, *21*(1), 3-29.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 698–714.

Ricketts, D., Roper, T., Rogers, B., Phadnis, J., Elsayed, S., & Sokol, D. (2019). Informed consent: the view from the trenches. Annals of The Royal College Of Surgeons Of England, 101(1), 44–49.

Rjaibi, W. (2020). *'Enhanced Encryption and Fine-Grained Authorization for Database Systems* (Doctoral dissertation, Manchester Metropolitan University).

Robbins, L. M. (2008). *Bridging the gap in leadership development within generation X and Y*. Seminar paper presented to Graduate Faculty at: University of Wisconsin-Platteville, Wisconsin. Retrieved from: http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/31911.

Robertson, P. J., Wang, F., & Trivisvavet, S. (2007). Self-and collective interests in public organizations: An empirical investigation. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *31*(1), 54-84.

Robinson, C., & Scaglion, R. (1987). *The origin and evolution of the police function in society: Notes toward a theory. Law & Society Review*, *21*.

Russell, L. M., Cole, B. M., & Jones III, R. J. (2014). High-risk occupations: How leadership, stress, and ability to cope influence burnout in law enforcement. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 11(3), 49-69.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23, 1*45-157.

Rutberg, S., & Bouikidis, C. D. (2018). Focusing on the fundamentals: A simplistic differentiation between qualitative and quantitative research. *Nephrology Nursing Journal, 45*(2), 209–213.

Sackman, H. (1975). Delphi critique. Lexington Books; Lexington.

Sadiq, A. W. (2020). *Influence of leadership practices on organizational safety performance* (Order No. 27738382). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ University of Phoenix; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2385667710).

Retrieved from

https://search.proquest.com/docview/2385667710?accountid=35812

Safi, A., & Burell, D. (2007). Developing critical thinking leadership skills in homeland

security professionals, law enforcement agents and intelligence analysts.

Homeland Defense Journal, 5(6).

Salkind, N. J., & Rasmussen, K. (2013). Delphi technique. *In Encyclopedia of*

measurement and statistics (pp. 241-247).

Sanders, T. J., & Davey, K. S. (2011). Out of the leadership theory jungle: A proposed

meta- model of strategic leadership. *Proceedings of the Academy of Strategic*

Management,10(1):41-46.

Sarver, M. B., & Miller, H. (2014). Police chief leadership: Styles and

effectiveness. *Policing*, 37(1), 126-143.

Schafer, J. A. (2009a). "Developing effective leadership in policing: perils, pitfalls, and

paths forward", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies &*

Management, Vol. 32 Issue: 2, pp.238-260.

Schneider, M. P. (2020). Where Will Tomorrow's Law Enforcement Leaders Come

From?. Retrieved from https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/where-will-

tomorrows-law-enforcement-leaders-come-from/

Schreiber, J., & Asner-Self, K. (2011). *Educational research: The interrelationship of*

questions, sampling, design, and analysis. Wiley.

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive

theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *60*, 101832.

Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (4th ed.), Pearson Education, Boston.

Schunk, D. H., & Usher, E. L. (2019). Social cognitive theory and motivation. *The Oxford handbook of human motivation*, 11.

Scott, R. (2003). *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*. 5th Edition. Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall.

Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2007). Organizations and organizing: Rational. *Natural and Open*. Taylor & Francis.

Seers, K. (2011). Qualitative data analysis. Evidence Based Nursing, 15(1), 2-2. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ebnurs.2011.100352

Sekayi, D., & Kennedy, A. (2017). Qualitative delphi method: A four round process with a worked example. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(10), 2755-2763.

Sendall, M. C., McCosker, L. K., Brodie, A., Hill, M., & Crane, P. (2018). Participatory action research, mixed methods, and research teams: Learning from philosophically juxtaposed methodologies for optimal research outcomes. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18.

Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant Leadership: Its Origin, Development, and Application in Organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *9*(2), 57-64.

Sereni-Massinger, C., & Wood, N. (2016). Improving Law Enforcement Cross Cultural Competencies through Continued Education. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *5*(2), 258–264.

Seyranian, V. (2010). Transactional leadership theories. In J. M. Levine & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of group processes & intergroup relations* (pp. 928-931). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Shaju, M., & Subhashini, D. (2017). A study on the impact of Job Satisfaction on Job Performance of Employees working in Automobile Industry, Punjab, India. *Journal of Management Research*, 9(1), 117-130.

Shane, J. M. (2019). *Stress Inside Police Departments*. Routledge.

Shanock, L. R., Eisenberger, R., Heggestad, E. D., Malone, G., Clark, L., Dunn, A. M., Kirkland, J., & Woznyj, H. (2019). Treating Employees Well: The Value of Organizational Support Theory in Human Resource Management. *Psychologist-Manager Journal (American Psychological Association)*, *22*(3/4), 168–191.

Shaw, M. E. (1955). A comparison of two types of leadership in various communication nets. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*.

Silver, C., & Lewins, A. (2014). Working with coding schemes. In Using software in qualitative research (pp. 205-228). 55 City Road, London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781473906907.n10

Simon, M. K. (2011). Dissertation and scholarly research recipes for success (2011 ed,) Seatle, WA: Dissertation Success LLC.

Simonet, D. V., & Castille, C. M. (2020). The search for meaningful work: A network analysis of personality and the job characteristics model. *Personality & Individual Differences*, *152*, N.PAG.

Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with why: How great leaders inspire everyone to take action*. New York, NY: Portfolio-Penguin.

Singh, A., Singh, S. K., & Khan, S. (2016). "Job characteristics model (JCM): utility and impact on working professionals in the UAE", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 24 Issue: 4, pp. 692-705.

Sinha, I. P., Smyth, R. L., & Williamson, P. R. (2011). Using the Delphi technique to determine which outcomes to measure in clinical trials: recommendations for the future based on a systematic review of existing studies. PLoS Med. 2011;8(1):e1000393.

Smith, T. (2018). Qualitative & Quantitative Research. *Qualitative & Quantitative Research -- Research Starters Education*, 1. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=shib&db=e0h&AN=31962646&site=eds-live&scope=site

Soler, L. (2020, Winter). Followership: An Essential Component of Leadership. *FBI-LEEDA Insider: Leading Through Change*, (1), 14-16.

Sosik, J. (2007). Transformational and transactional leadership. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 835-837). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Steele, R., Bosma, H., Johnston, M., Cadell, S., Davies, B., Siden, H., & Straatman, L. (2008). Research priorities in pediatric palliative care: A Delphi study. *Journal of Palliative Care*, 24(4), 229-39.

Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *25*(4), 349-361.

Strasser, A. (2017). Delphi method variants in information systems research: taxonomy development and application.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research techniques*. SAGE publications.

Style, I. O. S. L. (2019). The Role Of Work Motivation As A Mediation Influence Of Situational Leadership Style and Change Management On Performance of Employee in Bank Mandiri Jember. *Management*, *1*(12).

Surmiak, A. (2018). Confidentiality in qualitative research involving vulnerable participants: researchers' perspectives. Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 19(3), 393.

Sušanj, Z., & Jakopec, A. (2012). Fairness perceptions and job satisfaction as mediators of the relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment. *Psihologijske teme*, *21*(3), 509-526.

Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative Research: Data Collection, Analysis, and Management. *The Canadian journal of hospital pharmacy*, *68*(3), 226–231. https://doi.org/10.4212/cjhp.v68i3.1456

Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 113 (2010), pp. 73-84.

Tabassi, A. A., Roufechaei, K. M., Bakar, A. H. A., & Yusof, N. (2017). Linking Team Condition and Team Performance: A Transformational Leadership Approach. *Project Management Journal*, 48(2), 22–38. doi:10.1177/875697281704800203

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement. (2020). *Current*

   Statistics. https://www.tcole.texas.gov/content/current-statistics

Tharenou, P., Donohue, R., & Cooper, B. (2007). *Management research methods*.

   Cambridge University Press.

Theofanidis, D., & Fountouki, A. (2018). Limitations and Delimitations in the Research

   Process. *Perioperative Nursing*, *7*(3), 155–163.

