

Police Job Satisfaction in Turkey: Effects of Demographic, Organizational and Jurisdictional Factors

HASAN BUKER¹
OSMAN DOLU²

Center for the Study and Prevention of Crime and Delinquency
Turkish National Police Academy, Ankara-Turkey

This paper examines the issue of job satisfaction in the context of the Turkish National Police (TNP). It brings a comparative view to the factors affecting the level of job satisfaction among police personnel. In addition, this study is the first attempt to assess the level of job satisfaction among the members of the TNP. The validity of the factors, which were found to be effective in determining police officers' job satisfaction in the US and that of employees of other countries' law enforcement agencies, were tested on a nationally organized, centralized police department.

Using survey data collected in Turkey during the summer of 2005, we employed multivariate statistics (OLS) and multilevel modeling techniques (HLM) in our analyses to address (a) the level of job satisfaction among the members of the TNP in comparison to their US counterparts and (b) the effects of demographic, jurisdictional, and macro/micro-level work environment factors on the officers' level of job satisfaction. The results supported some of the earlier findings, but also provided different outcomes from the existing body of related literature. In conclusion, we suggest and discuss several policy implications for the future of the TNP and for the study of police management in general terms.

INTRODUCTION

Given the continually changing nature of society, policing is one of the most complicated social service activities, made more so by the general population's increasing fear of crime and expanded demands of service from police organizations. Success in policing, as in other social services, is related to the level of job satisfaction held by police personnel, in addition to other factors affecting the organizational success (Lambert, Hogan & Barton, 2002; Jaramillo, Nixon & Sames, 2005; Lurigo & Rosenbaum, 1994). Despite increasing interest in the issue of personnel satisfaction linked to thriving community policing applications, knowledge regarding job satisfaction in police organizations is, at best, limited (Buzawa, Austin & Bannon, 1994; Dantzker, 1994). In the search for the factors affecting the level of satisfaction among police officers, most studies have relied on data retrieved from US police organizations. These studies have usually indicated two major groups of factors affecting the level of satisfaction among police personnel (O'Leary-Kelly & Griffin, 1995): (a) demographic characteristics of the officers (e.g., Buckley & Petrunik, 1995; Griffin, Dunbar & McGill, 1978; Jacobs & Cohen, 1978; Lofkowitz,

1974), and (b) the work environment characteristics of the organizations (e.g., Greene, 1989; Winfree & Taylor, 2004; Zhao, Thurman & He, 1999).

Demographic backgrounds of the officers, such as age, gender, ethnicity, education, rank, and job tenure, have been widely assessed as potential sources of job satisfaction in policing studies (see Buzawa, 1984; Lim & Teo, 1998). Although work environment has also been recognized widely as another strong predictor of job satisfaction in general (Agho, Mueller & Price, 1993; Brown & Sounders, 1990), policing studies have not paid as much attention to this factor as they have to demographics (Matrofski, Ritti & Snipes, 1994; Zhao, et al., 1999). Several theoretical frameworks, such as “Hierarchy of Needs Theory” (Maslow, 1943) or “Achievement Motivation Theory” (McClelland, 1985), examined work environments to find out what motivates employees. In general, police administration texts focus on Herzberg’s (1968) two-factor theory of motivation to explain the effects of work environment on police job satisfaction (see, Fyfe, Greene, Walsh, Wilson & McLaren, 1997; Roberk, Kuykendall & Novak, 2002; Sheehan and Corner, 1995; Whisenand, 2004). Herzberg indicated that satisfaction and dissatisfaction in a job originate with factors directly related to work environment, such as administrative policies, supervision, salary, work conditions, and recognition of achievements. In any of these theories, the police job satisfaction/work environment relationship remains largely undetermined, especially outside of the US. Some other organizational characteristics, such as serving in an urban or rural area, or the department size, have also been examined as potential sources of job satisfaction among police personnel (Dantzer, 1997; Winfree & Taylor, 2004).

Taking these facts as its starting point, this study intends to assess the effects of generally examined demographic variables, work environment, and department characteristics on the job satisfaction levels of the personnel of a police agency outside the US: the Turkish National Police (TNP), the national law enforcement agency of Turkey. TNP is a centralized, democratic police organization realizing the tasks of policing regarded as normal in any democratic country, such as the detection and prevention of crime in the interest of public safety (Skolnick, 1999). Examining an important issue of contemporary policing, job satisfaction, based on data collected from a non-Western police department, the general aim of this study is twofold: (a) for the first time³, empirically assessing the level of job satisfaction and its correlates among the members of the TNP, and (b) testing the validity of existing information regarding the sources of job satisfaction for police personnel, which is mostly derived from local-level US police departments, on a centralized, multi-jurisdictional and unified police organization.

Sources of Job Satisfaction in Policing

Generally referred to as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job” (Locke, 1976: 1300), more specifically, job

satisfaction can also be defined as “the state of mind that results from an individual’s needs or values being met by the job and its environment” (Hopkins, 1983: 32). Having a higher level of satisfaction among the employees of an organization is considered to be important for several reasons. Buzawa (1984: 61) stated that “studying patterns of job satisfaction is important due to their correlation with important employee behavioral characteristics and potentially dramatic effects on overall performance of the organization.” For instance, a high level of job satisfaction is positively related to the employee’s commitment to the organization (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Brown & Peterson, 1993; Johnston, Futrell, Parasuraman & Black, 1990; Lim & Teo, 1998) and to the general well-being of the officers (Kohan & O’Connor, 2002). A higher level of commitment to the organization, in turn, is related conversely to the boundary-spanning employee turnover (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Simmons, Cochran & Blount, 1997). Decreasing turnover rates is an important outcome of increasing criminal justice employees’ level of job satisfaction, where the cost of hiring and training new personnel is relatively higher than for many other institutions and organizations (Haar, 2005; Howard & Boles, 2004).

In general, job satisfaction is a multifaceted management concept in both public and private organizations, composed of several factors such as satisfaction with supervision, the work itself, benefits, appraisal, promotion practices, and coworkers (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). To determine the factors affecting the level of satisfaction in several aspects of police work, existing studies have dealt with multiple variables. Related studies in policing have generally examined two types of factors as the sources of job satisfaction: individual characteristics and work environment (O’Leary-Kelly & Griffin, 1995).

Individual Characteristics

The personnel’s demographic characteristics constitute an important part of the studies on police job satisfaction (see Buckney & Petrunik, 1995; Buzowa, 1984; Griffin, et al., 1978; Lofkowitz, 1974). ‘Years in the service’ is one of the generally examined variables in this category. The general finding of these studies is that seniority and job satisfaction are negatively related (Buzawa, et al., 1994; Dantzker, 1994; Zhao, et al., 1999). To explain this situation, they usually rely on the argument that alienation and cynicism increase with the years in service, and so does the dissatisfaction with the work (Gaines, 1993). The counterargument, however, is that organizational values such as loyalty and commitment increase with seniority and, therefore, the level of satisfaction increases the longer the time on the job (Griffin, et al., 1978; Schnitzius & Lester, 1980). In both arguments, a curvilinear relationship structure is mentioned to be a problematic issue, which implies that the decrease or increase in the level of satisfaction may begin after a certain point of employment in a department (Dantzker, 1994; Griffin, et al., 1978; Lim & Teo, 1998). There are also other studies that found no significant effect of this variable on the level of job satisfaction (Bennet, 1997; Lester & Butler, 1980). Since rank is related

to seniority in many police agencies, it is a variable generally covered within this issue and, thus, yields identical results.

