

Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior at ASUPD

by

Michael Lloyd Thompson

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

Approved April 2020 by the  
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Eugene Judson, Chair  
Ray R. Buss  
Michael Scott

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2020

## ABSTRACT

In the United States, the profession of Law Enforcement is facing a workforce crisis. There are fewer applicants applying for policing jobs than there was just a decade ago. To worsen the problem, many officers are leaving the profession in less than five years. The Arizona State University Police Department is no exception to this problem. Police employees leave the department for a variety of reasons but among them is a conflict with their supervisor in the area of organizational justice. There is a gap in the training of first-line supervisors in policing as a whole as it pertains to organizational justice and how to implement it within their workgroups. Organizational Justice Theory includes the constructs of distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. This mixed-methods study tested the assumption that organizational justice training with first-line supervisors at Arizona State University Police Department would have an effect on their self-efficacy and implementation of organizational justice practices and therefore improve relationships with their subordinates. Results of the study showed a single eight-hour class on Organizational Justice had no effect on the self-efficacy or implementation of organizational practices by first-line supervisors within the timeframe of the study. Like the supervisors, there was also no statistically significant effect on the employees and their belief that their supervisors were practicing organizational justice within their workgroups.

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my wife Bernedette, our children, and my family who were always there encouraging me to push through all the tough times while working on a doctorate, holding down a high demand career, being a husband, father, brother and son all at the same time. Thank you for supporting me and tolerating my absences and frustrations as I worked through the process, I could have never completed this without you.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I feel blessed to have been placed in a cohort that truly bonded from our first night together. We pushed, pulled, and supported each other through times where many of us felt like throwing in the towel over an assignment or two. We were frustrated together but more importantly, we laughed together, and that made all the difference. Thank you.

I would also like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Eugene Judson, for all of his patience and encouragement as I moved through the dissertation process. Additionally, I would like to acknowledge my committee members Dr. Ray Buss and Dr. Michael Scott for their guidance and sharing their expertise with me.

Last, I would like to acknowledge all of the instructors I had through this program. Each one of you were gracious with your time, attention, and patience to ensure we were fully grasping the concepts being presented.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
CHAPTER	
1 CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE ACTION RESEARCH .....	1
National Context .....	1
Personal Context .....	5
Local Context.....	7
Problem of Practice.....	9
Role of the Researcher.....	11
Research Questions.....	11
2 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH GUIDING THE	
PROJECT .....	13
Frameworks and Relevant Research .....	14
Organizational Justice.....	14
Distributive Justice.....	15
Procedural Justice .....	16
Informational Justice.....	17
Interpersonal Justice.....	18
Verticle Dyad Linkage Theory History .....	18
Leader-Member Exchange Theory.....	20
The Transition from VDL to LMX .....	21
LMX and Role Theory.....	21

CHAPTER	Page
Dangers of not Recognizing Employee/ Leader Relationships .....	24
Importance of Building Relationships.....	25
Benefits of LMX.....	27
Organizational Citizen Behavior .....	28
Low-quality LMX and OCB .....	30
Implications.....	35
<b>3 METHOD .....</b>	<b>36</b>
Research Design.....	36
Research Questions.....	38
Intervention .....	39
Procedural Justice .....	39
Distributive Justice.....	39
Informational Justice.....	40
Interpersonal Justice.....	40
Timeline for Implementation.....	40
Participants and Sampling .....	40
Supervisor Organizational Justice Survey.....	43
Employee Organizational Justice Survey.....	43
Supervisor Interviews .....	45
Data Analysis .....	46
Threats to Validity .....	46
<b>4 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....</b>	<b>47</b>

CHAPTER	Page
Results from Quantitative Data .....	49
Internal Reliability of SOJS/ EOJS .....	49
Pre-SOJS and Post- SOJS Analysis.....	50
Pre-EOJS and Post- EOJS Analysis .....	51
Results from Qualitative Data .....	51
Theme 1: The Importance of Relationship Building.....	57
The Value of Supervisors Being Dedicated to Employees .....	57
Supervisor has Employee Concerns at Heart .....	58
Mentorship of Employee by Supervisor.....	60
Theme 2: Employee Success and How That Occurs .....	61
Employee Development.....	61
Employee Feels Valued .....	63
Challenge Employees .....	64
Showing Genuine Interest in Employee’s Success .....	66
Theme 3: Communication Skills are Critical for Effective Supervisors .....	67
Open Communication.....	68
Being Transparent.....	69
Active Listening.....	70
Theme 4: Barriers .....	73
Closed Minded/ Stubborn.....	73
Miscommunication .....	74
Controlling .....	75

CHAPTER	Page
Employee Fears Retaliation/ Being Targeted.....	75
Summary of Results.....	76
5 DISCUSSION .....	78
Interpretation of Findings .....	79
Discussion and Implications .....	81
Research Questions and Findings.....	81
Threats to Validity .....	84
History.....	84
Experimenter Effect.....	84
Social Desirability Effect.....	85
Lessons Learned.....	85
Recommenations for Future Research and Practice .....	86
Conclusion .....	87
REFERENCES .....	89
APPENDIX	
A SUPERVISOR PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL .....	97
B SUPERVISOR ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE SURVEY .....	101
C EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE SURVEY .....	106
D SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM .....	111
E UNIVERSITY APPROVAL FOR HUMAN SUBJECT TESTING .....	117



LIST OF TABLES

Table .....	Page
1. Timeline for Implementation and Analysis.....	41
2. Supervisor Organizational Justice Survey Results .....	52
3. Employees Organizational Justice Survey Results .....	54
4. Themes, Theme-related Components, and Findings .....	56

## CHAPTER 1

### CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE ACTION RESEARCH

The single biggest decision you make in your job--bigger than all the rest--is who you name manager. When you name the wrong person manager, nothing fixes that bad decision. Not compensation, not benefits--nothing.

—Jim Clifton, *Gallup CEO*

#### **National Context**

According to the Police Executive Research Forum (2018), first-line level supervisor sergeants and lieutenants training has been lacking within most police departments across the country. In April of 2018, Police Executive Research Forum (2018) discussed what they believed is a nationwide shortage of quality first-line supervisors. In their publication *Critical Issues in Policing Series*, the Forum (2018) highlighted the prominent influence of first-line supervisors on the attitudes and behaviors of officers regarding their police work. With increased tensions between police departments and the communities they served, the need for effective police leadership is at an all-time high (Can, Hendy, & Berkay, 2017). Police officers faced a tremendous amount of stress from fearing for their personal safety, being sued by a litigious society, or having their reputation damaged to the point they could no longer earn a living in their profession (Cox, Fitch, & Marchionna, 2017). Although threats from the street could be lethal, in an officers' eyes, the stress experienced within the police station as it pertained to their job security and happiness was much more disconcerting (Neal, 2014). In extreme cases, the effects from unjust or weak supervision ranged from health concerns, stress, post-traumatic stress disorder, relationship/marital issues (e.g., divorce), loss of

family and friends, and sometimes suicide (Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012). According to Brunetto et.al. (2012) when officers did not feel emotionally safe or supported within the police station, their turnover increased and they left for other departments or professions to find the supportive environment they were seeking. Supervisors who lacked the skills of empathy, understanding, listening, and trust might have been direct contributors to officer turnover without realizing that they may have been part of the issue. Police agencies added to this dilemma when they did not provide the necessary training and tools needed to be successful as a supervisor.

According to the Police Executive Research Forum, first-line supervisors, sergeants and lieutenants are the most critical positions in any police agency (Police Executive Research Forum, 2018). First-line supervisors were responsible for supervising up to 85% of all agency personnel. This percentage translated to an estimated 50,000 first-line level supervisors directly supervising over 650,000 officers, deputies, and detectives nationwide (Police Executive Research Forum, 2018).

In October 2018, I attended the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Conference in Orlando Florida. In one of the workshops I attended, Lieutenant Greg Pashley from Portland, Oregon Police Department stated that there was an officer shortage across the country and police departments were not just competing with other police agencies for police officers, but also with big business (G. Pashley, personal communication, October 6, 2018). According to Lieutenant Pashley, individuals today had many options to choose from when considering a career. Generally, people who have the skills and education to be a police officer also had the aptitude to work in professions that were outside of law enforcement at companies such as Google, Intel, and GoDaddy

to name a few. What attracted them most to these companies was a sense of belonging, being part of a team and feeling the environment was fair, and that they would be valued and treated with respect (Brunetto et al., 2012). First-line supervisors have tremendous ability to affect these organizational attributes and were therefore critical players influencing officers' well-being and retention (Gabliks, 2018; Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, & Douglas, 2011).

In 2016, Development Dimensions International (DDI) published a longitudinal study assessing over 15,000 business leaders from more than 300 organizations across 20 industries and 18 countries. These data were used to determine which supervisory skills had the greatest effect on employee performance (Paese, Sinar, Smith, Watt, & Wellins, 2016). DDI's report stated that of those first-line leaders who were assessed, only 40% had empathic skills which were highly desired by employees. One of the listed reasons employees left their jobs was to get away from a manager or supervisor who had no empathy (Paese et al., 2016). It was estimated that the real cost to an organization or company from turnover of an employee can be up to 250% of the annual salary for a person holding a skilled position (Hester, 2013). The costs were hidden in finding and retraining of new employees, and the inefficiency of the team that the employee left behind until the new person was trained to the level of the one who just left (Hester, 2013).