 Thomann, E., Hupe, P., & Sager, F. (2017). "Serving Many Masters: Public

   Accountability in Private Policy Implementation." *Governance* 31 (2): 299–319.

   doi:10.1111/gove.12297.

Thomas, E., & Magilvy, J. K. (2011). Qualitative rigor or research validity in qualitative

   research. *Journal for specialists in pediatric nursing*, 16(2), 151-155.

Thorndike, R. M., & Thorndike-Christ, T. M. (2009). Measurement and evaluation in

   Psychology and education (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tongco, M. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. Ethnobotany

   Research & Application, 5, 147-158.

Townsend, A., Cox, S. M., & Li, L. C. (2010). Qualitative research ethics: Enhancing

   evidence based practice in physical therapy. *Physical Therapy*, 90(4), 615-28.

   Retrieved from https://search-

   proquestcom.contentproxy.phoenix.edu/docview/223115745?accountid=134061

Trochim, W. (2006). Research Methods Knowledge Base. Retrieved March 9th, 2017,

   from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net

Turner, A. N., & Lawrence, P. R. (1965). *Industrial jobs and the worker*. Boston, MA:

   Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Ulrich, D., & Smallwood, N. (2012). What is Leadership? in William H. Mobley, Ying

Wang, Ming Li (ed.) *Advances in Global Leadership (Advances in Global*

Leadership, Volume 7*)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.9 – 36.

United States Department of Justice. (2020). Presidential Commission On Law

Enforcement And The Administration Of Justice. Retrieved from

https://www.justice.gov/ag/presidential-commission-law-enforcement-and-

administration-justice

Val, C., & Kemp, J. (2015). Leadership Styles. Retrieved from

http://www.files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ994012.pdf

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of*

Management, 37, 1228-1261.

Vanek, J. (2016). Debunking 3 myths of 21st century police leadership. Retrieved from

https://www.policeone.com/police-products/continuing-

education/articles/debunking-3-myths-of-21st-century-police-leadership-

U36kwV83bbc8hcQA/

Van Vugt, M., Jepson, S. F., Hart, C. M., & De Cremer, D. (2004). "Autocratic

leadership in social dilemmas: A threat to group stability". *Journal of*

Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 1-13.

Vargas, M. A. (2016). Generational Supervisory Gaps in Law Enforcement. *The Bill*

Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas, (), .

Retrieved from https://shsu-

ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11875/2078/1665.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=

y

Varpio, L., Ajjawi, R., Monrouxe, L. V., O'Brien, B. C., & Rees, C. E. (2017). Shedding the cobra effect: Problematising thematic emergence, triangulation, saturation and member checking. Medical Education, 51(1), 40–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13124

Violanti, J. (2011). *Police suicide: Epidemic in blue (American series in behavioral science and law).* Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas Publisher.

Von der Gracht, H. A. (2012). Consensus measurement in Delphi studies: Review and implication for future quality assurance. *Technological Forecasting and Social change*, 79, 1525-1536.

Voon, M. L., & Ayob, M. C. (2011). The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in public sector organization in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business, Management & Social Sciences* 2 (1).

Wagner, J. (1997). Estimating the economic impacts of tourism. Ann Tour Res. 24(3):592–608.

Walker, R., & Solvason, C. (2014). Gathering data. In Success with your early years research project (pp. 76-91). London,: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781473913875.n7

Wang, Y. (2014). Empowering the police: How the Chinese communist party manages its coercive leaders. *The China Quarterly*, 219(6), 625-648. doi:10.1017/S0305741014000769

Ward, S. (2019). Leadership from the Bottom Up. Retrieved from https://shsu-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11875/2632/1855.pdf?sequence=1

Warren, G. A. (2020). Great Leadership Drives High Performance. Retrieved from

https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/great-leadership-drives-high-performance/

Weimer, G., & Securing, S. (2008). Information needs in the outsourcing lifecycle.

Industrial Management Data Systems, 108(1), 107-121.

doi:10.1108/02635570810844115

Welch, C., Plakoyiannaki, E., Piekkari, R., & Paavilainen-Mäntymäki, E. (2013).

Legitimizing diverse uses for qualitative research: A rhetorical analysis of two

management journals. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15, 245-

264.

Wells, J. E., & Peachey, J. W. (2011). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and

satisfaction with leader matter? *Team Performance Management*, 17(1/2), 23–40.

Wellstein, B., & Kieser, A. (2011). Trading "best practices"--a good practice*? Industrial

and Corporate Change*, 20(3), 683-719. doi:10.1093/icc/dtr011

Wickersham Commission. (1931). "*Report on lawlessness in law enforcement, Part 1*",

Wickersham Commission Report, available at:

www.lexisnexis.com/documents/academic/upa_cis/1965_WickershamCommPt1.

pdf

Wickramasinghe, A. S. (2021). Trust and Organizational Leadership. In *Handbook of

Research on Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Managerial and Leadership

Psychology* (pp. 490-511). IGI Global.

Wolf, R., Korosec, R., & Goltz, J. W. (2008, July). An analysis of factors affecting the

implementation of small municipal police agencies: An open-systems approach.

American Journal of Criminal Justice. doi:10.1007/s12103-008-9045-z.

Woodard, T. D. (2017). *Autocratic leadership and stress on law enforcement officers: A narrative inquiry*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Wren, D. A. (2005). *The history of management thought*. John Wiley & Sons Incorporated.

Wren, J. (1995). The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages. New York: The Free Press.

Wycoff, M. A., & Skogan, W. G. (1994). *The effect of a community policing management style on officers' attitudes*. NCCD News, 40(3), 371-383.

Xirasagar, S. (2008). Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership among physician executives. *Journal of Health organization and management*.

Yazan, B. (2015). Three Approaches to Case Study Methods in Education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake. The Qualitative Report, 20(2), 134-152. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss2/12

Yiing, L. H., Zaman, K., & Ahmad, B. (2009). The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30 (1), 53-86.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Yongbeom, H. (2013). Turnover, voluntary turnover, and organizational performance: Evidence from municipal police departments. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 37(1), 3-35.

Yousef, D. A. (2017). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and attitudes toward organizational change: A study in the local government. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40(1), 77–88.

Yu, S., & Ko, Y. (2017). Communication competency as a mediator in the self-leadership to job performance relationship. *Collegian*, *24*(5), 421-425.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zehndorfer, E. (2013). *Leadership: A critical introduction*. Routledge.

Zhang, Y., & Xie, Y. H. (2017). Authoritarian leadership and extra-role behaviors: a role-perception perspective. *Management and Organization Review*, *13*(1), 147-166.

Zyphur, M. J., & Pierides, D. C. (2019). Statistics and probability have always been value-laden: An historical ontology of quantitative research methods: JBE JBE. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-18.

University of Phoenix®

INFORMED CONSENT: PARTICIPANTS 18 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER

Greetings,

My name is Joshua L. Hadnot-Harris and I am a student at the University of Phoenix working on a Doctor of Management. I am conducting a research study entitled Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leadership: A Modified Delphi Study. This study will seek to obtain consensus from 15 law enforcement personnel in Texas who are currently in leadership positions and have graduated from an accredited leadership training institute for law enforcement. Law enforcement officers are constantly under pressure to not only perform their duties but also provide leadership to personnel within their respective organizations. The style of Autocratic leadership has forever been an issue within policing, as leadership styles have often resembled the military regarding rank, structure, and management of personnel. Adequate leadership has become a key factor to achieving the outcomes of increased performance, morale, and job satisfaction through profound leadership practices and styles geared toward innovative approaches and teamwork. These approaches are targeted to obtain the best performance from personnel, sustain morale within the organization, and extend the careers of officers debating departure due to levels of job satisfaction.

The purpose of the research study is to aggregate and condense the opinions of 15 experts in the law enforcement profession by seeking consensus regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in law enforcement. These

opinions would be translated into recommendations which organizational leaders may incorporate into their law enforcement agency to prevent elements of burnout or turnover and improve their personnel's performance, department morale, and increase levels of job satisfaction.