Gender and ethnicity are two other important variables used to explain the differences in job satisfaction among police personnel. It is mostly due to the historical dominance of white male personnel in police organizations (Grant, Garrison & McCormic, 1990; Leonard, 1985; Martin, 1980; Sullivan, 1993) and indifference to the needs of minority and female officers (Alex, 1976; Schulz, 1995; Steel & Lovrich, 1997). In general, it is hypothesized that the female and the minority officers would be in the group least satisfied with their job. Several studies examining the effects of these two important variables, however, reached mixed results on the issue. Buzowa, et al., (1994) and Burke & Mikkelsen (2005), for example, reported that female and minority officers are more likely to be dissatisfied with their job than the other members of police organizations (see also, Dowler, 2005). Lim and Teo (1998) and Dantzker and Betsy (1998), on the other hand, concluded that there is not a significant difference between male and female officers in terms of job satisfaction and commitment to the department. Likewise, Buzowa (1984) reported mixed results across jurisdictions with regard to the effects of gender and race on the level of satisfaction among police officers.

The educational background of the employees is also considered to be a potential source of job satisfaction among police personnel. Since the beginning of the modernization of the criminal justice system and policing in the late 1960s, education has always been accepted as an essential factor in effective and successful law enforcement in American society (see, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967). With this shift, the education level of officers rose dramatically between the 1960s and 1990s (Carter & Sapp, 1990). Substantial empirical results of this rise, however, have not been clearly evaluated (see, Zhao, et al., 1999). The studies examining the education/job satisfaction relationship have reached divergent results. Lofkowitz (1974), for example, reported that the level of education is conversely related to the level of job satisfaction, whereas Buzowa (1984) noted the contrary situation for one of his research sites, but could not find the same result in the other site. Dantzker (1994, 1998) found that education level, at best, weakly affected job satisfaction (see also, Sherman, 1980). Griffin, et al. (1978) stated that the level of education did not make any difference to the officers' level of job satisfaction.

In general, existing studies indicate that demographic characteristics of the individuals, as control or explanatory variables, are of limited capacity to contribute substantively to the understanding of the sources of police job satisfaction (see Buzowa, 1984; Buzowa, et al., 1994; Zhao, et al., 1999). Work environment characteristics, however, have been indicated to have more potential to explain the sources of job satisfaction among members of police organizations (see, Buzowa, et al., 1994; Zhao, et al., 1999).

Work Environment

In this context, researchers examined the effects of work itself, workplace, and several work-related applications on the level of employees' job satisfaction. Since the emergence of community policing applications in many police departments, understanding the effects of the work environment on the officers' positive behaviors towards these innovations has become more important (Zhao, et al., 1999). Community policing applications, moreover, promise to provide a more supportive environment to the officers by empowering their problem-solving and decision-making skills (Trojanovicz & Buckueroux, 1990), which, in turn, are supposed to improve the positive attitudes of officers towards their job.

Recent studies on the job satisfaction of police officers indicate that creating more opportunities for officers to participate in decision-making processes, improve their problem-solving skills, and have more autonomy in their daily activities, along with similar innovations in police management, improves the level of job satisfaction among officers (Adams, Rohe & Arcury, 2002; Halsted, Bromley & Cochran, 2000; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997; Trojanovicz & Buckueroux, 1990; Wycoff & Skogan, 1993).

Despite the fact that some aspects of work environment, such as management practices, have sparked some attention in recent years, the effects of the immediate work environment have not been examined extensively in police job satisfaction studies. As mentioned in the earlier parts of this study, Herzberg's (1968) two-factor theory indicated some important factors that motivate employees in their work environment. At the center of Herzberg's theory is the argument that job satisfaction is rooted mainly in the job context, which is found in the work *environment* (original emphasis). This context includes perceptions about the importance of the work itself, the autonomy and responsibility of the employee while conducting his or her duties, and the recognition/guidance received about the work performed. These issues, from a theoretical perspective, provide a framework for what should be considered as job characteristics that may potentially affect the level of job satisfaction.

In a recent study, Zhao and his colleagues (1999) examined the effects of intrinsic work conditions on police officers' level of job satisfaction. They indicated that the police officers' job satisfaction could generally be explained by the characteristics of their job, which is found in their intrinsic work environment. They, indeed, reported that work environment factors explain more variation in the level of participants' level of job satisfaction than demographic characteristics. The emphasis at the end of their study was on the fact that these results are based on data collected from a medium-sized US police department. They then invite other scholars to test the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction of police officers with different study designs and in different contexts.

Following this invitation, Lambert, Hogan and Barton (2000) also examined the importance of immediate work environment on the level of job satis-

faction across police officers conducting traditional and community-oriented policing duties. Their study, similar to Zhao, et al.'s (1999) findings, indicated that, regardless of assignment type, immediate work environment is an important predictor of job satisfaction in several dimensions (work itself, supervisors and coworkers).

Several studies in American policing indicated that there are numerous differences in small town and metropolitan police organizations in the sense of approaching their duties, their expectations for their jobs, and attitudes towards their jobs (see Eisenstein, 1982). More specifically, these studies indicated that small and mid-sized agencies are mostly concerned with crime prevention, whereas larger departments are more criminal law-enforcement-oriented (Decker, 1979; Meager, 1985). Since these organizational and social contextual differences are rooted in department structures and sizes, it is generally assumed that the job satisfaction levels of police officers might be affected by these factors (see, Winfree & Taylor, 2004). Examining 14 municipal police departments in the US, Dantzker (1997) reported that agency size creates a difference in the level of police job satisfaction. He found that the fewer the number of personnel in an organization, the more satisfied the employees. Winfree and Taylor (2004), on the other hand, examining the members of a central police organization from rural, small-town and metropolitan police departments, noted that there was not a significant difference in the general attitudes of the officers, including job satisfaction. They explained this situation with the fact that there is a mutual cultural background among the officers due to the unified training and management applications.

Policing in Turkey has been thriving following the general movement towards more efficient public organizations in the West (Boland & Fowler, 2000). The European Union (EU) membership process has also fueled this movement in the TNP. Examining job satisfaction, its components and sources in the TNP is timely, therefore, in order to plan future managerial strategies within the organization. Mostly describing the conditions valid also for Turkey, Bennet (1997: 296) stated the importance of examining the issue of police job satisfaction in a developing society as follows:

Job satisfaction is an especially important concept for policing in less developed nations throughout the world. With democratization and human rights rapidly becoming international imperatives, knowledge about how to increase receptivity to change in traditional policies and operations, reduce costly turnover in personnel, and increase the incidence of cooperative behavior is necessary. Most police forces in the developing world operate with very limited financial and personnel resources, so they must understand how to use those resources most effectively and efficiently. At the same time, developing nations... are experiencing dramatic increases in crime, and particularly crimes of violence, that challenge their established ways of operating.

Job satisfaction, as mentioned earlier, is accepted as an important factor determining numerous employee attitudes. For the first time, this study assess-

es the issue of job satisfaction among members of the TNP. Another important mission of this study is to fill the gap within the literature on police job satisfaction with regard to the lack of adequate information about the employees of non-Western police organizations (see also, Lim & Teo, 1998).

Method

Data

The data used for this study comes from a survey administered among the members of the TNP in the summer of 2005. The overall study is a revised replication of a survey conducted by Washington State University's Division of Governmental Studies and Services for the Spokane Police Department (Zhao, et al., 2003). Since the department is a national, centralized unit, the survey was conducted in seven different jurisdictions. These jurisdictions were purposefully chosen to provide a representative sample. Each jurisdiction is from a different geographical region of Turkey, from small-town departments to metropolitan police departments.⁴ In addition, these jurisdictions have different populations, crime rates, numbers of officers, and growth rates, in order to maintain a representative sample. These jurisdiction characteristics are displayed in Table 2. Civilian officers,⁵ police officers and mid-level supervisors were invited to participate voluntarily in the survey because of the conceptual considerations of the study, namely, assessing perceptions about mid-level supervisors. From 1,015 questionnaire forms, 812 were filled and returned appropriately, constituting an 80% response rate.