First-line supervisors have been the key to the success of a department (Police Executive Research Forum, 2018). They were involved in relaying, incorporating, and "selling" most of the messaging coming from the top of the organization, and they had their fingers on the pulse of the organization. In other words, they could detect the

grumbings of the employees long before they were heard at the executive level (Police Executive Research Forum, 2018). First-line supervisors train and mentor employees and had the power to make new programs or policies great successes or utter failures. The challenge was many first-line supervisors did not realize the magnitude of their role within organizations and how their actions had highly influential ramifications within the organizations. First-line supervisors could increase burnout in employees, increase sick time usage, alienate groups of people while embracing others, foster tensions, and encourage resignations (Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter, & Whitten, 2012; Goodman, 1990; Mudaly & Nkosi, 2015; Tyler, Goff, & MacCoun 2015).

Policing which is a form of emotional labor (managing or altering one's emotions to perform their job duties) that has always been scrutinized. It is a unique profession because the employee is fully aware of the physical risk they accepted for communities that might not always appreciate or thank them while also dealing with stress and scrutiny from within the police department. In daily performance of their duties, police officers respond to endless situations they might not know how to resolve perfectly. The decisions they make often have tragic consequences either for the officer or the person with whom they are dealing. From the officer's perspective, making a misstep in their response is very stressful because it could very likely land them on the six o'clock news, in a lawsuit, and/or under the departmental microscope leaving the officers worried about retaining their jobs (Cox et al., 2017).

If law enforcement executives claimed the first-line supervisors were critical to the success of any organization and particularly in the context of a police department, there needed to be intentional focus on leadership training in which most agencies were

simply not investing time (Police Executive Research Forum, 2018). There needed to be a focus on how leaders and managers developed relationships with employees within their organizations that would contribute to the employees' success and subsequently move the organization forward (Babic, 2014).

### **Personal Context**

Police stress and the support of good supervision has been difficult to understand without personal experience. Early in my career, I was working a winter evening shift when my supervisor contacted me on the radio and asked me to work several hours overtime because some officers on the oncoming graveyard shift had called in sick and the department was concerned about coverage during the busy part of that shift. I agreed to stay.

In the very early hours of the morning, long after my normal co-workers had gone home, I received a call of a possible drowning that was occurring in the canal near my location. Upon my arrival, I saw a man who appeared to be highly intoxicated floating on his back in the canal stuck on some reeds near the edge. The canal was deep and had a steady current. I called for the fire department to bring water rescue equipment. The man continued to flail around, dislodging himself from the reeds and becoming caught in the current. He was not swimming and rolled over face down in the water and was sucked under the surface. I removed my gun belt, boots, uniform shirt and bulletproof vest and dove in. I found him under the water and drifted downstream with him until I was able to pull him to the side of the canal where I was able to keep his head out of the water. He was too heavy and the bank too steep for me to pull him and myself out of the water. I had to wait there, hanging on for both of our lives until the fire department could find us.

The fire department arrived and was able to pull us both from the water, and I returned to my car to drive to the station. Because I took my equipment off to jump in the water as to not be weighted down, I had not been communicating on the radio with the dispatchers or the supervisors that were working at the time. I was cold and wet and did not have dry clothes at the station into which to change. Therefore, I was going to have to go off shift for the night and go home a few hours before the end of my shift. The supervisors who were working at the time were upset with me. They were not happy that I was going home early, even though I was technically on overtime, and because I did not have dry clothes at the station, which was not any kind of requirement or expectation. At the station, I left the windows down on the car to allow the driver's seat to dry out since I drove it back to the station with wet pants on. I placed the car keys on the peg board with a note to not use the car because of a wet seat and wrote the case number down as well for anyone to reference.

The next day I returned to work for my normal shift and was immediately called in to my supervisor's office. He was upset with me because he had been scolded by the Lieutenant about me leaving the seat wet. Apparently, they were in the process of filing a formal complaint against me because they assumed I spilled a large soft drink on the seat and then left the car for someone to sit in it, which apparently someone did. I explained that I had saved someone from drowning and had to drive the car back to the station with wet pants on and that there was no soft drink involved. I followed policy on how I left the car and explained that it was not my fault if the person who sat in the car and got wet decided to ignore my note that was literally attached to the keys. Rather than being thanked for saving someone's life and receiving a lifesaving award, I found myself

defending my actions and being scrutinized on whether I followed policy. I was angry and frustrated for several weeks after that and would have resigned if I would have had a job to which I could go.

Without the guidance and emotional support of good supervision, these common issues only intensify to the point of officers seeking some escape or excuse to leave their organizations (Brunetto et al., 2012).

### **Local Context**

The Arizona State University Police Department (ASUPD) has been responsible for providing security and policing to all of Arizona State University's campuses across the Phoenix metro area. The police department consisted of 92 sworn individuals with another 67 non-sworn staff members. ASUPD has been accredited by two different bodies, the Commission for Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) and the International Association of College Law-Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA). ASUPD was the 22<sup>nd</sup> largest police department in Arizona and only one of 14 agencies in Arizona that was accredited by CALEA.

As the Chief of Police at Arizona State University, I have found myself on a weekly basis talking to employees who were several levels down in the organization from me about issues they had with their supervisors. Often, the employees felt they had been treated unfairly in some manner by their supervisor with respect to a variety of issues, from discipline to the kind of car they were assigned to drive for the shift. Typically, they blamed their unhappiness on their immediate supervisor and how the supervisor did not like them or had it out for them. Quite often their perception was they were treated this way because they felt they were not in the "in-group" and therefore were thought about



last and felt devalued. One year, a group of current and former employees became so enraged with their supervisors, they filed a lawsuit in the U.S. Federal Court against the ASUPD and several employees within it which ultimately caused even more stress.

With almost five years as police chief and over 20 years in some form of law enforcement supervision, I have observed the primary issues of supervision do not vary from one police agency to another. The reason was people want to feel valued regardless of whether they were in law enforcement, nursing, teaching etc. They all wanted to be treated with respect. A majority of the time, after listening to the complaints, I found there has been no policy violation whatsoever by the supervisor. The decisions that have been made were not wrong decisions, which left the employee feeling, again, not validated and undervalued when I did not reverse the decision their supervisor made. All of these negative feelings had potential of being avoided if the employee's supervisor took the time to realize they could have done a better job communicating with the employee and understanding their actions had a direct effect on the health of the organization. It appeared some supervisors lacked the confidence in their leadership skills to go beyond just being a manager to become more of a leader. This included building relationships of trust with their employees. I suspected this occurred because the supervisors had never been trained to build relationships through organizational justice-based training (OJ-based training); it caused a lack of confidence and deficiency in their abilities. This lack of self-efficacy caused supervisors not to reach their full potential and not achieve the results they were seeking (Ramchunder & Martins, 2014). For the purposes of this research, self-efficacy is a self-estimate of one's ability to perform the desired functions by successfully executing the behavior that are required to produce

outcomes desired (Palis & Green, 2001). Within OJ theory there were four primary constructs: distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005).

In essence, OJ ensured all employees were treated fairly without bias, offered respect, and provided with procedures and distribution of salaries and resources that were fair to all employees.

### **Problem of Practice**

Currently when new ASUPD supervisors are promoted, they receive little to no training on how to be successful police supervisors. Typical instruction encompasses administrative duties and paperwork, such as filling out worker's compensation forms, ensuring time sheets are completed properly, conducting workstation reporting and evaluations, etc. It is here where I have found my problem of practice. Through my review of relevant literature, described in Chapter Two, I have identified that there is a need for immediate training of first-line level supervisors in employee/supervisor interaction and relationship building (i.e., OJ-based training). In my current department, I have observed supervisors jump to conclusions about employee issues and behavior based on assumptions and long-standing biases about the employee's behavior from many years ago. These assumptions were made without ever discussing issues with employees. For example, I personally stopped a formal complaint against an employee for sleeping on duty where the supervisor had not even interviewed the employee or the person he was sitting with inside the station. The supervisor assumed the person was sleeping because the employee's eyes were closed. Had the supervisor actually entered the room, he would have learned that the employee was in fact awake.

When a supervisor lacks the skills to properly interact with employees and co-workers in a fair and ethical manner it creates an uncomfortable environment causing co-workers to look for other employment (Brunetto et al., 2012). When this occurs, it contributes to low morale throughout the department, and costs the university approximately \$40,000 when the employee skill and experience is quantified according to the Associate Vice President of Human Resources at Arizona State University (K. Salcedo, personal communication, August 1, 2018). Further, it can take approximately nine months to a year to hire a person and have them properly trained.