Your participation will involve:

1. Completion of three round web-based questionnaires. The amount of time necessary for completion of the questionnaire may vary for each panelist; but would be about approximately 35 minutes, depending on the length of the responses to questions, and approximately 90 minutes for questions in all 3 rounds.

2. Your name would not be disclosed in any report or publication resulting from this study. The informed consent will be presented before any demographic information, survey and participation can begin. Informed consent will be presented before each round to the participant to access the survey. The amount of time necessary for completion of the demographic information may vary for each panelist; but would be approximately 10 minutes, depending on the length of the responses to question. To prevent unauthorized access to the survey, you would be provided with a password sent through an encrypted email message to enable access to the survey. You will remain anonymous to all other expert panelist throughout the study, and only the researcher would be able to identify your specific responses. The gathered data would be encrypted and securely stored online. A dedicated Microsoft outlook digital folder would be created for each Panelist for storage of e-mail exchanges, completed demographic

questionnaire, and a copy of informed consent for each round. The digital folder would be encrypted and named with the Panelist's alias. For example, Panelist one would be identified as LEP1 in all records of exchanged where LE stands for Law Enforcement, P stands for Panelist and 1 means 1. No hard copy data of the panelist would be maintained. The responses will be retained for a period of three years. After three years, the media of storage would be destroyed by electronic deletion.

3. Participants may be terminated without participant's consent and if no response is received from the expert panelist after reminders based on the panelist's preference and the expiration of the defined timeline of one week which is the allotted time to complete each round. As each round will remain available to participants for one week prior to being closed.

4. Once informed consent has been completed and accepted, participants would be invited to complete a short demographic questionnaire asking for years of experience in law enforcement, job title, educational qualifications, and external leadership trainings and certifications obtained. 15 Delphi panelists would be selected from the population of participants based on defined inclusion and exclusion criteria of experience, educational qualifications, and external leadership trainings and certifications obtained.

You can decide to be a part of this study or not. Once you start, you can withdraw from the study at any time without any repercussions. The results of the research study may be published but your identity will remain confidential, and your name will not be made known to any outside parties.

In this research, there are no foreseeable risks to you in relation to your participation. Although there may be no direct benefit to you, a possible benefit from your being part of this study is making your voice heard as part of the body of research related to leadership practices in Texas law enforcement to help improve the performance, morale, and job satisfaction of officers.

 If you have any questions about the research study, please email me at ███████ ███ or email me at ████████████████████████. For questions about your rights as a study participant, or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Phoenix Institutional Review Board at IRB@phoenix.edu.

As a participant in this study, you should understand the following:

1. You may decide not to be part of this study or you may want to withdraw from the study at any time. If you want to withdraw, please call me at ███████████ or email me ████████████████████████

2. Your identity will be kept confidential.

3. Joshua L. Hadnot-Harris, the researcher, has fully explained the nature of the research study and has answered all of your questions and concerns.

4. Data will be kept secure by encryption and securely stored online. You are required to agree to the Informed Consent at the beginning of each round prior to accessing the study questionnaires and demographic information. A dedicated outlook digital folder would be created for each Panelist for storage of e-mail exchanges, demographic information, and a copy of signed informed consent for each round. The digital folder would be encrypted and named with the Panelist's alias as informed consent and demographic information will be kept separate.

The data will be kept for three (3) years, and then destroyed by electronic

deletion and the closing of online storage accounts. IP addresses will not be

collected for this study to further protect the confidentiality. If you decided to

withdraw from the study at any time data will be withdrawn and destroyed

immediately.

5. The results of this study may be published.

By signing this form, you agree that you understand the nature of the study, the

possible risks and benefits to you as a participant, and how your identity will be kept

confidential. When you sign this form, this means that you are 18 years old or older and

that you give your permission to volunteer as a participant in the study that is described

here.

      (☐) I accept the above terms.   (☐) I do not accept the above terms.

(CHECK ONE)

Email address of the research participant _____

Appendix B

Letter of Invitation to Potential Participants

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: "Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leadership: A Modified Delphi Study."

My name is Joshua L. Hadnot-Harris, I am active Texas law enforcement officer, and I am conducting a research study in pursuit of a Doctor of Management degree at the University of Phoenix. I am completing my dissertation on performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas law enforcement. The purpose of this qualitative modified Delphi study is to gain consensus from 15 active law enforcement officers regarding performance, morale, and job satisfaction with autocratic leadership in Texas that may influence future changes to the profession through education and training of future leaders.

To be eligible, participants must be:

- Sworn and active Texas law enforcement officers with a license ranging from basic to master peace officer

- Have seven or more years of experience with a high school diploma and/or post-secondary degree

- Currently in leadership positions ranging from Sergeant to Chief of Police or Sheriff or any federal law enforcement officials in Texas with a designation showing leadership

- Attended and graduated from some additional form of leadership training such as Federal Bureau of Investigations National Academy (FBI-NA), Federal Bureau of

Investigations Law Enforcement Executive Development Association (FBI-

LEEDA) Supervisor, Command, or Executive Leadership Institute, The Bill

Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas (LEMIT)

Leadership Command College, Institute for Law Enforcement Administration

(ILEA), or the Senior Management Institute for Police (SMIP) through the Police

Executive Research Forum.

Participation in this study is voluntary and all the identities of participants will

remain confidential. The study will consist of three rounds of questions with each round

containing 10-15 questions over a 60-day period. The estimated time requirement to

complete each round of questioning is approximately 35 minutes or more depending on

the length of the responses to the questions. For three rounds of questioning the

anticipated time commitment to answer questions would be 90 minutes for three rounds

of questioning. Informed consent will be provided to each participant before accessing

the demographic information or any surveys for each round. The amount of time

necessary for completion of the demographic information may vary for each panelist; but

would be approximately 10 minutes, depending on the length of the responses to

question. A dedicated outlook digital folder would be created for each Panelist for storage

of e-mail exchanges, demographic information, and a copy of informed consent for each

round. The digital folders would be encrypted and named with the Panelist's alias as

informed consent and demographic information will be kept separate. The data will be

kept for three (3) years, and then destroyed by electronic deletion and the closing of

online storage accounts. IP addresses will not be collected for this study to further protect

the confidentiality. If you decided to withdraw from the study at any time data will be withdrawn and destroyed immediately.

The questionnaires and reviews will be delivered utilizing a secure online software; SurveyMonkey which can be completed via the internet and is not restricted to a particular location for completion and meets CDC guidelines during the pandemic of COVID-19. While there may be no direct benefit for your law enforcement office, other law enforcement offices may benefit by being exposed to ideas or practices as it relates to leadership practices in relation to performance, morale, and job satisfaction. Successful implementation of future solutions could potentially increase the performance, morale, and job satisfaction within law enforcement organizations thereby enabling law enforcement leaders to better understand the meaningfulness and effectiveness of leadership practices. If you are interested in participating in this study please contact Joshua L. Hadnot-Harris █████████████████████████ or ████████ ██████████████████████████

Appendix C

Demographic Questionnaire

Current employment

Alias Identifier _____

Job Title _____ ☐Prefer not to answer

Employed with ☐municipal, ☐county, ☐state, ☐federal, or ☐Prefer not to answer

Years in the law enforcement? ☐0-10, ☐11-20, ☐21-30, ☐31 or more, or ☐Prefer

not to answer

Background details (please tick)

Are you   Male   ☐   Female☐   Prefer not to answer☐

Age   21 – 29   ☐   50 – 59   ☐

                       30 – 39   ☐   60 – 69   ☐

                       40 – 49   ☐   Over 70   ☐

                       Prefer not to answer   ☐

Please list any law enforcement related leadership training you have attended and

graduated from: ☐Prefer not to answer

_____

_____

What is your highest level of education? (please tick) ☐Prefer not to answer

☐HS diploma or GED, ☐Bachelor degree, ☐Master degree, or ☐Doctorate degree,

What is your level of peace officer license? (please tick) ☐Prefer not to answer

☐Basic, ☐Intermediate, ☐Advanced, or ☐Master

Thank you for taking the time to complete the demographic questionnaire.