Research Design

Existing research indicates that a study assessing the sources of police job satisfaction should cover the effects of two main factors: demographic characteristics and work environment. The design of the current study, therefore, is structured accordingly. Several demographic characteristics of the participants and the variables reflecting work environment were correlated with different facets of job satisfaction. Furthermore, these variables were regressed in ordinary and hierarchical multilevel models to evaluate their prediction strengths over job satisfaction indicators.

As indicated above, most of the studies examining these two common factors relied on data derived from US police organizations, which are mostly local law enforcement agencies. An important difference in this study is the fact that it examines these factors on a national, centralized, and multi-jurisdictional law enforcement agency outside the US: the Turkish National Police (TNP). In this context, the policing applications in all jurisdictions of the departments are virtually identical, due to the fact that the laws regulating policing practices, police recruitment, and training and education are identical. Indeed, the centrality of management gives little discretion to local police

chiefs to implement their own policies, which, in turn, brings uniformity to policing all around the country. Routine rotation of the officers across jurisdictions and throughout various regions of the country, as well as nearly standardized pay in all jurisdictions, are other elements increasing the uniformity of social context within the TNP. Seven different TNP jurisdictions, ranging from metropolitan city departments to small-town police departments, have been included in this study. This structure gives this study an opportunity to assess the effects of different department sizes and workloads in a centralized police organization where the uniformity of social contexts and work attitudes are expected to be similar. The first aim of this study, then, is to take this opportunity and examine the effects of jurisdictional differences, in a centralized police organization setting, on employees' job satisfaction levels.

The multilevel nature of the data, however, violates the general assumption of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. Since the participants of this survey were clustered by seven different jurisdictions of the TNP, error terms in predicting their level of job satisfaction might not be independent. During the analyses of data in this study, therefore, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) techniques (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) have also been employed, along with OLS models, to account for individual-level independent variables (level 1) and jurisdiction-level variables (level 2) separately.

Second, this study intends to bring a comparative view to the issue of police job satisfaction. Although the TNP is a national police organization, comparing the personnel job satisfaction scores from the TNP with an American police department might, at least, help to shed light on the situation for the TNP. In an extension to the main body of analysis, therefore, Spokane PD members' job satisfaction scores (Zhao, et al., 2003) were used to maintain a comparative approach. This comparison, on the face of it, seems valid because the Spokane PD survey results are recent, use the same measures, and present departmental demographics close to the average demographics of the TNP. In addition, several other items, such as the level of bureaucracy (as measured by an index measure as explained below), measures concerning the participants' perceptions of their work, and the participants' level of commitment to their departments (the TNP and the Spokane Police Department, respectively) were also compared.

Dependent Variable

Job satisfaction is the primary dependent variable in this study. In general, job satisfaction is measured in global and specific faceted formats (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). In the global format, employees are asked about their general satisfaction with their job (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). In the specific faceted measurements, however, employees are asked about their satisfaction with different aspects of their job, such as the work itself, supervision, and salary. Based on the recommendations of Dantzker (1993), a faceted measure, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969)

was used in this study. This instrument can identify five facets of job satisfaction: satisfaction with the work itself, supervisor, coworkers, pay, and promotion. In the analysis, three of these facets were used: (a) satisfaction with job content ($\alpha=.68$), (b) satisfaction with supervisor ($\alpha=.72$), and (c) satisfaction with coworkers ($\alpha=.80$). The validity of this measure was also proved in several other studies (see Hulin, 1969; Hulin & Water, 1971).

Independent Variables

Two groups of independent variables were used in the analyses. In the first group, the demographic characteristics of the participants and their perceptions regarding macro- and micro-level factors on their work environment and job context were included. Age, gender, rank, marital status, education level, and years in the department were used as demographic characteristics of the participants. In addition, participants' perceptions in regards to job content were included in order to assess the effects of the work environment on the level of job satisfaction. A model assessing three important factors in job content—perceptions regarding the importance of the work itself, the level of responsibility required by the work, and the recognition received for the work—was generated by Hackman and Oldham (1980). In their measure, jobs that motivate people contain three properties: (a) *meaningfulness* of the work (employees' perceiving the work as worthwhile and important), (b) *responsibility* in the work (employees' perceiving themselves to be accountable for the outcomes of the work), and (c) *knowledge* about the results of the work (employees' perceptions of the feedback they receive about the work).

These three core characteristics of the work environment are assessed according to five dimensions of the work. Experienced *meaningfulness* is assessed according to perceptions about the skill variety, task significance, and task identity in the work. Experienced *responsibility* is the product of perceptions regarding autonomy in the work. Finally, *knowledge* of the actual results of the work is calculated by assessing perceptions of the adequacy of feedback from superiors or colleagues regarding the effort involved in the work. In this model, the total outcome is defined as “high internal work motivation” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980: 73) (see Table 1). In summary, the five dimensions reflecting the motivating level of the work as used in this study are: skill variety ($\alpha=.65$), task significance ($\alpha=.58$), task identity ($\alpha=.56$), autonomy ($\alpha=.33$), and feedback ($\alpha=.67$).

Note that the alphas in some cases are not as large as one would desire. Hackman and Oldham (1980) themselves also stated that the job characteristics, as measured by JDS, are not independent from one another. When a job scores high on certain characteristics, it also tends to score high on certain other dimensions. They identified this as a limitation to their measurement and recommended approaching the results cautiously. In our study, these composite dimensions are included, because they have consistently been used in previous research and are accepted as valid measures of job motivation levels

Table 1: Three Psychological States of the Employees and Their Correlates.

| Core Job Characteristics | Critical Psychological States | Outcomes |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Skill Variety /Task Identity Task Significance | Experienced meaningfulness of the work | High internal work motivation |
| Autonomy | Experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work | |
| Feedback from Job | Feedback from job | |

(Retrieved from Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 77).

(see Aldag, Barr & Brief, 1981, for a review; see also, Zhao, He & Lovrich, 2002, and Zhao, et al., 2003, for recent examples).

Going beyond the characteristics of the intimate work environment, the macro-level organizational processes were also covered as a possible explanatory variable in employee satisfaction in police organizations. To assess the macro-level effects of the organizational processes, a bureaucracy index was used. The presence of bureaucracy within a particular department might also explain job satisfaction, as it does for other job-related attitudes, such as stress and commitment (see Reese, 1986; Violanti & Arron, 1994; Zhao, et al., 2002). In this study, bureaucracy is assessed with a composite measure of eight items ($\alpha=.79$). These items assess the respondents' perceptions about the presence of several problems within the department, such as excessive workload, too much red tape, inadequate equipment, poor working conditions, and inadequate management. The choices ranged from *1- no problem* to *3- serious problem*. The composite measure of bureaucracy, similar to Zhao, et al.'s (2002) measure, is a summed scale based on eight items (see Appendix A for all items). Several studies (Brown & Campbell, 1994; Coman & Evans, 1991) mention that these typical characteristics of the bureaucracy are generally defined in police organizations.

In the second group, available jurisdiction characteristics in our data were utilized as the actual number of crimes / population rate (for each 1,000 people) and the number of crimes / number of officers rate (for each 100 sworn officers) in order to assess the effects of jurisdiction characteristics. The latter formula indicates the workload in each department, whereas the former one is positively related with department size, in terms of jurisdiction population and number of officers. Seven jurisdictions of the TNP, from different sizes and different geographical regions of the country, were included in the data. The number of crimes represents the total number of cases that the police department actually dealt with in 2004, based on the official records of each jurisdiction's police department. Population is derived from the General Census of Turkey (2000), representing the number of residents within a particular jurisdiction. The number of officers reflects only the sworn-in personnel of the department actively dealing with policing duties.