In a personnel audit review of hiring and resignations from ASUPD over a five-year period from July 2013 through July 2018, ASUPD hired a total of 58 sworn police officers; however, as of August 2018, 26 officers have left the department. Through personal conversations, general feedback and my perceptions, I surmise some of the reason's employees leave are pursuit of higher wages from competitors, seeking career opportunities in specialty units, and lack of engagement, which aligns with research conducted by Brunetto et al. (2012). According to an internal report from ASU Human Resources for the reporting period of October 1<sup>st</sup> through November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2018, 145 employees separated from their positions with ASU during that time which included police employees. Of the 145 employees, 32 participated in an exit interview that was administered electronically. Of the participants, 15.63% said they left ASU because of the low quality of supervision and 15.63% said they left because of a lack of recognition and low salary (ASU Human Resources Exit Interview Survey Report, 2018). In the exit survey lack of recognition and low salary were combined since many view salaries as recognition for a job well done. Because of the low sample size of the exit survey it is

difficult to draw any firm conclusions from it. According to Brunetto et al. (2012), as an employee's wellbeing and engagement increased, intention to leave decreased. The quality of a supervisor's relationship had a direct influence on the employee's job satisfaction, wellbeing, and turnover intentionality (Brunetto et al., 2012).

The primary way I addressed this problem of practice was through training for all supervisors throughout the ASUPD. This training focused on OJ and how the supervisors can operationalize OJ-based training into their daily interactions with their employees by building positive relationships. The training addressed the relationship between OJ (if the supervisor/organization is treating the employees fairly and giving them a voice) and how those behaviors directly influenced employees. This training also provided supervisors the information necessary to be successful in the performance of their roles as supervisors and mentors to their employees and to build their self-efficacy. Although a first line level supervisor does not have the ability to increase salary the OJ training might possibly increase the positive relationship between the supervisor and the employee and therefore improve the employees' attitude towards their supervisor and ASU.

### **Role of the Researcher**

I am currently the Chief of Police for ASUPD. I have worked for ASUPD for 10 years and have been the police chief for the past four years. Prior to working for ASU, I worked for the Mesa Arizona Police Department for 20 years. My role in this action research was the primary researcher, wherein I identified and initiated professional development aligned with the needs of supervisor development, evaluated the effects of training, observed, distributed and collected all qualitative and quantitative data, and analyzed the data. Simultaneously as the Chief of Police, I ensured the department was

operating efficiently for day-to-day operations. I also modified training material and coordinated the necessary training.

While conducting the research, I attempted to be fully aware of any biases that I may have had as it pertained to how I perceived the problem and recognized and admitted that I might in fact be part of the problem. I also had to be careful to make sure that all participants did not feel coerced or forced into participating in the workshops.

### **Research Questions**

The study was conducted to address the following five research questions.:

- RQ 1. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program on first-line level supervisors' self-efficacy related to leadership?
- RQ 2. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program on first-line level supervisors' planned implementation of organizational justice?
- RQ 3. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' sense of organizational fairness?
- RQ 4. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' perception of influence in decision making within the organization?
- RQ 5. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' willingness to engage in their responsibilities?

To address the above research questions, I will identify, and support implementation of an OJ-based training program aligned to best practices as outlined in Chapter Two. I will further describe the specific design of the training and my research design in Chapter Three.

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH GUIDING THE PROJECT

As previously discussed in Chapter 1 by Brunetto et al. (2012), first-line level supervision has a direct effect on employees' health, mental wellness, and personal life. In this chapter, I examined literature that illustrated how first-line level supervisors could be instrumental in providing an environment where the employee felt valued and important.

According to Duffy, Tepper, and Zellars (2002), when employees felt they were being treated unfairly by their supervisors who they saw as representatives of the organization, they would withhold actions that benefited the organization to even the score. When employees did not feel safe or supported in their roles within organizations, which was typically manifested through interaction with the first-line supervisors, they also did not invest in the organization (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). This led employees to feeling fearful at work which had led to burnout (Tyler, Goff, & MacCoun, 2015). One of the symptoms of burnout was increased absenteeism or abuse of sick time which could also be a way of evening the score (Tyler et al., 2015; Zellars et al., 2002). A lack of support from the first-line supervisors has caused employees to assume they are not valued by the organization and potentially led to the encouragement of resignations and sabotage (Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, & Douglas, 2011b). Support has come in many forms, such as working with employees in ways such as career development, counseling, setting goals, and including the employees in strategic planning. It also included the supervisor being thoughtful of the employees' individual personal needs such as being mindful of issues at home or challenges they were personally facing.

If law enforcement executives assert that first-line supervisors are critical to the success of any organization and particularly to a police department; logically there needs to be intentional focus on leadership training (Police Executive Research Forum, 2018). Further there needed to be a focus on how leaders and managers developed relationships with employees within their organizations that contributed to the employees' success at work and subsequently moving the organization forward (Babic, 2014).

### **Frameworks and Relevant Research**

For the scope of this problem of practice, several conceptual and theoretical areas were considered. The first framework area was organizational justice (OJ) theory and how it pertained to employment exchanges or contracts between the employees and the organization. In the following section, I discussed different constructs associated with organizational justice. In the second framework, I focused on leader-member exchange (LMX) theory as it related to relationships between the member and the organization, which led to job satisfaction within police organizations. I additionally discussed how LMX specifically fostered interaction between a supervisor and employees and how it was interwoven within constructs of OJ. The last theory, organizational citizen behavior (OCB) theory, has been used to explore employees' behavior when the employees felt they are being treated un/fairly by the organization. OCB was a byproduct of OJ and LMX. I also reviewed other relevant studies inside and outside of police work that have used these theories in similar ways to understand the possible effects the theories could have on the ASUPD when they were introduced to the supervisors of the department.



## **Organizational Justice**

Over several decades, organizational researchers have become increasingly interested in studying workers' perceptions of fairness on the job and the extent to which these perceptions affect job-related attitudes and behavior (Eskew, 1993). Since the 1980s, research on relationships between OJ and employee job attitudes has been a primary focus in the field of management. Theorists contend the events that an employee experiences in one part of their lives directly affects other areas of their lives, which was not always apparent (Trinkner et al., 2016). For example, employees have experienced stress at work which manifested in their personal relationships with family members at home and the employee may not have connected the two issues as being related.

Therefore, according to the research, employees who experienced respect and fairness from supervisors were likely to extend those same courtesies in their customer and public contacts (Wang, Tao, Bowers, Brown, & Zhang, 2018). Within OJ theory there were four primary constructs: distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice (Colquitt, 2001). I have discussed each of these constructs, how they played a role in organizational behavior, and under what circumstances they were likely to be observed.

**Distributive justice.** Distributive justice was defined as how resources were allocated to employees. This came in the form of pay, tools, overtime that was offered, or training opportunities, to name a few. Employees were typically concerned with the outcomes of distributive decisions, especially how and why things were distributed or given in the manner they were (Eskew, 1993). The focus of distributive justice was how

decision makers apportion resources to members/employees, did things seem evenly distributed in the eyes of the members/ employees.

Over several decades, there were several different versions and names for distributive justice including the *justice judgment model* (Leventhal, 1980), *distributive justice theory* (Greenberg, 1990), *allocation preference theory* (Leventhal, 1980), and *equity theory* (Leventhal, 1980). Debates on which of the constructs within OJ had the most influence over an employee's job satisfaction continue on today. Tyler (2003) considered that distributive justice was highly correlated to job satisfaction. However, Folger and Konovsky (1989) indicated that distributive justice also influenced pay satisfaction. Empirical studies have further demonstrated distributive justice was related to personal-referenced outcomes such as pay satisfaction and job satisfaction (McFarland, Webb, & Brown, 2012; Wang, Huang, Li, & Chu, 2010). Aside from the distribution of resources (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005), the interpersonal treatment used by decision makers (Bies & Moag, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987) had an effect on an individual's attitude about the fairness of outcomes from distribution decisions (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

**Procedural justice.** Procedural justice referred to “the perceived fairness of the procedures which are used in making decisions” (Folger & Greenberg, 1985, p. 143). Further, parameters of procedural justice include employees feeling they were treated equally, fairly, and according to policies free from prejudice and bias (Trinkner et al., 2016). A consistent finding in this line of research was that people who received an outcome from a fair procedure (to include the person being treated fairly and the criteria being used), consider that outcome as more fair than an outcome produced by an unfair

procedure, whether the outcome was in their favor or not (Eskew, 1993). Procedural justice has been studied primarily through the guise of organizational structure. For example, researchers have explored the fairness of an outcome by evaluating procedural rules, such as bias, consistency, and/or accuracy (Greenberg, 1986; Leventhal, 1980), or by how much influence, or “voice,” employees have in determining outcomes they receive (Folger, 1977; Trinkner et al., 2016). In general, when individuals determined that the structural characteristics of decision-making process were fair (i.e., procedures had no bias, were consistent, are accurate, provided the opportunity for voice), they perceived the outcome received from the decision-making process as fair.

Research on procedural justice has identified the critical role it played in many areas that were important to employees. These areas included processes surrounding performance appraisals employees received, and day-to-day managerial operations (Greenberg, 1986; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987). Employees felt that when receiving a performance evaluation, particularly when tied to some sort of monetary compensation or discipline, they should have had a role in that process and they wanted that process to be fair and unbiased (Greenberg, 1986). Day-to-day managerial tasks such as coordinating meetings, delegating tasks, representing the organization to the public or senior management, planning a budget or strategic plan, and staff development, all were heavily influenced by good or poor procedural justice practices and were highly important to employees (Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987).

**Informational justice.** Informational justice has referred to the level at which decisions were explained to the employees/members (Colquitt, 2001). Employees were looking for open communication along with justification about why a decision was made.