Appendix D

Modified Delphi Round One Invitation Email

Dear [PARTICIPANT NAME]:

Thank you for signing and returning the informed consent form for the research study

entitled Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic

Leadership: A Modified Delphi Study. Below is the link to the first round of questioning.

(Link will be inserted here once generated by SurveyMonkey)

If you have any questions about the research study, please call me or email me.

Appendix E

Modified Delphi Round Two Invitation Email

Dear [PARTICIPANT NAME]:

In round 1 of questioning you were asked to provide responses related to your

perceptions and experiences with strategies and practices used by autocratic leaders with

a focus on performance, morale, job satisfaction.

The round 2 questionnaire will provide information collected in round 1.

You will be asked to rate statements in round two whereas:

1. Performance

2. Morale

3. Job Satisfaction

Please use the following link and within each section rate your level of agreement with

the statements provided.

(Link will be inserted here once generated by SurveyMonkey)

If you have any questions about the research study, please call me or email me.

Appendix F

Modified Delphi Round Three Invitation Email

Dear [PARTICIPANT NAME]:

Thank you for completing round 2 of the Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leadership research study. You were invited to continue in round 3 of the study. Please use the following link to complete the 3rd round of questioning.

(Link will be inserted here once generated by SurveyMonkey)

If you have any questions about the research study, please call me or email me.

Appendix G

Thank You Email

Thank you for taking part in the Performance, Morale, and Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leadership research study. The study has concluded after 3 rounds of data collection. I greatly appreciate your contribution to the study. Please contact me if you have questions related to the research.

Sincerely,

Joshua L. Hadnot-Harris

Appendix H

Modified Delphi Round One Questionnaire

The Delphi Round One instrument will consist of twelve open-ended questions,

intended to extract comprehensive responses.

The round will consist of the following questions:

1. From your experience and perceptions, provide examples of what strategies or
   practices used by autocratic leaders that influence performance of law
   enforcement officers?

2. From your experience and perceptions, provide examples of what strategies or
   practices used by autocratic leaders that influence morale of law enforcement
   officers?

3. From your experience and perceptions, provide examples of what strategies or
   practices used by autocratic leaders that influence job satisfaction of law
   enforcement officers?

4. From your experience and observation, provide examples of what strategies or
   practices used by autocratic leaders that influenced education and training of
   law enforcement officers?

5. From your experience and perceptions, provide examples of what strategies or
   practices used by autocratic leaders that influenced you to stay at your current
   organization?

6. From your experience and perceptions, provide examples of what strategies or
   practices used by autocratic leaders that would influence you to leave your
   current or influence you to leave your previous organization?

7. Describe your feelings or emotions regarding autocratic leadership and its connection to the education and training of future leaders?

8. Describe your feelings or emotions regarding other leadership styles and the connection to the education and training of future leaders?

9. From your experience and perceptions, provide examples of what influence autocratic leaders can have versus other leadership styles on education and training?

10. From your experience and perceptions, provide examples of what information you have found helpful throughout your career regarding leadership practices?

11. What recommendations do you have for law enforcement leaders to improve their leadership?

12. In your opinion is autocratic leadership outdated in the profession of law enforcement, if so, what leadership styles should be more prevalent and the focus of education and training of future leaders?

Appendix I

Modified Delphi Round Two Questionnaire

The development of the Delphi round two instrument will be based on the responses from round one. The responses from round 1 will be analyzed and duplicate and similar statements will be combined. Panelist will be asked to rate the round one's responses in order of importance using a Likert scale of 1 – 4 where 1 is strongly agree, and 4 is strongly disagree. Round 2 will use the following four-point rating scale: 1= *Strongly Agree*, 2 = *Agree*, 3= *Disagree*, and 4= *Strongly Disagree*. The responses from questions will be organized under themes that were important for performance, morale, and job satisfaction.

Appendix J

Modified Delphi Round Three Questionnaire

In round two participants will be asked to rate factors about autocratic leaders and performance, morale, and job satisfaction. Round three will present the same factors and asks you to consider them in the context regarding the future education and training of leaders.

For each statement you will be asked if the factor should be included in performance, morale, and job satisfaction initiatives. The following choices will be available:

1 = *Absolutely Necessary: Required*

2 = *Recommended: Contributes highly*

3 = *Optional: Not essential, does add some value*

4 = *Not Necessary: Has no impact*

For each statement, you were provided with the overall group response from round two, presented as an abbreviation in parenthesis after each statement:

Strongly Agree = (SA)

Agree = (A)

Disagree = (D)

Strongly Disagree = (SD)

The overall group response reported will allow you to compare your previous ratings to those of the other expert panel members. During the round please consider your previous response and the overall group response. Next, rate the statements in the context of performance, morale, and job satisfaction.

Appendix K

Modified Delphi Round Two Questionnaire

Number	Question
1	Autocratic leaders provide strict policies and guidelines to enforce compliance.
2	Autocratic leaders "my way or no way at all" approach hinders the decision making and performance of officers which can have both a positive and negative outcome.
3	The "my way or no way at all" approach often has consequences for low performers.
4	Not an ideal form of leadership, does not allow for "buy-in" from officers.
5	Fear of decisions that the officers make while performing their duties can be a huge factor in how they respond and react.
6	Autocratic leaders do not challenge officers to come up with better ways of doing things or new solutions to problems they may face.
7	Autocratic leaders are best utilized in emergency situations, where decisions have to be made quickly.
8	Autocratic leaders do not allow for the element of free thinking.
9	They utilize micromanagement practices overseeing every aspect of a task. This usually results in low or poor performance.
10	Most officers who work under an autocratic leader job performance is down.

11	The autocratic strategy with the greatest effect on job satisfaction is "do as I say, not as I do".
12	Autocratic leaders impair creativity and innovation within the department.
13	Will make an employee afraid to think outside the box.
14	There are times in leadership that you must make big decisions quickly without the luxury of feedback.
15	Autocratic leadership should only be utilized in a crisis AFTER you have communicated the mission and vision to your team.
16	Autocratic leadership does not create a cohesive work environment.
17	Leaders should be open to what the subordinates have to say.
18	Autocratic leaders will have poor morale when employees feel they are under your thumb and you dictate every move.
19	Morale can also be severely affected by autocratic leaders.
20	Officers can become discouraged that they do not have a voice in their respective departments.
21	All strategies and practices used by leaders influence the morale of their officers.
22	Autocratic leaders are sometimes needed in our profession due to the inherit dangers of law enforcement.
23	An autocratic leader can influence the morale of officers by not pursuing pay scales that keep their department competitive and giving their officers access to training that would expand their career.

24	There are some good things that you can learn from autocratic leader, such as when decisions need to be made quickly without consulting with a large group of people.
25	Not the type of leadership 21st century policing needs at this time.
26	Micro-management in its truest form displays the "do as you are told" mentality creating isolation and eroding trust.
27	Autocratic leaders are task oriented and have a specific way of accomplishing those tasks, and do not accept input from others.
28	Autocratic leaders typically make choices based on their ideas or judgments and rarely accept advice from followers.
29	Strategies implemented by autocratic leaders are ultimately self-serving.
30	Becoming discouraged from sharing opinions and often becoming disgruntled causes officers to seek employment outside with another agency.
31	Leads to a lack of initiative and free thinking which leads to loss in morale or feeling of inclusion.
32	Autocratic leadership strategies foster resentment and distrust.
33	Creates "snitches" within an organization and lots of closed-door discussions.
34	The inability to effectively exercise officer discretion and the constant second-guessing results in low job satisfaction.

35   A leader who barks orders at his employees without getting to know them or hearing their ideas will influence job satisfaction and morale in a negative way.

36   Autocratic leaders lack fair promotional processes and restricts the ability to grow or provide opportunities for training.

37   They will not influence training and education from a fear of being replaced or someone having different ideas of how to accomplish goals.

38   On the job training is more favorable with autocratic leaders versus traditional educational practices such as college degrees.

39   All state mandated training will be handled as it is in black and white, however beneficial outside training may be missed or underutilized if not accepted or allowed by the autocratic leader.