Table 2a: Descriptive Statistics

| VARIABLES | N | % | MEAN | SD | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Gender</u> | | | | | | |
| Male (0) | 699 | 86 | | | | |
| Female (1) | 112 | 14 | | | | |
| <u>Marital Status</u> | | | | | | |
| Married (1) | 597 | 74 | | | | |
| Single (2) | 186 | 23 | | | | |
| Engaged (3) | 22 | 2.7 | | | | |
| Romantic relation (4) | 7 | 0.9 | | | | |
| <u>Years in the TNP</u> | | | | | | |
| 5 and below (1) | 309 | 38 | | | | |
| 6-10 (2) | 179 | 22 | | | | |
| 11-15 (3) | 181 | 22 | | | | |
| 16-20 (4) | 96 | 12 | | | | |
| 20 and above (5) | 47 | 5.8 | | | | |
| <u>Rank</u> | | | | | | |
| Civilian officer (1) | 24 | 3 | | | | |
| Line police officer (2) | 690 | 85 | | | | |
| Sergeant (3) | 70 | 8.6 | | | | |
| Lieutenant (4) | 27 | 3.3 | | | | |
| <u>Education Level</u> | | | | | | |
| High School (1) | 353 | 44 | | | | |
| Associates Degree (2) | 247 | 34 | | | | |
| Bachelor's Degree (3) | 161 | 20 | | | | |
| Graduate Degree (4) | 24 | 3 | | | | |
| <u>Job Dimensions</u> | | | | | <u>Min.</u> | <u>Max.</u> |
| Skill Variety | | | 4.7 | 1.58 | 1 | 7 |
| Task Identity | | | 4.08 | 1.59 | 1 | 7 |
| Task Significance | | | 5.59 | 1.23 | 1 | 7 |
| Autonomy | | | 3.42 | 1.44 | 1 | 7 |
| Feedback | | | 4.36 | 1.62 | 1 | 7 |
| <u>Job Satisfaction</u> | | | | | | |
| Satisfaction with work | | | 23.33 | 10.35 | 0 | 45 |
| Sat. with supervisors | | | 33.5 | 15.23 | 0 | 54 |
| Sat. with co-workers | | | 35.98 | 14.63 | 0 | 54 |
| <u>Commitment to TNP</u> | | | | | | |
| | | | 5.36 | 1.71 | 0 | 7 |
| <u>Bureaucracy Index</u> | | | | | | |
| | | | 18.2 | 4 | 7 | 24 |

Findings

In total, the results of 812 surveys from seven different jurisdictions of the TNP were examined. Most of the participants were male (86%), married (73.5%), line officers (85%), and between the ages of 26 and 35 (53.4%). All descriptive statistics of the participants and the included variables are displayed in Table 2a and 2b. The correlations between these variables are also provided as Appendix B.

Table 2b: Descriptive Statistics

| Jurisdictions | N | % | Population* | N. of Officers | N. of Crimes | Crime/Population** | Crime/Officers*** | Growth Rate**** |
|----------------------|----------|----------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| J-1 | 222 | 27.3 | 2897 | 17727 | 28643 | 9.8 | 165.8 | 22.15 |
| J-2 | 104 | 12.8 | 10033 | 27247 | 201892 | 20.12 | 740.9 | 29.47 |
| J-3 | 273 | 33.6 | 603 | 1133 | 8639 | 14.32 | 762.49 | 44.13 |
| J-4 | 28 | 3.4 | 82 | 165 | 886 | 10.74 | 536 | 28.49 |
| J-5 | 67 | 8.3 | 196 | 645 | 6820 | 34.73 | 1057.3 | -0.73 |
| J-6 | 63 | 7.8 | 93 | 153 | 827 | 8.87 | 540.52 | 46.27 |
| J-7 | 55 | 6.8 | 55 | 121 | 521 | 9.45 | 430.58 | 58.76 |

* (X) 1000

** Number of Crimes / Population (X) 1000

*** Number of Crimes / Number of officers (X) 100

**** Per Cent increase in the population between 1990 and 2000

When the satisfaction scores of the TNP members were compared with the scores of their colleagues from the Spokane PD, significant differences were discovered. The members of the TNP were significantly less satisfied with their work, supervisors and coworkers. The biggest difference was in satisfaction with the work itself. In the other comparable items, however, no significant differences were discovered except for in one—feedback at work. It is noteworthy that there was no significant difference between the commitment levels of Spokane PD and TNP members to their respective departments, which was contrary to expectations after finding out significant differences in all dimensions of job satisfaction measures. Possible explanations for this situation are discussed below. All other comparative scores are included in Table 3.

In order to find the explanatory effects of demographic, jurisdictional, and organizational variables, several different OLS and multilevel regression (HLM) models were run for each dimension of job satisfaction. In the beginning, only the demographic characteristics of the participants were included in Model 1 to assess the effects of individual-level factors over different dimensions of job satisfaction (Table 4). Then, work characteristics and organizational environment variables were added to the model (Model 2, Table 5). At the third stage, six jurisdiction dummy variables were added to Model 3, leav-

ing J-2 out of the equations as the reference group to assess whether jurisdiction characteristics can account for any of the residual variances, and multilevel regression models (HLM) were run using Generalized Linear Latent and Mixed Models (GLLAMM) (Table 6). Following this modeling, we compared group differences using ANOVA to see whether there were any differences among different dimensions of job satisfaction (Table 7) across the jurisdictions. Finally, jurisdiction-level characteristics were added in Model 3 and multilevel regression analyses were run (Table 8).

Table 3: Item Comparisons (Mean Scores/Standard Deviations)

| <i>Variables</i> | <i>TNP (n=812)</i> | <i>SPD (n=249)</i> | <i>t- test Score</i> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Satisfaction with work | 23.33 / 10.35 | 31.62 / 8.8 | -11.4** |
| Satisfaction with supervisor | 33.5 / 15.23 | 38.96 / 12.7 | -5.1** |
| Satisfaction with co-workers | 35.98 / 14.63 | 43.46 / 10.8 | -7.4** |
| Commitment to the Department | 5.36 / 1.71 | 5.26 / 1.31 | .9 |
| Skill variety at work | 4.7 / 1.5 | 3.56 / .65 | -11.08 |
| Task identity at work | 4 / 1.5 | 4.2 / 1.3 | -.95 |
| Task significance at work | 4.1 / 1.6 | 5.7 / 1 | -15.95 |
| Autonomy at work | 3.4 / 1.4 | 4.6 / .5 | -13.01 |
| Feedback at work | 4.3 / 1.6 | 4.6 / 1.1 | -2.24* |
| Bureaucracy at the Department | 18.2 / 4 | 13.3 / 2 | 17.13 |

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$

Effects of Demographics:

When the demographic characteristics of the participants were assessed alone in the first model as explanatory variables, age, rank, and marital status came out as significant predictors of satisfaction with the work itself. Older and higher-ranking participants were more satisfied with their work than younger and lower-ranking officers. Marital status had a negative effect on the satisfaction with work; in comparing married participants to unmarried ones, the satisfaction level decreased. The married participants were more satisfied with their work than the unmarried participants. Other demographic variables did not have a significant effect on the other two dimensions of job satisfaction, except for the effect of rank on the satisfaction with supervisors.