Thus, employees preferred to have specific rationales for decisions shared with them, as opposed to vague generalities (Trinkner & Tyler, 2018). These explanations and transparency were even more important when decisions were being made that would adversely affect employees (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Research results showed explanations were viewed to be adequate and acceptable when they were reasonable, timely, and specific (Colquitt, 2001).

**Interpersonal justice.** Interpersonal justice was defined as the perceived fairness of personal interaction between the supervisor/leader and the employee/member during decision-making processes (Colquitt et al., 2005). An administrative decision that was within policy, and implemented following all procedures and with forthright explanations, positively influenced an employee's behavior, but if the employee felt the decision was delivered in a condescending, disrespectful, or uncaring way, the employee walked away from the experience feeling not valued by the organization (Trinkner & Tyler, 2018).

These poor interactions between the leaders in an organization and an employee has led to the employees feeling that there has been a violation of their *psychological contract*. The psychological contract was a measure of the quality of exchange between the members and their organization (Wang et al., 2010). A psychological contract is defined by the relationship between an employer and the employee, where there were unwritten mutual expectations for each side (Wang et al., 2010). When employees believed the organization did not value its commitment to justice as it pertained to them, they identified it as a psychological contract violation or breach (Robinson, 2000).

**Vertical dyad linkage theory history.** Before discussing Leader Member Exchange (LMX) theory, I have made a brief digression to consider Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory to establish some foundational matters not discussed earlier. Vertical dyad linkage (VDL) included three stages of the leader-member relationship: (a) *role-taking*, (b) *role-making*, and (c) *routinization*. Role-taking occurred when the employee was introduced to the new job and environment. Role-making occurred when the employee took on new tasks and assignments and was evaluated by the supervisor to determine where the employee fit into the group or organization. This evaluation determined what category the supervisor mentally placed the employee in as the supervisor processed questions such as: *Can they be trusted? Are they a team player? Are they reliable?* If the answer was yes to these questions, the supervisor subconsciously categorized the employee as being in the “in-group.” Employees that did not fit these standards because of poor work quality or motivation were placed in the “out-group,” meaning they were viewed as a “hired hand” and not given special assignments or opportunities to achieve beyond their current potential (Liden & Graen, 1980). In contrast, the routinization stage involved the employee developing routines and patterns and building relationships with the supervisor and other in-group members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden & Graen, 1980). These three stages appeared to be a natural progression for employees maturing in their jobs, but many employees never made it through all phases of this growth process because out-group members may not have had the opportunity to earn trust back. A shortcoming of VDL was that it focused specifically on dyadic relationships between the leader and the follower and ignored the organizational relationship.

Dyadic relationships seemed to cause other members of the out-group distress and increase the distance between the leader and the member (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). According to Graen and Uhl-Bien, members who were in the in-group participated in *High Quality (HQ) exchanges* with leaders. An HQ exchange was exhibited by a high degree of mutual trust, respect, and obligation between the leader and the members of the in-group (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The main discovery of this early VDL work was that these two groups, in-group and out-group, and their relationships with their supervisors resulted from demands on the managers that required them to develop a reliable team of trusted assistants to help in the functioning of the work unit. Because these relationships required additional investment of the leader's already limited time and social resources, it was questionable how many HQ exchanges a leader could profitably develop and maintain. In earlier research on this topic, very little evidence existed to support the idea that managers rejected in-group relationships with all of their employees (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Typically, the demand on their time prevented it or the employees did not want that kind of relationship with their supervisor (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Therefore, expectations developed that managerial units could maintain only a few higher-quality exchange relationships (in-group), and the remainder of the relationships would be lower-quality exchanges, involving only obligatory compliance by the members with the formal role requirements (out-group). One possible solution which came out of the studies by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) required managers to identify the workers they had subconsciously treated as out-group members and reevaluate whether they still deserved that classification or had simply become alienated as a result of the unhealthy leader-member exchange (McRay, 2015).

## **Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory was a leadership theory that evolved from VDL in the 1960s-1970s. LMX focused on the relationships between leaders and employees and the constructs of procedural and distributive justice. The leader/employee interaction affected employees' work outcomes, such as access to resources that would not always be available to the employees, involvement in decision-making processes by allowing employees to be heard and voice concerns prior to decisions being made, and overall performance of employees because they had better communication on what the supervisor needed from them (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Thus, healthy relationships between supervisors and employees led to better organizational performance (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). LMX theory has undergone many refinements. For example, what began as an exploration of leadership style, VDL theory has progressed to a map for generating more effective leadership through the development and maintenance of mature leadership relationships (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

**The transition from VDL to LMX.** Research in the area of LMX has involved moving beyond *in-groups* and *out-groups* as discussed in the previous section, to focusing on generation of more effective leadership processes through development of effective leadership relationships. Using this paradigm, emphasis had been placed not on how supervisors may draw closer to one group over another, but rather on how they may extend the opportunity to each person on a one-on-one basis to develop a unique partnership. The shift in focus moved the theory beyond traditional thinking about *superiors* and *subordinates* to an examination of leadership as a partnership among dyadic members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). This had posed a particular problem for

police organizations because they heavily relied on rank structure and emphasized titles. A key difference in this line of thinking was rather than managers treating some employees more favorably than others (which occurred using VDL), LMX suggested managers should offer all members access to the partnership of LMX (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1991).

**LMX and role theory.** The fundamental basis of LMX was established from role theory, in which theorists stated that members of an organization completed their work through assigned roles (Cashman, Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1976). The basis of role theory was that the process of creating roles within an organization resulted in a variety of roles, and this differentiation of roles contributed to the level of exchanges that a leader had with followers (Matta, Scott, Koopman, & Conlon, 2015). LMX theory was based on the notion that follower outcomes was not simply a product of leader and follower traits and behaviors, but also were affected by the type of relationship the follower had with the leader (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Historically, leadership had been studied from a viewpoint that the leader was the center of the relationship. This viewpoint was used to assert the leader's style of control, guidance, or lack thereof, and various other organizational variables influenced the follower (Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2010). This belief has been well supported by behavioral and trait-based leadership theorists (Breevaart & de Vries, 2017; Grondel, Worthington, & Rowlanda Cawthon, 2016; Krimmel & Lindenmuth, 2001). Nevertheless, this perspective provided a rather one-dimensional view of leadership, because the leader was viewed as the predictor of the follower's behavior. It had become apparent to scholars that leadership was a multidimensional phenomenon and had



progressed well beyond the theoretical viewpoints that had been immortalized by trait and behavioral theorists (Boies & Howell, 2006).

Many of the early leadership theorists, such as trait- and behavioral-based theorists, assumed leaders simply developed a specific style that was equally distributed to all followers (Krimmel & Lindenmuth, 2001). Thus, all followers were influenced and treated the same by the leader (Boies & Howell, 2006). However, as leadership studies progressed, scholars observed that many leaders did not use a consistent leadership behavior with all followers (Gehani, 2002). LMX theorists stated that no leaders formed the same quality of relationship with each follower. The notion of quality was related to the resources a leader provided to each follower (Gwynne, 2014). If a follower received a high level of resources, the relationship would be considered a high-quality (HQ) LMX relationship. If the follower received a low level of resources from the leader, the relationship would be categorized as low quality. The gap between supervisors and employees has grown larger when there was already a perception within the organization that there was an in-group and an out-group. For example, supervisors have assigned a deserving employee the new equipment for their job or told another employee (out-group) they needed to temporarily change their shift or had them work at another desk. Supervisors may not even have been aware they were creating this dyadic separation of the in-group and the out-group. Supervisors have been completely unaware they have assisted in creating this environment because in their minds they were rewarding the (in-group) employee for a job well done and therefore assigning them the new equipment. To the out-group member, the in-group coworker was being favored by being allowed to use the new equipment.

In sum, LMX theory was based on the idea that effective leaders created dyadic relationships with followers that varied in quality. The variance influenced follower performance (Naidoo, Scherbaum, Goldstein, & Graen, 2011). LMX theory was focused on the idea that mutual exchanges will take place between followers and leaders, which were based on trust, respect, and obligation (Liao, Liu, & Loi, 2010).

**Dangers of not recognizing employee/leader relationships.** Although, ideally, all group members have had the opportunity for HQ LMX relationships, many factors affected realizing this ideal in practice. One was that two-way communication was limited between the follower and the leader. Not only may the leader have failed to provide important information to the follower, but also the leader may not have received important information from the follower, thus decreasing group or organizational performance (Gwynne, 2014). Additionally, since a low-performing employee lacked influence in the leader's decisions and leaders tended to assign individuals like themselves to their in-group, leaders often made decisions without receiving contrasting opinions that might only have been provided by a low-performing follower. This likely decreased the creativity and range of possible solutions to problems generated by the work group (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Another cause of minimizing out-group membership was leaders tended to assign valued tasks to those with whom they had HQ LMX relationships. Consequently, when a low performing out-group member happened to be the most capable individual to complete a valued task, not only was his or her skill wasted, but the less competent in-group member probably hindered the work group or organizational performance as well (Liao et al., 2010). Similarly, the leader had also assigned less-valued tasks to an out-group member in instances when the in-group

member was not the most qualified individual to complete the less desirable task. The leader also faced two additional problems when a significant number of out-group followers existed (IACP, 2012). First, by providing things such as valued tasks and influence in decisions to in-group members, leaders had created a sense of inequity for out-group members. As an example, research in this area clearly showed that out-group members received lower efficiency reports (performance appraisals) than in-group members (Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, & Van Den Heuvel, 2015). This inequity could have easily affected the motivation of out-group members.