40   Autocratic leaders hand pick training that falls in line with their thinking and their approach to doing the job.

41   By promoting the best trained, educated, and exceptional workers it sets the bar high for competition and sends a message that only the most qualified and educated will he promoted.

42   In a department with autocratic leadership, the only officers who have the opportunity for education and training are the officer's hand-picked by the leader.

43   Autocratic leadership style does not promote the education and training of future leaders.

44	I believe in today's world of law enforcement, future leaders must maintain this type of leadership to make sure all officers are trained to the max.
45	You must invest in your personnel to ensure that they have the education and training needed to carry out the organizations mission and goals.
46	Autocratic leaders may discourage other leaders from encouraging training and education due to the distraction from their primary work functions.
47	I believe autocratic leadership puts limits on what officers can achieve and their willingness to improve.
48	If you want to succeed in law enforcement in the 21st century education and training is a must.
49	Some leadership styles work better than others, but I personally do not like the Autocratic style.
50	I feel like it is important that future leaders study the different leadership styles and attempt to incorporate all the different leadership styles into their own personal leadership as they progress.
51	I believe that no particular leadership style is greater than another and in law enforcement, a leader needs to learn to be flexible.
52	A democratic leadership style gives everyone room for input.
53	A coaching style leadership is also helpful as it instills the feeling of worth, growth and that you have been invested in.

54	I believe one of the best leadership styles is letting your team feel they have ownership in some decision that are being made in the department.
55	ALL other leadership styles; transformational, transactional, management by walking around, etc., have vastly more traits in the plus column than autocratic leadership does.
56	Autocratic leadership teaches through opposites, while the other traditional management styles teach by walking a path.
57	I feel that a good leader can adapt to any situation and with their ability to adapt and overcome is what will help them connect to future leaders and help develop future leaders.
58	I feel that authoritative and/or democratic style of leadership if much more effective in the long term.
59	Transformational leadership practices provide idolized leadership for those coming up through the ranks.
60	I do not believe in autocratic style. Servant-leadership should be the model used.
61	Leaders should be able to listen to their people, consider as many possible factors as possible. There is a time and a place for every style of leadership. Too much of one could be an issue.
62	The transformative leader will search for and motivate future leaders of the department and direct them in the paths that will benefit them and the department.

63	Transformational leadership fosters collaboration, inspires shared vision, and promotes career development and teamwork.
64	Autocratic leaders tell you what to do and other leadership styles allow you to come up with a presentation.
65	I believe autocratic leaders are limited in today's society due to the do as I say philosophy and that other styles of leadership such democratic or coaching styles lend more to the "newer generation".
66	Leaders wanting to improve their department will be identifying their future needs and preparing their departments by training officers to meet those future needs.
67	What works for one employee does not always work for another employee and as a leader we should be flexible when the opportunity arises.
68	I have learned the most from mentors, constructive criticism, and coaches. I have learned the least from the do what I say because I told you so style of leadership.
69	Autocratic leadership is OUTDATED and has no place in law enforcement as other styles such as transformational, democratic, servant or a mixture of styles should be used.
70	Autocratic leadership is NOT outdated and has a place in law enforcement.
71	I believe that the profession is moving away from the militaristic/autocratic from of leadership.

72	Autocratic leadership is valuable as a manual for how not to run a Police organization.
73	Future leaders who have operated under autocratic leaders are well-equipped to lead because they are coming into positions of upper management with their eyes wide open.
74	Autocratic leaders handicap progression in law enforcement.
75	Subordinates may have a better way or even a more efficient way of completing a task.
76	Autocratic leadership strategies can lead officers to keep as many things to themselves as possible, such as feelings, attitudes, and questions for fear of perceived retaliation.
77	Leaders should seek input from others (inside and outside agency), but not be scared to stand on a decision even when it is not the majority opinion.

Appendix L

Modified Delphi Round Two Consensus Statements

Number	Question	Consensus Rating ≥ 75%
1	Autocratic leaders provide strict policies and guidelines to enforce compliance.	80.00%
2	Autocratic leaders "my way or no way at all" approach hinders the decision making and performance of officers which can have both a positive and negative outcome.	80.00%
3	The "my way or no way at all" approach often has consequences for low performers.	80.00%
4	Not an ideal form of leadership, does not allow for "buy-in" from officers.	86.67%
5	Fear of decisions that the officers make while performing their duties can be a huge factor in how they respond and react.	80.00%

6	Autocratic leaders do not challenge officers to come up with better ways of doing things or new solutions to problems they may face.	80.00%
7	Autocratic leaders are best utilized in emergency situations, where decisions have to be made quickly.	80.00%
8	Autocratic leaders do not allow for the element of free thinking.	80.00%
9	They utilize micromanagement practices overseeing every aspect of a task. This usually results in low or poor performance.	80.00%
10	Most officers who work under an autocratic leader job performance is down.	80.00%
11	The autocratic strategy with the greatest effect on job satisfaction is "do as I say, not as I do".	80.00%
12	Autocratic leaders impair creativity and innovation within the department.	80.00%
13	Will make an employee afraid to think outside the box.	80.00%
14	There are times in leadership that you must make big decisions quickly without the luxury of feedback.	80.00%

15	Autocratic leadership should only be utilized in a crisis AFTER you have communicated the mission and vision to your team.	80.00%
16	Autocratic leadership does not create a cohesive work environment.	80.00%
17	Leaders should be open to what the subordinates have to say.	86.67%
18	Autocratic leaders will have poor morale when employees feel they are under your thumb and you dictate every move.	80.00%
19	Morale can also be severely affected by autocratic leaders.	80.00%
20	Officers can become discouraged that they do not have a voice in their respective departments.	86.67%
21	All strategies and practices used by leaders influence the morale of their officers.	86.67%
23	An autocratic leader can influence the morale of officers by not pursuing pay scales that keep their department competitive and giving their officers access to training that would expand their career.	80.00%

24	There are some good things that you can learn from autocratic leader, such as when decisions need to be made quickly without consulting with a large group of people.	80.00%
25	Not the type of leadership 21st century policing needs at this time.	80.00%
26	Micro-management in its truest form displays the "do as you are told" mentality creating isolation and eroding trust.	80.00%
27	Autocratic leaders are task oriented and have a specific way of accomplishing those tasks, and do not accept input from others.	80.00%
28	Autocratic leaders typically make choices based on their ideas or judgments and rarely accept advice from followers.	80.00%
29	Strategies implemented by autocratic leaders are ultimately self-serving.	80.00%
30	Becoming discouraged from sharing opinions and often becoming disgruntled causes officers to seek employment outside with another agency.	80.00%

31	Leads to a lack of initiative and free thinking which leads to loss in morale or feeling of inclusion.	80.00%
32	Autocratic leadership strategies foster resentment and distrust.	80.00%
33	Creates "snitches" within an organization and lots of closed-door discussions.	80.00%
34	The inability to effectively exercise officer discretion and the constant second-guessing results in low job satisfaction.	80.00%
35	A leader who barks orders at his employees without getting to know them or hearing their ideas will influence job satisfaction and morale in a negative way.	80.00%
36	Autocratic leaders lack fair promotional processes and restricts the ability to grow or provide opportunities for training.	80.00%
37	They will not influence training and education from a fear of being replaced or someone having different ideas of how to accomplish goals.	80.00%

38	On the job training is more favorable with autocratic leaders versus traditional educational practices such as college degrees.	80.00%
39	All state mandated training will be handled as it is in black and white, however beneficial outside training may be missed or underutilized if not accepted or allowed by the autocratic leader.	80.00%
40	Autocratic leaders hand pick training that falls in line with their thinking and their approach to doing the job.	80.00%
41	By promoting the best trained, educated, and exceptional workers it sets the bar high for competition and sends a message that only the most qualified and educated will he promoted.	80.00%
43	Autocratic leadership style does not promote the education and training of future leaders.	80.00%
44	I believe in today's world of law enforcement, future leaders must maintain this type of leadership to make sure all officers are trained to the max.	80.00%