When the work characteristics, perceived organizational environment, and jurisdictional characteristics were included in the following OLS and HLM models over the demographic variables, however, no demographic variable, only the rank, remained a significant predictor of job satisfaction scores. The rank consistently remained a significant predictor of satisfaction with work itself in a positive relation. As the data moves from lower ranks to higher ones,

Table 4: Model 1 (OLS Regression) -Demographics Only Restricted Model

| PREDICTOR VARIABLES | MODEL 1 | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | SATISFACTION WITH WORK ITSELF | SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISOR | SATISFACTION WITH CO-WORKERS |
| <i>Demographic Characteristics</i> | B & SE | B & SE | B & SE |
| Age | 1.63/.77* | .64/1.18 | -.39/1.13 |
| Gender | -.10/.81 | .93/1.23 | -1.43/1.2 |
| Rank | 3.5/.78** | 3.66/1.2** | .14/1.15 |
| Education status | -.75/.46 | -.4/.7 | .13/.68 |
| Years in TNP | .67/.45 | .90/.69 | .56/.67 |
| Marital Status | -1.85/.94* | .20/1.4 | -.76/1.1 |
| Constant | 14.6/2.77*** | 21.8/4.2*** | 37.64/3.77*** |
| R ² | .088 | .02 | .005 |

*= p<.05 **=p<.01 ***=p<.001

Table 5: Model 2 (OLS) -Demographics & Work Characteristics

| PREDICTOR VARIABLES | MODEL 2 | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | SATISFACTION WITH WORK ITSELF | SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISOR | SATISFACTION WITH CO-WORKERS |
| <i>Demographic Characteristics</i> | B & SE | B & SE | B & SE |
| Age | .26/.64 | -.9/1.1 | -1.5/1.1 |
| Gender | -.09/.68 | .20/1.1 | -2.15/1.16 |
| Rank | 1.6/.66* | 2.1/1.1* | -1.2/1.13 |
| Education status | -.82/.38 | -.48/.65 | .06/.65 |
| Years in TNP | .14/.38 | .37/.65 | .03/.56 |
| Marital Status | -.26/.56 | 1.4/1 | -.15/1.1 |
| <i>Work Characteristics</i> | | | |
| Skill Variety | 1.4/.24*** | .48/.41 | .51/.42 |
| Task Identity | .8/.22*** | .25/.38 | .7/.38 |
| Task Significance | 1/.29** | 2/.5*** | .9/.5 |
| Autonomy | .97/.22*** | 1.5/.38*** | .8/.34* |
| Feedback | 1.14/.23*** | 1.5/.4*** | .9/.4* |
| <i>Organizational Environment</i> | | | |
| Bureaucracy Index | -.3/.07*** | -.5/.12*** | -.6/.12*** |
| Constant | 2.5/2.9 | 11.2/5.03* | 40.12/5.1*** |
| R ² | .39 | .20 | .11 |

*=p<.05 **=p<.01 ***=p<.001

the scores for satisfaction with work itself increased significantly even when the work characteristics, organizational characteristics and jurisdictional characteristics were taken into account in OLS and HLM models.

Effects of Work Characteristics

All three dimensions of core job characteristics (see Table 1) were significant predictors of satisfaction with work itself. Participants experiencing more meaningfulness in their work, experiencing more responsibility for outcomes of their work, and receiving more feedback from their job were significantly more satisfied with their job when all Level-1 (individual) and Level-2 (jurisdictional) variables were controlled in multilevel and ordinary regression models. For the level of satisfaction with supervisor, task significance, autonomy at work, and feedback from work were three significant predictors in all models. As the levels of significance of task, responsibility for work outcomes, and feedback on job increased, the level of satisfaction with supervisors also increased. Finally, satisfaction with coworkers was positively related with autonomy at work and feedback on work in all regression models.

Effects of Organizational Environment

The bureaucracy index, the only variable to assess the effects of organizational environment on the participants' levels of job satisfaction in this study, was a significant predictor for all dimensions of job satisfaction in all regression models. The participants perceiving more bureaucracy in their organizational environment were significantly less satisfied with their work, supervisors and coworkers.

Effects of Jurisdictional Characteristics

Since we used a multilevel data nested within seven different jurisdictions of the TNP, several analyses were conducted by hierarchical linear models to account for any jurisdictional level variance. Individual-level variables (L-1) —Demographics, perceived work characteristics, perceived organizational environment— were separated from jurisdictional-level variables (L-2). In Model 3 (Table 6), we found that the jurisdictional characteristics can account for the residual variance on the participants' levels of job satisfaction. In addition, an ANOVA test (Table 7) indicated that there were significant differences across the jurisdictions in the mean levels of job satisfaction of the participants. Following these findings, we employed two jurisdictional characteristics —crime rate and number of crimes per officer—in Model 4 (Table 8) and found that these characteristics were not related to the satisfaction with work itself. However, the number of crimes per officer in a jurisdiction was positively related to satisfaction with supervisor. When the average workload in a

jurisdiction increased, the levels of the participants' satisfaction with their supervisor also increased. On the other hand, crime rate in a jurisdiction was negatively related to satisfaction with coworkers. When the reported crime rate of a jurisdiction increased, the participants' levels of satisfaction with their coworkers decreased in a respective jurisdiction.

Table 6: Model 3(HLM) -Full Model

| PREDICTOR VARIABLES | | MODEL 3 | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | SATISFACTION WITH WORK ITSELF | SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISOR | SATISFACTION WITH CO-WORKERS | |
| <i>Demographic Characteristics</i> | B & SE | B & SE | B & SE | B & SE |
| Age | .183(.648) | -1.008(1.094) | -1.758(1.105) | |
| Gender (Female) | .021(.870) | 1.737(1.469) | -2.745(1.483) | |
| Rank | 1.581(.660)* | 2.197(1.114) | -1.369(1.125) | |
| Education Status | -.877(.381) | -.609(.643) | .039(.650) | |
| Years in TNP | .172(.380) | .432(.641) | .178(.647) | |
| Marital Status | .488(.783) | -1.125(1.322) | .790(1.334) | |
| <i>Work Characteristics</i> | | | | |
| Skill Variety | 1.366(.247)*** | .368(.416) | .390(.420) | |
| Task Identity | .776(.223)** | .246(.377) | .716(.381) | |
| Task Significance | .944(.292)** | 1.953(.493)*** | .813(.497) | |
| Autonomy | .978(.222)*** | 1.548(.376)*** | .736(.379)* | |
| Feedback | 1.119(.234)*** | 1.381(.396)*** | .755(.400)* | |
| <i>Jurisdiction</i> | | | | |
| J-1 | -1.816(1.007) | -4.604(1.699)** | -2.519(1.716) | |
| J-3 | -2.026(.991)* | -2.580(1.673) | -2.324(1.689) | |
| J-4 | -1.963(1.764) | -1.029(2.977) | -3.468(3.006) | |
| J-5 | -2.710(1.298)* | -4.655(2.190)* | -6.854(2.212)** | |
| J-6 | -1.452(1.333) | -1.841(2.249) | .770(2.271) | |
| J-7 | -1.164(1.387) | -3.547(2.341) | -3.370(2.364) | |
| <i>Organizational Environment</i> | | | | |
| Bureaucracy Index | -.292(.073)*** | -.510(.124)*** | -.590(.125)*** | |
| Constant | 4.283(2.665) | 18.900(4.498)*** | 39.882(4.542)*** | |
| Number of Observations | 811 | 811 | 811 | |
| Number of L1 Units | 811 | 811 | 811 | |
| Number of L2 Units | 7 | 7 | 7 | |

*=p<.05 **=p<.01 ***=p<.001

Table 7: Group Differences in Job Satisfaction across Jurisdictions - ANOVA

| Type of Job Satisfaction | Groups | Sum of squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Satisfaction with work itself index | Between Groups | 5207,132 | 6 | 867,855 | 8,547 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 81734,753 | 805 | 101,534 | | |
| | Total | 86941,885 | 811 | | | |
| Satisfaction with promotion | Between Groups | 2099,218 | 6 | 349,870 | 2,497 | ,021 |
| | Within Groups | 112814,024 | 805 | 140,142 | | |
| | Total | 114913,241 | 811 | | | |
| Satisfaction with supervisor | Between Groups | 7537,902 | 6 | 1256,317 | 5,596 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 180727,067 | 805 | 224,506 | | |
| | Total | 188264,969 | 811 | | | |
| Satisfaction with coworkers | Between Groups | 5837,739 | 6 | 972,956 | 4,667 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 167836,084 | 805 | 208,492 | | |
| | Total | 173673,823 | 811 | | | |