A second problem regarding LMX relationships related to the cohesion of the work group or organization. The differences in the way a leader treated in-group and out-group followers easily caused animosity between the two groups and damaged departmental or group cohesion (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). It is important to recognize that there was a downside to in-group relationships. In our busy world, we tend to categorize people quickly, and it's been difficult to change categorizations of people due to subsequent bias towards information that confirmed the initial classification. Although we placed someone in the in-group, it does not mean that a person's contributions to the leader-follower dyad will always be positive (Shirley, 2003). The relationship may become dysfunctional over time if the leader fails to re-evaluate the contribution that person was making (IACP, 2012). Our in-group and out-group boundaries should not be permanent. Leaders should be willing to constantly re-assess these relationships and make adjustments in their behavior as warranted, always trying to maximize the positive contributions from all their followers (IACP, 2012).

**Importance of building relationships.** The time and logistical constraints placed on high-level leaders (those above first-line level) inhibit their ability to create HQ LMX relationships with all followers. It would be unrealistic to expect a chief of police to have a HQ relationship with every officer within their department, especially if their department has hundreds of officers. As a result, employees saw their immediate supervisors as representatives of the department. When the relationship between the employee and their immediate supervisor was of low quality it sent the message to employees that the department did not care about them. This was why it was critical for first-line supervisors to make conscious efforts to improve their relationships with employees: then HQ LMX relationships became more likely and therefore gave the employee reassurance the organization cared about them. These relationships were built on mutual trust, respect and obligation within the relationship (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). However, because the number of HQ LMX relationships was related to leader effectiveness, a leader who wished to optimize group performance needed to look at how they had extended LMX relationship opportunities to all members of their work group they worked with directly. By examining the relationship between the supervisor and employee/member rather than just the supervisor or member individually (as VDL theory would suggest) the supervisor had a better opportunity to engage with the employee (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

According to researchers, extending the opportunity to every member to join in partnership had a twofold effect: (a) the LMX process was seen as fair and therefore better accepted by those members who may have felt excluded or denied the opportunity (Williams, Scandura, Pissaris, & Woods, 2016), and (b) the potential for more HQ

relationship development (partnerships) increased the potential for more effective leadership and expanded organizational capability (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Naidoo et al., 2011).

As a result of the suggestion that leaders/supervisors create an environment that provided the chance for all members to have the opportunity to enter into HQ-LMX partnerships, researcher George Graen et. al. (1982, 1984) conducted two different studies wherein leaders were trained to offer the same opportunity for a HQ relationship to all of their employees. Results showed that those employees who accepted the offer by the leader to develop a HQ LMX improved their performance dramatically (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Scandura & Graen, 1984). The results of this body of research indicated that work units showed productivity gains as a result of increased HQ LMX relationships.

As these relationships grew and exhibited new levels of understanding and respect for each group member involved, there was the potential for the lessons and feelings to extend beyond the walls of the organization. The converse was also true because poorly treated employees/members could transfer their unhappiness to the clients whom they interact routinely (Harter & Adkins, 2015; L. Wang et al., 2010). When these relationships were not developed and employees/members felt they could not trust the partnership they often acted out in multiple ways that were counterproductive to the organizational citizenship desired.

**Benefits of LMX.** As LMX relationships developed over time, they became mature partnerships which were highly developed and effective (Babic, 2014). The partnerships became an *in kind* relationship where both leaders and employees/members

benefited and reciprocated loyalty and support over time (Babic, 2014). These partnerships extended beyond job duties and migrated to include mutual respect, trust, commitment, and a feeling of obligation to be open to growth throughout the process. It was at this stage that the influence and leadership between the members was extremely high (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1991).

For work groups who made it to the mature *partnership* stage, the payoffs were exponential. The potential for incremental influence was nearly unlimited due to the enormous breadth and depth of exchange of work-related and social contributions that were possible (Burns & Otte, 1999). At this stage, the mature relationship resulted in progressively higher degrees of mutual trust, respect, and sense of obligation within the partnership. This positive outcome likely persuaded employees to engage in more responsible activities than they would have otherwise, like taking on extra duties without expecting monetary compensation for example (Chen & Li, 2013; Zellars et al., 2002). As a result, employees were more likely to rely on the leaders for needed support, encouragement, and career investments. Likewise, supervisors/leaders noticed employees offering assistance and stepping up to challenges when there was a need. It was this mutual trust, respect, and commitment for each other that empowered and motivated both to reach past the formalized work agreements and assignments/job descriptions and develop a partnership based on mutual reciprocal influence that grew beyond what they could have accomplished individually (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1991).

### **Organizational Citizen Behavior (OCB)**

HQ leader–member relationships were characterized by high levels of trust, interaction, support, and formal and informal rewards (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Settoon,

Bennett, & Liden, 1996). Such relationships included the exchange of material and nonmaterial goods that extended beyond what was specified in the formal job description (Liden & Graen, 1980; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). To reciprocate high LMX relationships, subordinates would often go beyond required job descriptions and behavior and engage in OCB to maintain a balanced or equitable social exchange (Shirley, 2003). According to Moorman (1991), OCB was defined as work-related behaviors not typically captured on a performance appraisal, but that have a direct influence on the success of an organization. OCB has been studied for several decades starting with research conducted by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1964). In their research, they described OCB with the term “co-operation” which described acts that seemed to attend to maintaining the internal equilibrium (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1964). They described co-operation as day-to-day spontaneous prosocial gestures of individual accommodation to the work needs of others (e.g., co-workers, supervisor, clients in other departments) (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1964). The authors explained that cooperation, is a product of the logic of sentiment meaning the employee’s work experience quality was influenced by the way they felt about their employer and the value of the relationship. If, in employees’ minds, they were treated unfairly, employees shifted their perceptions to an economic exchange view and only performed actions for which they were paid and for those duties which were specifically in their job descriptions. Being treated fairly, then, meant it was more likely that OCB occurred (Eskew, 1993).

OCB behaviors have been divided into separate classifications. Organ (1988) used a five-dimensional model of OCB which included (a) altruism, (b) courtesy, (c) sportsmanship, (d) conscientiousness, and (e) civic virtue. *Altruism* was the determination

of how an employee helped others on the job and put others' needs before their own. *Courtesy* reflected checking with co-workers about actions that could affect those co-workers' responsibilities. *Sportsmanship* concerned negative behaviors employees abstained from doing. *Conscientiousness* was respecting the rules of the organization beyond what was officially required by that organization. Last, *civic virtue* concerned the degree to which an employee responded in the correct way to how the organization conducted business(Organ, 1988).

Organ and Konovsky (1989) suggested that OCB was reflected primarily through social exchange. In short, social exchange theory suggested there was a perceived obligation on the part of subordinates to reciprocate HQ relationships (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). Organ and Konovsky (1989) speculated that if people believed they were being treated fairly, and trusted they would continue to be treated fairly, they were more likely to judge they were in a reciprocal social-exchange relationship with their organization and did not worry about being rewarded for extra-role behaviors.

As previously mentioned, if the employee felt their organization (i.e., their supervisor) supported, cared, listened, and treated them fairly (the organization exercising OJ and LMX), the employee in turn reciprocated by investing in the organization by taking on extra responsibility and loyalty (extra-role behaviors) without the expectation of monetary compensation (Eskew, 1993; Matta et al., 2015; Organ, 1988; van Dijke, De Cremer, Mayer, & Van Quaquebeke, 2012; Zellars et al., 2002). Likewise, when an employee felt their organization did not support them nor were they investing in them or caring about them (i.e., not exhibiting OJ or LMX), then the employee withheld the value-added behaviors (OCB) they might have contributed to the organization (Lee & Allen,



2002; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Zellars et al., 2002). Therefore, the existence, or absence, of OCB was directly related to the degree and quality of OJ and LMX.

**Low-quality LMX and OCB.** Many employees do not have the opportunity to participate in a HQ LMX relationship despite how open they may be to the idea. Although *abusive supervision* is not prevalent in most organizations, its effects are significant. Keashly (1998) defines *abusive supervision* as “using derogatory names, engaging in explosive outbursts (e.g., yelling or screaming at someone for disagreeing), intimidating by use of threats of job loss, withholding needed information, aggressive eye contact, the silent treatment, and humiliating or ridiculing someone in front of others” (p. 87). A small body of empirical research suggested abused employees report greater job and life dissatisfaction, intentions to quit their jobs, internal conflict, and psychological distress, compared with their non-abused counterparts (Ashforth, 2009; Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994; Zellars et al., 2002), and that subordinates’ perceptions of unfairness explain their responses to abusive supervision and their lack of engagement (Tepper, 2000). Therefore, abusive supervision represents a source of conflict to LMX and OJ that has serious implications for organizations and employees by disrupting OCB (Bies & Tripp, 1998; Trinkner et al., 2016). The term *abusive supervision* in this context is defined as being verbal or emotional in nature (e.g., yelling, disrespectful talk, name calling and bullying) and excludes physical contact (Zellars et al., 2002).