45	You must invest in your personnel to ensure that they have the education and training needed to carry out the organizations mission and goals.	80.00%
46	Autocratic leaders may discourage other leaders from encouraging training and education due to the distraction from their primary work functions.	80.00%
47	I believe autocratic leadership puts limits on what officers can achieve and their willingness to improve.	80.00%
48	If you want to succeed in law enforcement in the 21st century education and training is a must.	93.33%
49	Some leadership styles work better than others, but I personally do not like the Autocratic style.	80.00%
50	I feel like it is important that future leaders study the different leadership styles and attempt to incorporate all the different leadership styles into their own personal leadership as they progress.	80.00%

51	I believe that no particular leadership style is greater than another and in law enforcement, a leader needs to learn to be flexible.	80.00%
52	A democratic leadership style gives everyone room for input.	80.00%
53	A coaching style leadership is also helpful as it instills the feeling of worth, growth and that you have been invested in.	80.00%
54	I believe one of the best leadership styles is letting your team feel they have ownership in some decision that are being made in the department.	80.00%
55	ALL other leadership styles; transformational, transactional, management by walking around, etc., have vastly more traits in the plus column than autocratic leadership does.	80.00%
56	Autocratic leadership teaches through opposites, while the other traditional management styles teach by walking a path.	80.00%
57	I feel that a good leader can adapt to any situation and with their ability to adapt and overcome is what will help them connect to future leaders and help develop future leaders.	80.00%

58	I feel that authoritative and/or democratic style of leadership if much more effective in the long term.	80.00%
59	Transformational leadership practices provide idolized leadership for those coming up through the ranks.	80.00%
60	I do not believe in autocratic style. Servant-leadership should be the model used.	80.00%
61	Leaders should be able to listen to their people, consider as many possible factors as possible. There is a time and a place for every style of leadership. Too much of one could be an issue.	80.00%
62	The transformative leader will search for and motivate future leaders of the department and direct them in the paths that will benefit them and the department.	86.67%
63	Transformational leadership fosters collaboration, inspires shared vision, and promotes career development and teamwork.	80.00%
64	Autocratic leaders tell you what to do and other leadership styles allow you to come up with a presentation.	80.00%

65	I believe autocratic leaders are limited in today's society due to the do as I say philosophy and that other styles of leadership such democratic or coaching styles lend more to the "newer generation".	80.00%
66	Leaders wanting to improve their department will be identifying their future needs and preparing their departments by training officers to meet those future needs.	86.67%
67	What works for one employee does not always work for another employee and as a leader we should be flexible when the opportunity arises.	86.67%
68	I have learned the most from mentors, constructive criticism, and coaches. I have learned the least from the do what I say because I told you so style of leadership.	80.00%
74	Autocratic leaders handicap progression in law enforcement.	80.00%
75	Subordinates may have a better way or even a more efficient way of completing a task.	80.00%
76	Autocratic leadership strategies can lead officers to keep as many things to themselves	80.00%

as possible, such as feelings, attitudes, and

questions for fear of perceived retaliation.

77	Leaders should seek input from others (inside	80.00%
	and outside agency), but not be scared to	
	stand on a decision even when it is not the	
	majority opinion.	

Appendix M

Modified Delphi Round Three Statements

Number	Question
1	Autocratic leaders provide strict policies and guidelines to enforce
	compliance. (SA)
2	Autocratic leaders "my way or no way at all" approach hinders the
	decision making and performance of officers which can have both a
	positive and negative outcome. (SA)

3	The "my way or no way at all" approach often has consequences for low performers. (SA)
4	Not an ideal form of leadership, does not allow for "buy-in" from officers. (SA)
5	Fear of decisions that the officers make while performing their duties can be a huge factor in how they respond and react. (SA)
6	Autocratic leaders do not challenge officers to come up with better ways of doing things or new solutions to problems they may face. (SA)
7	Autocratic leaders are best utilized in emergency situations, where decisions have to be made quickly. (A)
8	Autocratic leaders do not allow for the element of free thinking. (SA)
9	They utilize micromanagement practices overseeing every aspect of a task. This usually results in low or poor performance. (A)
10	Most officers who work under an autocratic leader job performance is down. (A)
11	The autocratic strategy with the greatest effect on job satisfaction is "do as I say, not as I do". (SA)
12	Autocratic leaders impair creativity and innovation within the department. (SA)
13	Will make an employee afraid to think outside the box. (SA)

14	There are times in leadership that you must make big decisions quickly without the luxury of feedback. (SA)
15	Autocratic leadership should only be utilized in a crisis AFTER you have communicated the mission and vision to your team. (D)
16	Autocratic leadership does not create a cohesive work environment. (A)
17	Leaders should be open to what the subordinates have to say. (SA)
18	Autocratic leaders will have poor morale when employees feel they are under your thumb and you dictate every move. (SA)
19	Morale can also be severely affected by autocratic leaders. (SA)
20	Officers can become discouraged that they do not have a voice in their respective departments. (SA)
21	All strategies and practices used by leaders influence the morale of their officers. (SA)
22	Autocratic leaders are sometimes needed in our profession due to the inherit dangers of law enforcement. (SA)
23	An autocratic leader can influence the morale of officers by not pursuing pay scales that keep their department competitive and giving their officers access to training that would expand their career. (SA)
24	There are some good things that you can learn from autocratic leader, such as when decisions need to be made quickly without consulting with a large group of people. (A)

25	Not the type of leadership 21st century policing needs at this time. (SA)
26	Micro-management in its truest form displays the "do as you are told" mentality creating isolation and eroding trust. (A)
27	Autocratic leaders are task oriented and have a specific way of accomplishing those tasks, and do not accept input from others. (SA)
28	Autocratic leaders typically make choices based on their ideas or judgments and rarely accept advice from followers. (SA)
29	Strategies implemented by autocratic leaders are ultimately self-serving. (SA)
30	Becoming discouraged from sharing opinions and often becoming disgruntled causes officers to seek employment outside with another agency. (SA)
31	Leads to a lack of initiative and free thinking which leads to loss in morale or feeling of inclusion. (SA)
32	Autocratic leadership strategies foster resentment and distrust. (A)
33	Creates "snitches" within an organization and lots of closed-door discussions. (SA)
34	The inability to effectively exercise officer discretion and the constant second-guessing results in low job satisfaction. (A)

35	A leader who barks orders at his employees without getting to know them or hearing their ideas will influence job satisfaction and morale in a negative way. (A)
36	Autocratic leaders lack fair promotional processes and restricts the ability to grow or provide opportunities for training. (A)
37	They will not influence training and education from a fear of being replaced or someone having different ideas of how to accomplish goals. (SA)
38	On the job training is more favorable with autocratic leaders versus traditional educational practices such as college degrees. (SA)
39	All state mandated training will be handled as it is in black and white, however beneficial outside training may be missed or underutilized if not accepted or allowed by the autocratic leader. (SA)
40	Autocratic leaders hand pick training that falls in line with their thinking and their approach to doing the job. (SA)
41	By promoting the best trained, educated, and exceptional workers it sets the bar high for competition and sends a message that only the most qualified and educated will he promoted. (SA)
42	In a department with autocratic leadership, the only officers who have the opportunity for education and training are the officer's hand-picked by the leader.