Table 8: Model 4 (HLM) -Full Model W/ Jurisdiction Level Characteristics

| PREDICTOR VARIABLES | MODEL 4 | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | SATISFACTION WITH WORK ITSELF | SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISOR | SATISFACTION WITH CO-WORKERS |
| <i>Demographic Characteristics</i> | B & SE | B & SE | B & SE |
| Age | .223(.648) | -.882(1.093) | -1.691(1.105) |
| Gender (Female) | -.131(.866) | 1.434(1.461) | -3.008(1.478) |
| Rank | 1.623(.662)* | 2.293(1.117) | -1.233(1.129) |
| Education Status | -.819(.380) | -.513(.641) | .101(.648) |
| Years in TNP | .131(.380) | .x2(.641) | .026(.649) |
| Marital Status | .461(.783) | -1.200(1.322) | .760(1.337) |
| <i>Work Characteristics</i> | | | |
| Skill Variety | 1.429(.245)*** | .496(.413) | .481(.418) |
| Task Identity | .800(.222)*** | .228(.375) | .698(.380) |
| Task Significance | 1.004(.291)*** | 2.041(.492)*** | .919(.497) |
| Autonomy | .976(.223)*** | 1.560(.377)*** | .764(.381)* |
| Feedback | 1.143(.235)*** | 1.441(.396)*** | .856(.401)* |
| <i>Jurisdiction Level Characteristics</i> | | | |
| Crime/Population | -.004(.065) | -.168(.110) | -.239(.112)* |
| Crime/Officer | -.000(.001) | .005(.002)* | .002(.002) |
| <i>Organizational Environment</i> | | | |
| Bureaucracy Index | -.299(.073)*** | -.522(.124)*** | -.601(.126)*** |
| Constant | 1.85(52.527) | 13.950(4.265) | 37.923(4.313)*** |
| Number of Observations | 811 | 811 | 811 |
| Number of L1 Units | 811 | 811 | 811 |
| Number of L2 Units | 7 | 7 | 7 |

*=p<.05 **=p<.01 ***=p<.001

Discussion

This study intends to fulfill two important goals: (a) for the first time, examining the state of job satisfaction among the members of the TNP, and (b) assessing the effects of generally examined correlates of satisfaction in policing in a non-US police organization and testing their validity in a nationally organized, centralized police department. Findings from this study, therefore, have implications for both the TNP and the general policing arena.

For the TNP, our analysis indicated that employees' level of job satisfaction, for all dimensions covered in the analyses, is significantly lower than their American colleagues' level of satisfaction. Although the comparative analysis was based on only one local police organization's data from the US, it still is instructive regarding TNP members' job satisfaction levels. Yet, this is a limitation of the study; future studies should make similar comparisons in more detail between the TNP and other nations' police organizations in order to test the findings of this study. An interesting outcome of this comparison is our findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and the level of commitment felt by employees. As mentioned earlier, several studies indicated that the level of job satisfaction is positively related to the commitment of a police officer to his/her respective department (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Brown & Peterson, 1993; Johnston, Futrell, Parasuraman & Black, 1990; Lim & Teo, 1998). In our comparative analysis, however, we discovered a great difference among the levels of job satisfaction scores, but not among the levels of commitment to the department, contrary to expectations. Based on this finding, it can be argued that the level of commitment in the TNP is mostly the result of several predictors other than the dimensions of job satisfaction. This finding should be studied further to understand possible other predictors of commitment for police officers beyond dimensions of job satisfaction.

Studying patterns of job satisfaction is especially important for the TNP as Turkey undergoes the process of attaining European Union membership, because of the potentially dramatic effects EU membership may have on the overall performance of the organization (Buzowa, 1984). The TNP, based on these results, should seriously consider what steps are necessary to modernize its managerial and organizational policies. Especially in recent years, there has been an increasing trend in the TNP of introducing effective and employee-centered management policies in order to make positive improvements to the organization. The results of this study, however, indicated that micro-level, as well as macro-level changes, in management issues are also important in determining the level of employee satisfaction. Organizational changes, therefore, should not stay at the macro-level, but rather, middle-level supervisors, who have the most direct relationship with first-line employees, should also participate in this movement. In order to do this, the managerial and leadership skills of the middle-level supervisors should be improved through several educational steps and training programs.

Also for the existing body of literature on the issue of police job satisfaction, the findings of this study are meaningful. The design of the analyses allowed us to assess the effects of demographic characteristics over the dimensions of job satisfaction *per se*, as well as control variables of other organizational factors. In general, our analyses indicated that the effects of demographic characteristics, with some exceptions, disappear in most of the job satisfaction dimensions when organizational environment characteristics and work characteristics are taken into consideration. With a general assessment,

therefore, this study supports earlier findings that organizational factors are stronger than several demographic characteristics in predicting job satisfaction in police organizations (see, Buzowa, et al., 1994; Greene, 1989; Winfree & Taylor, 2004; Zhao, et al., 1999). More specifically, Herzberg's (1968) two-way theory of job satisfaction, stating that satisfaction and dissatisfaction in a job comes from factors directly related to work environment, such as administrative policies, supervision, salary, working conditions, and recognition of employee achievements, is supported with our analyses.

There are also other implications from our findings in regards to the effects of demographics on the dimensions of job satisfaction. The first regression model indicated that age, rank, and marital status might be significant factors when they are assessed as explanatory variables. The rank and age were positively related to satisfaction with work, whereas experience in the department did not display the same significant relation. This situation is slightly different from the argument that organizational values such as loyalty and commitment increase with seniority and, in turn, level of satisfaction increases with increasing time on the job (Griffin, et al., 1978; Schnitzius & Lester, 1980). In this regard, the present result indicates that age, seniority, and rank should be assessed separately, because while age might be a significant predictor, seniority might not. This situation can be interpreted to mean that satisfaction with work is a product of maturity in life more than the length of time spent working in a department. Rank, in the TNP, is not related to seniority; graduates of the Turkish National Police Academy, which is the higher education unit of the department, can be assigned to managerial positions, despite relative youth and lack of experience in first-line duties. The satisfaction with work/rank relation, therefore, might not be associated with seniority in a department, but with increasing socioeconomic status, autonomy, and responsibility at work. Marital status was the final demographic characteristic affecting the levels of satisfaction with work in the first model. Married officers were more satisfied with their work than their unmarried counterparts. This finding, similar to the effect of age, might be interpreted as the product of maturity in life.

Work characteristics, assessing the effects of intrinsic work conditions on police officers' level of job satisfaction, displayed significant effects on all dimensions of job satisfaction. This finding, in general, supported the recent studies relying on data from US police organizations (Lambert, et al., 2000; Zhao, et al., 1999). Herzberg's (1968) two-way theory that the strongest predictors of job satisfaction could be found in the intimate work environment is supported by the findings of this study. This effect, however, might be at different levels across the dimensions of job satisfaction. In predicting satisfaction with work, for instance, all dimensions of job characteristics had strong effects while only autonomy and feedback were statistically significant in predicting satisfaction with coworkers. In general, however, when these variables were included in the regression models, the effects of demographic characteristics mostly disappeared. The overall explanatory powers of the models, moreover, drastically increased.

Another dimension of work-related conditions was assessed at the macro-level with a bureaucracy index. This index, as explained above, indicates the existence of several problematic issues at the organizational level. This variable had the most significant effect in all dimensions of job satisfaction. Earlier studies indicated significant effects of bureaucracy on several job-related attitudes of police officers (Reese, 1986; Violanti & Arron, 1994; Zhao, et al., 2002). Supporting these findings, our analyses indicated that police officers' satisfaction with their work, supervisors, and even with their coworkers is mostly related to their perceptions of macro-level organizational and administrative problems.