Quite often the desired response to abusive supervision from an employee is the desire to reciprocate the abuse (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Although the employee may want to lash out at the abusive supervisor to somehow restore order to the

psychological contract, it is not likely to happen for fear of further retaliation from the supervisor (Zellars et al., 2002). To restore some form of autonomy, the employee is more likely to withhold actions or services that benefit the organization and other employees, which is essentially the definition of negative OCB (Zellars et al., 2002). In retaliation to abusive supervision, the only safe recourse an employee has is withholding positive OCB which is not required behavior from the organization (Moorman, 1991; Organ, 1988). For example, as mentioned, the employee will retreat into an economic-exchange response, only performing tasks that they are specifically paid for and are assigned (Eskew, 1993; Zellars et al., 2002).

Research suggested employees who felt abused or devalued by their immediate supervisor held the organization accountable for that supervisor's behavior (Tepper, 2000). Tepper (2000) pointed out abusive supervision was typically defined by the perception of employees or witnesses, and it was ongoing and intentional. The key element of this statement is that the identification of the abusive supervision is entirely the employees' perception and not the supervisors' intention (Tepper, 2000). The statement also includes the component of the hostile behavior being sustained which would, by definition, exclude supervisors who are having the occasional bad day and took it out on their employees. Last, the statement requires that the behavior of the supervisor must be done willfully. This means that the supervisor does not have to have the intent to be abusive but only willfully engage in it. Reasons for doing this might include sending employees the message that mistakes will not be tolerated or to force high performance from the employees. Although these examples are not performed by the supervisor with the intention of being abusive, they still meet the definition and have

the same effect on the employee unless the employee understands that the supervisor has their best interests at heart. This emphasizes the identification and perception of abusive supervision is clearly from the employee's perception and the supervisor's intentions are not a factor in the employee's eyes (Tepper, 2000).

Research conducted by Hui, Law, and Chen (1999) found that employees who have a HQ LMX relationship with their direct supervisor were frequently exhibiting positive OCB (i.e., altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue) as compared to those employees in the out-group (low-quality LMX) who would withhold those positive behaviors/traits associated with OCB. Further, there were positive correlations between employees' exhibiting positive OCB and transformative leadership actions such as leaders sharing their vision, role modeling for the employees, challenging the employees intellectually and having high expectations pertaining to their performance (Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999).

Building on the work of Tepper (2000) that linked abusive supervision with work-family conflict, abusive supervision has been found to affect work-to-family conflict. This suggested employees took their frustrations home, which were manifested in domestic-relationship problems (Carlson et al., 2012). Hochschild (2003) indicated this kind of stress on employees caused emotional labor and burnout. Emotional labor, described as the management or alteration of emotion in carrying out job duties (Hochschild, 2003), was one possible mechanism employees used in addition to withholding OCB when the employee felt high amounts of stress as a result of an unsupportive work environment (Hochschild, 2003). Because of fear of retribution from their abusive supervisor if they exhibited frustration or anger, the employee also

repressed the outward signs of those emotions (Hochschild, 2003). One type of emotional labor was “surface acting.” Surface acting was characterized by outward displays of emotion that did not match the employee’s true internal feelings (Hochschild, 2003). Surface acting created dissonance between felt and displayed emotions when employees attempt to control emotional responses or fake emotional expression (Grandey, 2000). Further, surface acting required great effort and therefore depleted valuable mental resources, which were critical in the law enforcement profession (Beal, Trougakos, Weiss, & Green, 2006; Grandey, 2003).

It was well-established fact within law enforcement that the divorce rate was extremely high because of the stresses of the job (Woody, 2006). These stressors go beyond what the officer was facing on the street and also included internal office politics and work relationships (Woody, 2006). Researchers have yet to explore the role emotional labor played on the effects of abusive supervision on work–family conflict. In other words, what was the effect when the employee was forced to pretend to be happy at work only to emotionally dump those feelings out on their significant others at home (Carlson et al., 2012). In essence, when employees were not feeling valued and were experiencing stress from their supervisor, they were likely to withhold services and pretended to put on a *happy face*, which ultimately led to burnout or separation from the department and relationship issues at home.

**OCB— some final considerations.** Research results clearly indicated employees’ perception of fairness through OJ and LMX was a strong predictor of employees’ OCB (Ilies et al., 2007; Moorman, 1991; Wang et al., 2010; Zellars et al., 2002). By using OJ, first-line supervisors laid the foundation for employees’ trust which was the precursor to

a HQ LMX (Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002). Although LMX was a reciprocating agreement between the employee and the first-line supervisors, it was entirely the responsibility of the first-line supervisors to initiate that relationship because first-line supervisors had the most control over the everyday culture, work environment and conditions for his or her subordinates (Kirkland, 2019). In other words, first-line supervisors practicing good OJ with their employees was not enough to ensure a good LMX. They had to encourage the employee to enter that LMX exchange by opening the door and being intentional about leading that exchange with the employee (Kirkland, 2019). As the employee perceived the use of OJ by their supervisor through its four constructs of procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice, they were willing to enter into the LMX contract with the supervisor (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Gwynne, 2014; De Wang & Sung, 2016). As a result of the HQ LMX between the first-line supervisors and the employee, the employee was likely to exhibit healthy OCB (Breevaart et al., 2015; Ilies et al., 2007; Lee & Allen, 2002). Therefore, it was extremely important that organizations, leaders, and supervisors were keenly aware of how they treated their employees because the employees' perceptions of that treatment had a direct effect on their OCB.

### **Implications**

In this current climate, law enforcement is a challenging job, which may adversely affect recruiting new police officers. With the physical and social stressors placed on police department employees on a daily basis, police department executives should be doing everything they can to be part of a solution. When applying OJ theory, police departments have a roadmap on how they should be interacting with their

employees to help them progress in their careers and retain good employees. OJ leads to higher job satisfaction and higher positive LMX. With HQ LMX, OCB increases, which ultimately benefits the police agency and most of all the community that it serves.

For most police departments, the people who have the most influence on OJ, LMX, and OCB, are the first-line supervisors who receive little to no training in this area. It is incumbent upon police executives to exercise these theories, test them, *and* also teach them to all supervisors throughout the department. By doing so, supervisors will have the tools necessary to have more productive and happier employees. They will also have opportunity to grow and advance in their capabilities and ultimately serve the public in a professional manner.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

In this chapter, I discussed the methods that were used in this action research and how they addressed the research questions. I also outlined the research design, the innovation and how the innovation was administered. I included a timeline used for the action research project, a description of the participants, and a discussion of the data collection instruments and how the data from the instruments were analyzed.

#### **Research Methodology**

##### **Research Design**

The design was a concurrent mixed methods design (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Mertler, 2017). The study was conducted in two phases of data collection. The first phase consisted of two quantitative surveys, one for supervisors and one for their subordinates that were administered twice, once before the intervention and again after the intervention, and each was analyzed for change. The data from the pre-intervention surveys were used to inform what areas needed further investigation such as those areas that were confusing or contradictory. The pre-intervention supervisor OJ survey (SOJS) informed which participants of the supervisor group were selected for interviews. The responses from the pre-interview survey helped form the questions that were asked of the selected participants. The pre-intervention supervisor/employee OJ surveys were conducted before any intervention was introduced to the participants.

One eight-hour training/intervention class was conducted with approximately 27 supervisors at ASUPD. The training focused on the four constructs of organizational justice (procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal

justice). Several weeks after the final innovation/training, a post-survey was distributed to all departmental employees, as before, to determine changes in perceptions about organizational justice within the ASUPD.

I used this approach because it was the most conducive to the problem of practice and the environment in which participants were used to operating. To maintain their certifications as Arizona police officers, all sworn members of any police agency in Arizona are required to attend continued police officer training annually. The subject of those trainings can vary from year to year depending on the needs of the particular agency. Introducing a training that included surveys and course evaluations was normal protocol for the officers. As part of an accredited police department, civilian employees also must maintain training and certifications to include annual training per the requirements of the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) § 33.6 Specialized In-Service Training standards (CALEA, 2018). I worked with the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board (AZPOST) to obtain eight hours of in-service training for each of the participants, thereby allowing all employees (this includes supervisors and non-supervisors) to meet their annual training requirements.

In-person training, surveys, and individual interviews lend themselves to a mixed-methods design, which is one of three primary action research designs (Mertler, 2017). When conducting research on human interaction, neither quantitative nor qualitative research alone can provide the researcher a good understanding of what was happening in the phenomenon (Mertler, 2017). By conducting a mixed-methods research design, I



would have a better and deeper understanding of the problem, as well as overcoming limitations in qualitative and quantitative research alone (Mertler, 2017).

### **Research Questions**

The study was conducted to investigate five research questions which originated from my problem of practice.

RQ 1. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program on first-line level supervisors' self-efficacy related to leadership?

RQ 2. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program on first-line level supervisors' planned implementation of organizational justice?

RQ 3. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' sense of organizational fairness?

RQ 4. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' perception of influence in decision making within the organization?

RQ 5. What is the effect of an organizational justice based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' willingness to engage?

I hypothesized that OJ training would have a positive effect on the supervisors' belief in their ability to lead employees equally and fairly and that they would implement those tools within their relationships with their direct employees. I also anticipated that

OJ training would help to improve employees' sense of fairness and their ability to engage in decisions affecting their job, which would encourage them to have more positive engagement.