43	Autocratic leadership style does not promote the education and training of future leaders. (SA)
44	I believe in today's world of law enforcement, future leaders must maintain this type of leadership to make sure all officers are trained to the max. (SD)
45	You must invest in your personnel to ensure that they have the education and training needed to carry out the organizations mission and goals. (SA)
46	Autocratic leaders may discourage other leaders from encouraging training and education due to the distraction from their primary work functions. (A)
47	I believe autocratic leadership puts limits on what officers can achieve and their willingness to improve. (A)
48	If you want to succeed in law enforcement in the 21st century education and training is a must. (SA)
49	Some leadership styles work better than others, but I personally do not like the Autocratic style. (SA)
50	I feel like it is important that future leaders study the different leadership styles and attempt to incorporate all the different leadership styles into their own personal leadership as they progress. (SA)
51	I believe that no particular leadership style is greater than another and in law enforcement, a leader needs to learn to be flexible. (A)

52	A democratic leadership style gives everyone room for input. (A)
53	A coaching style leadership is also helpful as it instills the feeling of worth, growth and that you have been invested in. (A)
54	I believe one of the best leadership styles is letting your team feel they have ownership in some decision that are being made in the department. (SA)
55	ALL other leadership styles; transformational, transactional, management by walking around, etc., have vastly more traits in the plus column than autocratic leadership does. (SA)
56	Autocratic leadership teaches through opposites, while the other traditional management styles teach by walking a path. (A)
57	I feel that a good leader can adapt to any situation and with their ability to adapt and overcome is what will help them connect to future leaders and help develop future leaders. (SA)
58	I feel that authoritative and/or democratic style of leadership if much more effective in the long term. (D)
59	Transformational leadership practices provide idolized leadership for those coming up through the ranks. (A)
60	I do not believe in autocratic style. Servant-leadership should be the model used. (D)
61	Leaders should be able to listen to their people, consider as many possible factors as possible. There is a time and a place for every style of leadership. Too much of one could be an issue. (SA)

62	The transformative leader will search for and motivate future leaders of the department and direct them in the paths that will benefit them and the department. (SA)
63	Transformational leadership fosters collaboration, inspires shared vision, and promotes career development and teamwork. (SA)
64	Autocratic leaders tell you what to do and other leadership styles allow you to come up with a presentation. (SA)
65	I believe autocratic leaders are limited in today's society due to the do as I say philosophy and that other styles of leadership such democratic or coaching styles lend more to the "newer generation". (SA)
66	Leaders wanting to improve their department will be identifying their future needs and preparing their departments by training officers to meet those future needs. (SA)
67	What works for one employee does not always work for another employee and as a leader we should be flexible when the opportunity arises. (SA)
68	I have learned the most from mentors, constructive criticism, and coaches. I have learned the least from the do what I say because I told you so style of leadership. (A)
69	Autocratic leadership is OUTDATED and has no place in law enforcement as other styles such as transformational, democratic, servant or a mixture of styles should be used.

70	Autocratic leadership is NOT outdated and has a place in law enforcement.
71	I believe that the profession is moving away from the militaristic/autocratic from of leadership.
72	Autocratic leadership is valuable as a manual for how not to run a Police organization.
73	Future leaders who have operated under autocratic leaders are well-equipped to lead because they are coming into positions of upper management with their eyes wide open.
74	Autocratic leaders handicap progression in law enforcement. (SA)
75	Subordinates may have a better way or even a more efficient way of completing a task. (SA)
76	Autocratic leadership strategies can lead officers to keep as many things to themselves as possible, such as feelings, attitudes, and questions for fear of perceived retaliation. (SA)
77	Leaders should seek input from others (inside and outside agency), but not be scared to stand on a decision even when it is not the majority opinion. (SA)

Appendix N

Modified Delphi Round Three Consensus Statements

Number	Question	Consensus rating ≥ 75.00%

1	Autocratic leaders provide strict policies and guidelines to enforce compliance. (SA)	80.00%
6	Autocratic leaders do not challenge officers to come up with better ways of doing things or new solutions to problems they may face. (SA)	80.00%
7	Autocratic leaders are best utilized in emergency situations, where decisions have to be made quickly. (A)	80.00%
11	The autocratic strategy with the greatest effect on job satisfaction is "do as I say, not as I do". (SA)	80.00%
12	Autocratic leaders impair creativity and innovation within the department. (SA)	80.00%
13	Will make an employee afraid to think outside the box. (SA)	80.00%
15	Autocratic leadership should only be utilized in a crisis AFTER you have communicated the mission and vision to your team. (D)	80.00%
16	Autocratic leadership does not create a cohesive work environment. (A)	80.00%
17	Leaders should be open to what the subordinates have to say. (SA)	80.00%

18	Autocratic leaders will have poor morale when employees feel they are under your thumb and you dictate every move. (SA)	80.00%
19	Morale can also be severely affected by autocratic leaders. (SA)	80.00%
21	All strategies and practices used by leaders influence the morale of their officers. (SA)	80.00%
23	An autocratic leader can influence the morale of officers by not pursuing pay scales that keep their department competitive and giving their officers access to training that would expand their career. (SA)	80.00%
24	There are some good things that you can learn from autocratic leader, such as when decisions need to be made quickly without consulting with a large group of people. (A)	80.00%
25	Not the type of leadership 21st century policing needs at this time. (SA)	80.00%
26	Micro-management in its truest form displays the "do as you are told" mentality creating isolation and eroding trust. (A)	80.00%
27	Autocratic leaders are task oriented and have a specific way of accomplishing those tasks, and do not accept input from others. (SA)	80.00%

28	Autocratic leaders typically make choices based on their ideas or judgments and rarely accept advice from followers. (SA)	80.00%
29	Strategies implemented by autocratic leaders are ultimately self-serving. (SA)	80.00%
30	Becoming discouraged from sharing opinions and often becoming disgruntled causes officers to seek employment outside with another agency. (SA)	80.00%
31	Leads to a lack of initiative and free thinking which leads to loss in morale or feeling of inclusion. (SA)	80.00%
34	The inability to effectively exercise officer discretion and the constant second-guessing results in low job satisfaction. (A)	80.00%
36	Autocratic leaders lack fair promotional processes and restricts the ability to grow or provide opportunities for training. (A)	80.00%
40	Autocratic leaders hand pick training that falls in line with their thinking and their approach to doing the job. (SA)	80.00%
42	In a department with autocratic leadership, the only officers who have the opportunity for education and training are the officer's hand-picked by the leader.	80.00%

44	I believe in today's world of law enforcement, future leaders must maintain this type of leadership to make sure all officers are trained to the max. (SD)	80.00%
45	You must invest in your personnel to ensure that they have the education and training needed to carry out the organizations mission and goals. (SA)	80.00%
46	Autocratic leaders may discourage other leaders from encouraging training and education due to the distraction from their primary work functions. (A)	80.00%
47	I believe autocratic leadership puts limits on what officers can achieve and their willingness to improve. (A)	80.00%
48	If you want to succeed in law enforcement in the 21st century education and training is a must. (SA)	80.00%
50	I feel like it is important that future leaders study the different leadership styles and attempt to incorporate all the different leadership styles into their own personal leadership as they progress. (SA)	80.00%
51	I believe that no particular leadership style is greater than another and in law enforcement, a leader needs to learn to be flexible. (A)	80.00%
66	Leaders wanting to improve their department will be identifying their future needs and preparing their	80.00%

	departments by training officers to meet those future needs. (SA)	
67	What works for one employee does not always work for another employee and as a leader we should be flexible when the opportunity arises. (SA)	80.00%
74	Autocratic leaders handicap progression in law enforcement. (SA)	80.00%
75	Subordinates may have a better way or even a more efficient way of completing a task. (SA)	80.00%
76	Autocratic leadership strategies can lead officers to keep as many things to themselves as possible, such as feelings, attitudes, and questions for fear of perceived retaliation. (SA)	80.00%
77	Leaders should seek input from others (inside and outside agency), but not be scared to stand on a decision even when it is not the majority opinion. (SA)	100.00%

Appendix O

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round One

SUMMARY → DESIGN SURVEY → PREVIEW & SCORE → COLLECT RESPONSES → ANALYZE RESULTS → PRESENT RESULTS

Survey Design

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round One

Created on 11/3/2020

5	28
PAGES	QUESTIONS

Survey Language: **English**

Theme: **Arctic**

Logo added ❓

Logic added ❓

🖉 EDIT DESIGN

🔗 PREVIEW SURVEY

Did you know?

Responses and Status

TOTAL RESPONSES	OVERALL SURVEY STATUS •	NOTIFICATIONS ❓
15	CLOSED	Only you
		Edit

Response Collectors

CLOSED

Round One
Created: 11/19/2020

15
RESPONSES
COLLECTED

Responses Volume

November 5 - December 11

ANALYZE RESULTS

253

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round One

SUMMARY → DESIGN SURVEY → PREVIEW & SCORE → **COLLECT RESPONSES** → ANALYZE RESULTS → PRESENT RESULTS

ⓘ **New: copy a collector!** You can create a copy of a Web Link collector to send your survey again at a different time or to a new group of people. Click the ... icon next to the collector you want to copy.