The multilevel analyses indicated that the jurisdictional characteristics matter for employees' levels of job satisfaction. However, the limitations of the data we used did not allow us to examine what these exact jurisdictional characteristics could be in predicting job satisfaction scores. From the information in our data, we utilized crime/population rate and crime/officer rate to understand the effects of crime rates and average workload in a given jurisdiction. Both of these jurisdictional characteristics displayed controversial effects in our multilevel regression analyses.

Contrary to Dantzer's (1997) findings about US police organizations, crime rate, which is also related to the dimension of the department, had no significant effect on satisfaction with work and satisfaction with supervisors. Our findings, however, support the arguments of Winfree and Taylor (2004); examining job-related attitudes of police officers, including job-satisfaction, from small- and large-sized jurisdictions of the New Zealand Police Department, which has a centralized structure similar to the TNP, they noted no significant differences across officers from different-sized jurisdictions. This was mostly due to the centralized setting of these police organizations, in which the educational and cultural backgrounds of the officers were uniform, and rotation across jurisdictions is common and routine. In the analysis examining satisfaction with coworkers, the effect of the crime/population rate remained significant even when the organizational and work-related variables were in the model. This situation indicates that in larger departments, values such as close friendships and kinship might not exist as they might in smaller departments.

Workload (crime/officer rate) had a controversial effect on satisfaction with supervisors. Our findings indicated that officers who work for the jurisdictions that have relatively heavy workloads are more satisfied with their supervisors. This situation might be explained by the argument that policing, in general, is a boring job and police officers are happier when they have opportunities to practice what they assess as "actual policing" (see, Manning, 1997). Caldero and Crank (2004) tapped into this issue while elucidating an ethical dilemma in policing, "noble cause corruption." An important part of this dilemma is caused by police officers' aggressiveness in seeking problems with which they can employ their skills and duties as officers. Based on these arguments, we may speculate that police officers whose heavy workloads⁶

keep them from boredom would be less concerned with the attitudes of their supervisors and coworkers. In addition, supervisors in these jurisdictions might also be more work-oriented and less concerned with other details that might be bothersome to their subordinates.

This study is an important step towards understanding the correlates of job satisfaction among police officers. Our study reveals that, regardless of demographic differences and the difficulties inherent in policing occupations (i.e., exposure to danger, heavy workload, etc.), officers might be more or less satisfied with their job. This is mostly due to micro-and macro-level organizational and administrative policies, rather than other demographic, jurisdictional, and inherent occupation-related factors. Police administrators should introduce effective strategies to diminish the negative effects of bureaucracy in their departments. Modern management techniques and a transformational leadership model (Northouse, 2001) at the micro-level can create a positive work environment, which would improve the officers' level of satisfaction with their job. Middle-level supervisors especially should pay attention to passing on the responsibility of first-line duties to their subordinates. In addition, giving feedback to subordinates on their performance at work and its results would be another way for supervisors to increase the satisfaction of their subordinates.

In all democratic settings in the world, policing plays a critical role in balancing increasing security needs and individual rights. The performance of police organizations is strongly related to their employees' level of satisfaction, as well as to other legal and social correlates (see, Bennet, 1997). Future studies in this subject should look at different police organizations in order to identify the predictors of police officers' job satisfaction in a consistent manner. Police officers who are more satisfied with their job will be an important guarantor of secure and free societies.

NOTES

1. Contact information: Hasan Buker, Turkish National Police Academy, Yüce-tepe Mah. Necatibey Cad. No: 108, 06580 Anittepe-Çankaya, Ankara. Telephone: 312-412-1286. Email: hbuker@pa.edu.tr The authors would like to thank Drs. Nicholas Lovrich and Solomon Zhao for their invaluable help.

2. Contact information: Osman Dolu, Turkish National Police Academy, Yüce-tepe Mah. Necatibey Cad. No: 108, 06580 Anittepe-Çankaya, Ankara. Telephone: 312-412-1286. Email: odolu@pa.edu.tr

3. A broad review of the literature did not yield any published study as of June 2008, either in English or Turkish, regarding job satisfaction in the TNP.

4. The administrative subunits are called "il" and "ilçe" in Turkish and are the equivalents of counties and cities in the American administrative structure.

5. Civilian officers are the equivalents of the non-sworn-in officers in the American system and usually hold supportive, secondary duties, such as typist, driver, etc.

6. Note that the heavy workload refers to the average number of real crime cases that an officer in a particular jurisdiction handled during the previous year.

REFERENCES

- Agho, A. O., Mueller, C. W., & Price, J. L. (1993). Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a casual model. *Human Relations, 46*: 1007-1027.
- Aldag, R. J., Barr, S. H., & Brief, A. P. (1981). Measurement of perceived task characteristics. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*: 415-431.
- Bennet, R. R. (1997). Job satisfaction among police constables: A comparative study in three developing nations. *Justice Quarterly, 14*: 295-323.
- Brayfield, A. & Rothe, H. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*: 307-311.
- Brown, H. E. & Saunders, P. M. (1990). Predictors of job satisfaction among telemarketing sales employees. *Journal of Direct Marketing, 4*: 49-57.
- Brown, S. P. & Peterson, R. A. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal affects. *Journal of Marketing Research, 30*: 63-77.
- Buckley, L. B. & Petrunic, M. G. (1995). Socio-demographic factors, reference groups and the career orientations, career aspirations and career satisfaction of Canadian police officers. *American Journal of Police, 14*: 107-148.
- Buzawa, E. (1984). Determining patrol officer job satisfaction: The role of selected demographic and job specific attitudes. *Criminology, 22*: 61-81.
- Buzawa, E., Austin, T., & Bannon, J. (1994). The role of selected socio-demographic and job specific variables in predicting patrol officer job satisfaction: A reexamination ten years later. *American Journal of Police, 13*: 51-75.
- Burke, R. J. & Mikkelsen, A. (2005). Gender issues in policing. *Women in Management Review, 20*: 133-143.
- Boland, T. & Fowler, T. (2000). A systems perspective of performance management in public sector organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 13*: 417-446.
- Brunetto, Y. & Farr-Wharton, R. (2003). The commitment and lower-ranked police officers: Lessons for management. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 26*: 43-63.
- Brown, J. A. & Campbell, E. A. (1990). Sources of occupational stressing police. *Work and Stress, 4*: 305-318.
- Caldero, M. A. & Crank, J. P. (2004). *Police Ethics: The Corruption of Noble Cause*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson.
- Comman, G. & Evans, B. (1991). Stressors facing Australian police in the 1990s. *Police Studies, 14*: 153-165.
- Carter, D. L. & Sapp, A. D. (1990). The evaluation of higher education in law enforcement: Preliminary findings from a national study. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 1*: 59-85.
- Cohen, A. (2000). The relationship between commitment forms and work outcomes: A comparison of three models. *Human Relations, 53*: 387-417.
- Cook, J., Hepworth, S., Wall, T., & Warr, P. (1981). *The Experience of Work: A Compendium and Review of 249 Measures and Their Use*. New York: Academic Press.