### **Intervention**

The intervention consisted of training in four OJ constructs that was introduced through in-person training that gave first-line supervisors tools to engage with their employees and build positive relationships with them. There was one eight-hour session, which focused on the four constructs: procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. The curriculum introduced was "Actively Caring for People" (AC4P) and was taught by one of the authors of the curriculum and book, Bobby Kipper (Geller & Kipper, 2017). Mr. Kipper served a 25-year career with the New Port News Police Department beginning in 1977. Mr. Kipper was the founder and director of the National Center for the Prevention of Community Violence. He was also the author of another best-selling book on police leadership titled *Performance Driven Thinking*. Mr. Kipper's instruction provided specific awareness to the first-line supervisors on listed constructs as well as techniques for building positive relationships with employees.

**Procedural justice.** Each first-line supervisor was taught the importance of procedural justice as it pertained to treating every employee equally, including being free from bias in all their dealings with their employees. The objective was for participants to learn the importance of following policies and allowing each employee fair treatment without a preconceived determination that worked for or against the employee. Emphasis

was placed on treating our employees with the same amount of dignity and respect as we expect our officers to give the citizens they encounter in the field.

**Distributive justice.** Although many first-line supervisors viewed distributive justice as how much an employee is compensated (paid) by their organization they were quick to point out they were not the final decision makers as to the amount of pay an employee received. This class was to help the first-line supervisors recognize their role in that process and learn that their actions and opinions played a critical part in that decision. It also addressed the importance of the distribution of resources (work supplies, new equipment etc.), training, and special assignment opportunities.

**Informational justice.** When communicating decisions that have been made within the police department that affected employees' job, supervisors must have effectively communicated the information to employees. This class discussed and taught supervisors how to be candid and transparent with employees. Supervisors were taught to tailor their communications to employees in a way that met employee needs in a timely manner. Supervisors were taught to be thorough in their explanations and explain the reasoning behind the decisions made.

**Interpersonal justice.** Often interpersonal justice can be confused with informational justice. Informational justice refers to ensuring that information was delivered. Interpersonal justice involved how that information was delivered. In this two-hour session, supervisors were taught techniques in delivering information in a polite and dignified manner. Emphasis was placed on communicating with employees in a respectful manner despite whatever demeanor an employee may have been exhibiting. Techniques were taught in de-escalation and professional communication.

## Timeline for Implementation

This study took place during the fall of 2019. An outline of the timeline for the implementation and analysis of the intervention has been provided in Table 1.

## Participants and Sampling

The participants for my research included all first-line supervisors within ASUPD. This included 17 sergeants, three lieutenants, two lead police aides, four

Table 1

### *Timeline for implementation and analysis*

Timeframe	Actions	Procedures
January 2019	Prepared consent forms, refined protocols and questions for interviews and surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cleared consent forms with IRB</li><li>• Had critical friends and professors review and offer feedback on questions for interviews and surveys</li></ul>
April 2019	Received IRB approval for study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Submitted plan to IRB</li><li>• Made corrections and resubmitted</li></ul>
April 2019	Defended Proposal	
September 2019	Administered Supervisor OJ Survey and Employee OJ Survey (for pre-intervention assessment) to participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Created survey in Qualtrics.</li><li>• Gave survey three weeks prior to training/ intervention</li></ul>
October 2019	Delivered OJ professional development training program to participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Had class taught to supervisors</li></ul>

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

Timeframe	Actions	Procedures
December 2019	Second administration of Supervisor OJ Survey and Employee OJ Survey (post-intervention assessment) to participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second administration of Supervisor OJ Survey and Employee OJ Survey (post-intervention assessment) to participants</li> <li>• Collected data and analyzed it in SPSS</li> </ul>
January 2020	Conducted post interviews with five participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducted interviews with five participants</li> <li>• Transcribed and coded interviews</li> </ul>
February-March 2020	Completed analysis and wrote Results and Discussion section of dissertation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyzed data and wrote Results and Discussion section</li> </ul>

police communications supervisors, and one police records supervisor, for a total of 27 supervisors ( $n = 27$ ).

The supervisors ranged in years of experience from six months to ten years, with the mean being 4.5 years. The department consisted of two divisions: The Operations Division which consisted of patrol officers and police aides, and the Support Services Division which consisted of detectives, dispatchers and records section personnel. Within each division, there were sworn and non-sworn employees.

*Sworn* employees consisted of police department employees who “swear” an oath of office and have completed required AZPOST training.

*Non-sworn* employees were department members who were referred to as civilians because they did not have arrest powers and were not sworn in. Civilian employees included dispatchers, police aides, and administrative assistant staff members.

Each of these positions required different levels of expertise and training. Dispatchers required the most training among non-sworn employees, which consisted of 16-20 weeks before releasing them on their own “solo status.” Police aides (PAs) worked alongside with police officers, but they were not armed and wore a different color uniform.

The supervisors were comprised of sworn officers, PAs, and dispatchers. Each supervisor was responsible for two to seven employees. Currently the gender makeup of the supervisor pool was distributed as follows: 21 males and seven females. The racial/ethnic breakdown of the males was 18 White, two Hispanic, and one African-American. The racial/ethnic breakdown of the female participants was six White and one Hispanic.

## **Instruments**

**Supervisor OJ Survey (SOJS).** Data were collected from all supervisors who participated in the study. The same survey was given twice, once before the training and once after the training was completed. The survey had five statements/questions for each of the four constructs and five demographic questions for a total of 25 questions. Within each set of construct questions, there were statements that were embedded to measure self-efficacy for that construct. The supervisor OJ survey (SOJS) used the four OJ constructs which were: distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. At the beginning of the survey there was a list of the four constructs and their definition as they pertained to the survey since these concepts would be new to many of the participants prior to the training/intervention. As in the employee survey, statements were rated on a six-point Likert scale with options ranging from: (1) *strongly disagree*, (2) *mostly agree*, (3) *slightly disagree*, (4) *slightly agree*, (5) *mostly agree*, and

(6) *strongly agree* (see Appendix B). Statements within each of the constructs surveyed the participants' opinion and knowledge of organizational justice, their self-efficacy (which addressed RQ1) in these areas and their intent to use the skills that were taught to them (which addressed RQ2). An example of a self-efficacy survey statement was: "I feel confident, as a supervisor, in my understanding of all protocols pertaining to employee rights and discipline." An example of a planned intentional implementation of OJ statement was: "I will look for ways to improve in the area of exercising procedural justice with employees on a daily basis."

**Employee OJ Survey (EOJS).** Data were collected by a pre-intervention and post-intervention survey that captured data on the constructs listed (procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice). The survey had five questions per construct and five demographic information questions for a total of 25 questions. The survey was used to measure employee perceptions of: (a) *Distributive Justice* which is the employee's perceived fairness of resource distribution decisions; (b) *Procedural Justice* which referred to employees' perceived fairness of the procedures used to make decisions within an organization that affected them; (c) *Informational Justice* which referred to the timeliness and transparency of information about decisions that affected employees' jobs; and (d) *Interpersonal Justice* which was the employees' perceptions of respect from the supervisor during explanations of decisions that were made by the supervisor. The participants responded by using a six-point Likert scale with options ranging from (1) *strongly disagree*, (2) *mostly agree*, (3) *slightly disagree*, (4) *slightly agree*, (5) *mostly agree*, and (6) *strongly agree* (see Appendix C). Statements within each of the constructs surveyed the participants' opinion and knowledge of

organizational justice, their sense of organizational fairness (which addressed RQ3) their perception of influence in decision making (which addressed RQ4), and their willingness to engage with their supervisor (which addressed RQ5). An example of a survey statement that examined organizational fairness was: “I feel my workload to be fair.” An example of a statement on the survey that examined non-supervisor employees’ perceptions of their influence on decision making was: “My supervisor(s) make(s) sure non-supervisory employees or my concerns are heard before job decisions are made.” A survey statement example that assessed the non-supervisory employees’ willingness to engage was: “When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor(s) treats me with respect and dignity.”

**Supervisor Interviews.** Several weeks after the workshop/intervention, I conducted structured interviews, using purposive sampling, of five supervisors within the department to include four sworn and one civilian supervisors. I chose five supervisors because this provided robust but manageable data that allowed me to address the research questions. The interviews took place within the ASUPD Headquarters building in Room 206 which was a neutral conference room away from the administration section of the department to avoid any uncomfortableness on the part of the participants. All members of the department were allowed to use this room as it is a common space which allows for privacy.

The participants were asked to participate in the interviews and were assured their choice to participate or not had no effect on their standing or say in the department (see Appendix D for participant waiver). Because this was an action-research study, the data



were meant to describe and to explain the phenomenon experienced by ASUPD supervisors.

During the interviews I asked the participants to share their experiences pertaining to organizational justice that they had seen or used since the training. Examples of this behavior could be a supervisor explaining a decision that was made pertaining to discipline of an employee and explaining what the next steps are for the employee. Another example would include a supervisor explaining to the group what it takes to deserve to drive a new car for shift and why officer “X” earned that opportunity.