X

Survey Collectors

⛏ BUY TARGETED RESPONSES　　**ADD NEW COLLECTOR ▼**

NICKNAME	STATUS	RESPONSES	DATE MODIFIED ▲	
Round One Created 11/19/2020	CLOSED	15	Tuesday, December 22, 2020 2:21 PM	•••

COLLECTORS: 1 of 1

SUMMARY → DESIGN SURVEY → PREVIEW & SCORE → COLLECT RESPONSES → ANALYZE RESULTS → PRESENT RESULTS

« Back to All Collectors

Round One ⧉

Link created: 11/19/2020

Manual Data Entry »   CLOSED ▼

🔗 https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PerformanceMoraleJobS   CUSTOMIZE   COPY

⬇ DOWNLOAD QR CODE ⓘ

Copy and paste this link anywhere to share your survey. For example, paste it in an email, on a website, or share it on social media. The link works as long as the collector is open. Web link collectors ⧉ are open by default.

THUMBNAIL IMAGE & TEXT: Default	ⓘ	∨
RECURRENCE: Customized web links can't be part of a recurrence. Why can't I edit this option?	ⓘ	∨
CUSTOM THANK YOU: Off	ⓘ	∨
SURVEY END PAGE: Upgrade to show a custom page to people who complete your survey.	ⓘ	∨
MULTIPLE RESPONSES: On	ⓘ	∨
RESPONSE EDITING: On, until survey complete	ⓘ	∨
ANONYMOUS RESPONSES: On	ⓘ	∨
INSTANT RESULTS: Off	ⓘ	∨
CUTOFF DATE AND TIME: Off	ⓘ	∨
RESPONSE LIMITS: Off	ⓘ	∨
IP RESTRICTIONS: Off	ⓘ	∨
PASSWORD PROTECTION: On	ⓘ	∨
CUSTOM DISQUALIFICATION: Off	ⓘ	∨

Hide advanced options

Buy Survey Responses

Get real-time feedback from our panel of global respondents. See results in minutes.

GET STARTED

New! Reach more people with Messenger

Use our Facebook Messenger Template to get feedback from people wherever they are in the world.

TRY IT

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Two

Survey Design

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Two

Created on 11/20/2020

5	86
PAGES	QUESTIONS

Survey Language: English

Theme: Arctic

Logo added ❓

Logic added ❓

☑ EDIT DESIGN

🔗 PREVIEW SURVEY

Did you know?

Responses and Status

TOTAL RESPONSES	OVERALL SURVEY STATUS ●	NOTIFICATIONS ❓
15	CLOSED	Only you
		Edit

Response Collectors

CLOSED		15
Round Two		RESPONSES
Created: 12/22/2020		COLLECTED

Responses Volume

December 20 - December 30

ANALYZE RESULTS

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Two

New: copy a collector! You can create a copy of a Web Link collector to send your survey again at a different time or to a new group of people. Click the ... icon next to the collector you want to copy.

Survey Collectors

[⊞ BUY TARGETED RESPONSES] [ADD NEW COLLECTOR ▼]

	NICKNAME	STATUS	RESPONSES	DATE MODIFIED ▲	
🔗	Round Two Created 12/22/2020	CLOSED	15	Thursday, December 31, 2020 10:33 AM	•••

COLLECTORS: 1 of 1

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Two

« Back to All Collectors

Round Two ⧉

Link created: 12/20/2020

Manual Data Entry »   CLOSED ▾

🔗 https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PerformanceMoraleJobS   CUSTOMIZE   COPY

⬇ DOWNLOAD QR CODE ⓘ

Copy and paste this link anywhere to share your survey. For example, paste it in an email, on a website, or share it on social media. The link works as long as the collector is open. Web link collectors ⧉ are open by default.

THUMBNAIL IMAGE & TEXT: Default	ⓘ ∨
RECURRENCE: Customized web links can't be part of a recurrence. Why can't I edit this option?	ⓘ ∨
CUSTOM THANK YOU: Off	ⓘ ∨
SURVEY END PAGE: Upgrade to show a custom page to people who complete your survey.	ⓘ ∨
MULTIPLE RESPONSES: On	ⓘ ∨
RESPONSE EDITING: On, until survey complete	ⓘ ∨
ANONYMOUS RESPONSES: On	ⓘ ∨
INSTANT RESULTS: Off	ⓘ ∨
CUTOFF DATE AND TIME: Off	ⓘ ∨
RESPONSE LIMITS: Off	ⓘ ∨
IP RESTRICTIONS: Off	ⓘ ∨
PASSWORD PROTECTION: On	ⓘ ∨
CUSTOM DISQUALIFICATION: Off	ⓘ ∨

Hide advanced options

Buy Survey Responses

Get real-time feedback from our panel of global respondents. See results in minutes.

GET STARTED

New! Reach more people with Messenger

Use our Facebook Messenger Template to get feedback from people wherever they are in the world.

TRY IT

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Three

Survey Design

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Three

Created on 1/4/2021

6 PAGES

93 QUESTIONS

Survey Language: **English**

Theme: **Arctic**

Logo added ❓

Logic added ❓

✏ EDIT DESIGN

🔗 PREVIEW SURVEY

Did you know?

Responses and Status

TOTAL RESPONSES

15

OVERALL SURVEY STATUS •

CLOSED

NOTIFICATIONS ❓

Only you

Edit

Response Collectors

CLOSED

Round Three
Created: 1/4/2021

15 RESPONSES COLLECTED

Responses Volume

Tue 5:00 PM - Fri 4:00 PM

259

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Three

SUMMARY → DESIGN SURVEY → PREVIEW & SCORE → COLLECT RESPONSES → ANALYZE RESULTS → PRESENT RESULTS

ⓘ **New: copy a collector!** You can create a copy of a Web Link collector to send your survey again at a different time or to a new group of people. Click the ... icon next to the collector you want to copy.

✕

Survey Collectors

⬛ BUY TARGETED RESPONSES   ADD NEW COLLECTOR ▼

NICKNAME	STATUS	RESPONSES	DATE MODIFIED ▲	
🔗 Round Three Created 1/4/2021	CLOSED	15	Saturday, January 09, 2021 1:55 PM	•••

COLLECTORS: 1 of 1

Performance, Morale, & Job Satisfaction in Law Enforcement with Autocratic Leaders: A Modified Delphi Study Round Three

SUMMARY → DESIGN SURVEY → PREVIEW & SCORE → COLLECT RESPONSES → ANALYZE RESULTS → PRESENT RESULTS

« Back to All Collectors

Round Three

Link created: 1/4/2021

Manual Data Entry »   CLOSED

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PerformanceMoraleJobS   CUSTOMIZE   COPY

↓ DOWNLOAD QR CODE

Copy and paste this link anywhere to share your survey. For example, paste it in an email, on a website, or share it on social media. The link works as long as the collector is open. Web link collectors are open by default.

| THUMBNAIL IMAGE & TEXT: Default |
| RECURRENCE: Customized web links can't be part of a recurrence. Why can't I edit this option? |
| CUSTOM THANK YOU: Off |
| SURVEY END PAGE: Upgrade to show a custom page to people who complete your survey. |
| MULTIPLE RESPONSES: On |
| RESPONSE EDITING: On, until survey complete |
| ANONYMOUS RESPONSES: On |
| INSTANT RESULTS: Off |
| CUTOFF DATE AND TIME: Off |
| RESPONSE LIMITS: Off |
| IP RESTRICTIONS: Off |
| PASSWORD PROTECTION: On |
| CUSTOM DISQUALIFICATION: Off |
| Hide advanced options |

Buy Survey Responses

Get real-time feedback from our panel of global respondents. See results in minutes.

GET STARTED

New! Reach more people with Messenger

Use our Facebook Messenger Template to get feedback from people wherever they are in the world.

TRY IT