- Dantzker, M. L. (1993). Designing a measure of job satisfaction for policing: A research note. *American Journal of Police, 12*: 171-180.
- _____. (1994). Measuring job satisfaction in police departments and policy implications: An examination of a mid-size Southern police department. *American Journal of Police, 13*: 77-101.
- _____. (1997). Police officer job satisfaction: Does agency size make a difference? *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 8*: 309-322.
- Decker, S. (1979). The rural sheriff: An issue in social control. *Criminal Justice Review, 4*: 97-111.
- Dowler, K. (2005). Job satisfaction, burnout, and perception of unfair treatment: The relationship between race and police work. *Police Quarterly, 8*: 476-489.
- Eisenstein, J. (1982). Research on rural criminal justice: A summary. In S. Cronk, J. Jankovic & R.K. Green (Eds.), *Criminal Justice in Rural America*, pp. 105-143. Washington, DC: Department of Justice.
- Fyfe, J. J., Greene, J. R., Walsh, W. F., Wilson, O. W., & McLaren, R. C. (1997). *Police Administration*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gaines, L. (1993). Coping with the police job: Stress in police work. In Dunham, R. & Alpert, G. (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings*, pp. 338-350. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- General Census of Turkey. (2000). Retrieved from <http://www.die.gov.tr/konularr/nufusSayimi.htm> Accessed August 12, 2005.
- Greene, J. R. (1989). Police officer job satisfaction and community perceptions: Implications for community oriented policing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 26*: 168-183.
- Griffin, D. R., Dunbar, R. L., & McGill, M. E. (1978). Factors associated with job satisfaction among police personnel. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 6*: 77-85.
- Hackman, J. & Oldham, G. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Haar, R. N. (2005). Factors affecting the decision of police recruits to "drop out" of police work. *Police Quarterly, 8*: 431-453.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, 46*: 53-62.
- Hopkins, A. H. (1983). *Work and Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector*. New Jersey: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Howard, W. G. & Boles, J. S. (2004). Inter-domain work-family, family-work conflict and police work satisfaction. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 27*: 380-395.
- Hulin, C. L. (1969). Sources of variation in job and life satisfaction: The role of community and job related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*: 69-74.
- Hulin, C. L. & Water, L. K. (1971). Regression analysis of three variations of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*: 211-217.
- Jacobs, J. B. & Cohen, J. (1978). The impact of racial integration on the police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 6*: 168-183.

- Jaramillo, F., Nixon, R., & Sames, D. (2005). The effect of law enforcement stress on organizational commitment. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 28: 321-336.
- Johnston, M. W., Futrell, C. M., Parasuraman, A., & Black, W.C. (1990). A longitudinal assessment of the impact of selected organizational influences on salespeople's organizational commitment during early employment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27: 334-344.
- Kohan, A., & O'Connor, B. P. (2002). Police officer job satisfaction in relation to mood, well-being, and alcohol consumption. *The Journal of Psychology*, 136: 307-318.
- Lawton, B. A., Hickman, M. J., & Piquero, A. R. (2000). Assessing the interrelationships between perceptions of impact and job satisfaction: A comparison of traditional and community-oriented policing officers. *Justice Research and Policy*, 2: 47-72.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2002). A review of the literature on the correlates of correctional staff job satisfaction. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 29: 115-143.
- Lester, D. & Butler, A. J. (1980). Job satisfaction and cynicism in police: A cross-national comparison. *Police Studies*, 2: 44-45.
- Lim, V. K. & Teo, T. S. (1998). Effects of individual characteristics on police officers' work related attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 13: 334-342.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Behavior*, pp. 1297-1349. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lofkowitz, J. (1974). Job attitudes of police: Overall description and demographic correlates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 5: 221-230.
- Lurigo, A. J. & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994). The impact of community policing on police personnel: A review of the literature. In D.P. Rosenbaum (Eds.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Manning, P. K. (1997). *Police Work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50: 370-396.
- Matrofski, S. D., Ritti, R. R. & Snipes, J. B. (1994). Expectancy theory and police productivity in DUI enforcement. *Law & Society Review*, 28: 113-148.
- McClellan, D. (1985). *Human Motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Meager, M. S. (1985). Police patrol styles: How pervasive is community variation. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 13: 36-45.
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership Theory and Practice*, second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. & Griffin, R. (1995). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In Brewer, N. & Wilson, C. (Eds.), *Psychology and Policing*, pp. 367-393. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1967). *Task Force Report: The Police*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

- Reese, J. (1986). Policing the violent society: The American experience. *Stress Medicine*, 2: 233-240.
- Raudenbush, S. W. & Bryk, A. (2002). *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*, second edition. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Roberk, R. R., Kuykendall, J., & Novak, K. (2002). *Police Management*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing.
- Schnitzius, J. T. & Lester, D. (1980). Police professionalism and job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, 46: 402.
- Sherman, L. W. (1980). Causes of police behavior: The current state of quantitative research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17: 69-100.
- Simmons, C., Cochran, J. K., & Blount, W. R. (1997). Effects of job related stress and job satisfaction on probation officers' inclinations to quit. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 21: 213-229.
- Skolnick, J. H. (1999). *Ideas in American Policing: On Democratic Policing*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Trojanovicz, R. & Buckueroux, B. (1990). *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Violanti, J. M. & Aron, F. (1994). Ranking police stressors. *Psychological Reports*, 75: 824-830.
- Whisenand, P. M. (2004). *Supervising Police Personnel*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Winfree, L. T. & Taylor, T. J. (2004). Rural, small town, and metropolitan police in New Zealand: Differential outlooks on policing within a unified police organization. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 27: 241-263.
- Wycoff, M. A. & Skogan, W. G. (1994). The effects of a community policing management style officers' attitudes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40: 371-383.
- Zhao, J., Thurman, Q., & He, N. (1999). Sources of job satisfaction among police officers: A test of demographic and work environment models. *Justice Quarterly*, 16: 153-173.
- Zhao, J., He, N. P., & Lovrich, N. (2002). Predicting five dimensions of police officer stress: Looking more deeply into organizational settings for sources of police stress. *Police Quarterly*, 5: 43-62.
- Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., Gaffney, M. J., Smith, M. (2003). *Spokane P.D. Commissioned Employee Survey: General Findings*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University, Department of Departmental Studies and Services.

Appendix A: Organizational Bureaucracy Index Items

| | |
|---|--|
| Excessive workload | Inadequate supervision/direction |
| Inadequate equipment / technology | Poor working conditions (space, lighting, furniture, etc.) |
| Inadequate staff | Inadequate budget resources |
| Inadequately specific policies / procedures | Too much "red tape" within the department |

Appendix B: Correlation Matrix

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|----|
| 1 Gender | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Rank | -.12** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 Education | .021 | .41** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Marital status | .15** | .06 | .15** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 Years in TNP | -.10** | -.01 | -.17** | -.44 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 Skill Variety | -.13** | .12** | -.02 | -.27** | .31** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 Task Identity | -.08 | .16** | .02 | -.12** | .13** | .26** | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 Task Significance | -.11** | .11** | .01 | -.19** | .19** | .29** | .39** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 9 Autonomy | -.00 | .12** | .04 | -.07* | .18** | .19** | .57** | .33** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 10 Feedback | -.04 | .08* | -.01 | -.17** | .21** | .28** | .29** | .39** | .19** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 11 Satisfaction w/ Work | -.07 | .14** | -.04 | -.17** | .22** | .28** | .51** | .53** | .49** | .38** | 1 | | | | | |
| 12 Satisfaction w/ Supervisor | .00 | .1** | .01 | -.23 | .09** | .25** | .09** | .27** | .13** | .24** | .21** | 1 | | | | |
| 13 Satisfaction w/ Co-worker | -.05 | .01 | .00 | -.05 | .05 | .19** | .26** | .27** | .3** | .28** | .34** | .3** | 1 | | | |
| 14 Crime/pop. rate | .00 | -.09* | -.08* | .09* | -.15** | .03 | .17** | .21** | .17** | .17** | .22** | .15** | .33** | 1 | | |
| 15 Crime/ officer rate | .02** | -.2** | -.17** | .05 | -.05 | .12** | .08* | -.02 | .07 | .03 | .05 | .01 | .01 | -.06 | 1 | |
| 16 Bureaucracy index | -.07* | -.09 | .09 | -.12 | -.06 | -.12* | .08* | .02 | .06 | .05 | .07 | .03 | .07* | -.00 | .08** | 1 |