I solicited their experiences where they used organizational justice which they learned from the training/intervention. The interview questions addressed RQ1 and RQ2. I was also interested in learning what prior training or experience they had in the area of organizational justice (see appendix A).

### **Data Analysis**

Initial analysis relied on descriptive and inferential statistics calculated from the surveys. The statistics included the reliability and mean scores of participants, and whether scores of pre- and post-intervention surveys had changed. To measure the effect of the training/intervention, I tested the change of scores across variables by using a Wilcoxon signed ranks test, which was applied to the both the EOJS and the SOJS to determine if there was a statistically significant difference from pre- to post-intervention scores. All interviews were recorded and transcribed and were coded using the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1992) in HyperResearch.

## **Threats to Validity**

I would be remiss if I did not discuss my concerns that I had about being the chief of police and the researcher simultaneously. There was certainly a threat to validity due to the experimenter effect since I was conducting the research and analysis. This threat could have manifested itself while in the course of the research by discovering that my personal leadership abilities and style were in fact part of the organizational leadership problem or participants telling me only what they thought I wanted to hear. I had to be mindful not to take offense to any shortcomings that were divulged to me about myself and to look at them as opportunities for improvement in the future. Second, because I was the chief of police, there was always the risk that the participants would not feel like they had a realistic choice as to whether they wanted to participate in the study. For this study to be successful, I needed participants to open up to me and trust that I would not and could not act against them in any way for failing to participate.

## CHAPTER 4

### DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Results from the study have been presented here in two sections. In the first section, I discussed the results from the quantitative data collected. I analyzed data and information collected from the Supervisor Organizational Justice Survey (SOJS) and the Employee Organizational Justice Survey (EOJS) that were administered to supervisors and employees at the Arizona State University Police Department (ASUPD) prior to the Actively Caring for People (AC4P) (Geller & Kipper, 2017) training intervention and following the AC4P training. In the second section, I discussed the results and analysis of the qualitative portion of the study: data from interviews with selected supervisors after they attended the AC4P training. In the qualitative section, I discussed themes that emerged in the interviews. Quotes from the interview transcripts were used to support findings following the analysis of the interviews.

The quantitative data consisted of pre-SOJS and pre-EOJS scores as well as post-intervention SOJS and EOJS scores collected from first-line level supervisors (sergeants, lieutenants, and civilian supervisors) as well as employees of ASUPD. Both the SOJS and the EOJS contained the same constructs and statements for both the pre- and the post-intervention SOJS and EOJS surveys. The four constructs within Organizational Justice (OJ) were: (a) distributive justice (DJ), (b) procedural justice (PJ), (c) informational justice (IJ), and (d) interpersonal justice (IPJ). All four constructs were present within the SOJS and EOJS. Minor adjustments to wording were made to address the role of supervisor or employee on the SOJS or the EOJS.

Of the eligible supervisors, 15 participated in both the pre- and post-intervention SOJS. Supervisors consisted of both sworn employees (those that have arrest authority) and civilian employees (those who do not have arrest authority). Police patrol supervisors, records division supervisors, and dispatch supervisors all participated. The data collected from these participants were used to assess the participating supervisors' self-efficacy related to leadership, which addressed RQ1, and their intent to implement OJ practices with their employees, which addressed RQ2.

Employees were surveyed using the pre- and post-intervention EOJS to measure any change in their sense of fairness within ASUPD, which addressed RQ3, and employees influence on decisions within the four OJ constructs as they were applied within ASUPD, which addressed RQ4. Pre- and post-intervention EOJS data were also used to measure any difference in the employees' willingness to engage with their supervisors in OJ practices, which addressed RQ5. Employees were not given the AC4P training and were strictly asked to give their perceptions of their supervisor's practice of OJ prior to and after the AC4P training.

The quantitative data were analyzed in two different ways. Cronbach's alpha analyses were conducted to assess reliability of the SOJS/EOJS instruments. Following the reliability analysis, a Wilcoxon signed-ranks analysis was conducted to measure any statistically significant differences in the SOJS/EOJS responses from pre- to post-AC4P training.

Qualitative data were collected from in-person interviews with supervisors within the ASUPD. Those interviews were recorded and transcribed. Transcriptions of the interviews were entered into HyperResearch (HyperResearch 4.5.0, 2018) and analyzed

using the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1992). Qualitative data were coded using initial codes and quotes from the interviewees. The coded data were then placed into larger categories, which were separated into theme-related components. Findings were then extracted from these data and supported with quotes from the participants.

### **Results from Quantitative Data**

Results from the quantitative data were presented in two following sections. First, reliability test results have been presented for all items encompassing all four constructs (DJ, PJ, IJ, and IPJ), for both the SOJS and the EOJS. Within each of the four constructs in the SOJS there were statements that measured the supervisor's self-efficacy (SE) within that construct. Second, analysis of changes from pre- to post-survey completion were discussed for both the EOJS and the SOJS.

**Internal reliability of the SOJS/EOJS surveys.** Internal reliability for the entire SOJS was computed through Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) using SPSS (IBM SPSS Statistics, 2016). Measuring all variables, the internal reliability for the entire SOJS instrument was .91, which is above the minimal recommended level of reliability, .70. The SOJS included four constructs: (a) distributive justice (DJ), (b) procedural justice (PJ), (c) informational justice (IJ), and (d) interpersonal justice (IPJ). Within the constructs were statements designed to measure the supervisors SE in applying the four constructs of OJ (see Appendix C for survey questions). For each construct, Cronbach's alpha was computed to determine the internal reliability of the items within the construct (Cronbach, 1951). Analysis of the supervisor survey results showed that the reliabilities

for the individual constructs DJ, PJ, IJ, and IPJ were .86, .77, .71, and .84 respectively. Reliability of the SE items filtered out within each of the four constructs was .78.

Internal reliability for the entire EOJS was computed through Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) using SPSS (IBM SPSS Statistics, 2016). Measuring all variables, the internal reliability for the entire EOJS instrument was .98, which is above the minimal recommended level of reliability, .70. Cronbach's alpha tests were again applied to the items comprising each construct of the EOJS: DJ, PJ, IJ, and IPJ. Analysis showed the reliabilities for the constructs were .90, .96, .94, and .97 respectively. All of the reliability coefficients exceeded the .70 minimal acceptable level of reliability.

**Pre- and post-intervention SOJS analysis.** A Wilcoxon matched pair signed-ranks test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference in the ranking of supervisors' opinions from the pre-SOJS to the post-intervention SOJS. Results indicated that, with few exceptions, there was no statistically significant differences in how the supervisors ranked themselves before and after the AC4P training. The Wilcoxon signed-ranks test used rankings instead of means, but means were supplied for ease of interpretation (see Table 2). Comparing means from pre-SOJS to post-SOJS, there was virtually no change statistically and scores remained the same with a couple statistically significant negative changes. The SOJS can be viewed in its entirety in Appendix B.

Changes in responses from pre- to post-SOJS in only three of the questions were statistically significant ( $p \leq .05$ ). In the area of distributive justice item Q1-2 DJ – “I consider the workload across my employees to be equally distributed”, supervisors rated themselves significantly more harshly on the post-survey  $M_{\text{post}} = 4.67$  than on the pre-survey  $M_{\text{pre}} = 5.16$ ,  $p = 0.05$ . Supervisors rated themselves with less confidence after the

AC4P training for the statement Q2-4 PJ in the SOJS; “I feel confident as a supervisor in my understanding of all policies pertaining to employee rights and discipline”  $M_{pre} = 4.87$ ,  $M_{post} = 4.13$ ,  $p = 0.02$ . Similarly, there was a statistically significant change where supervisors rated themselves lower after the AC4P training than they did before for item Q3-3 IJ– “I feel I have the ability to explain decisions I may not agree with to employees”  $M_{pre} = 5.27$ ,  $M_{post} = 4.73$ ,  $p = 0.04$ .

### **Pre- AC4P Training and post- AC4P Training employee survey (EOJS) analysis**

A Wilcoxon matched pair signed-rank test was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant changes in employees’ opinions about their supervisors’ performances after the supervisor AC4P training. As with the SOJS, there was no significant change from the pre- intervention EOJS to the post- intervention EOJS with the exception of two items within two different constructs (distributive justice and informational justice) that showed a marginal difference. In essence, employees saw no difference in their supervisors’ behavior as a result of the AC4P training. Overall, the pre- AC4P training and post- AC4P training surveys had the same results (see Table 3). The EOJS can be viewed in its entirety in Appendix C.

### **Results from Qualitative Data**

In this section, results from qualitative data are presented. The themes, their associated components, and findings emerge from the data collected from interviews with the supervisors. Interviews were transcribed and coded in HyperResearch (2018) using the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1992). Next, from the interview codes, themes and their associated components emerged using HyperResearch frequency reports (2018). By examining the larger themes, their associated components, and

Table 2

*Supervisor Survey*  $n = 15$ 

Item	Pre		Post		<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Q1-1 DJ / Fair time-off process	5.67	0.49	5.67	0.49	1.00
Q1-2 DJ / Emp. workload fair	5.13	0.92	4.67	1.54	0.05
Q1-3 DJ / Rewards distributed fairly	5.00	0.85	4.80	0.86	0.08
Q1-4 DJ (SE) / Easy to treat emp. fairly	5.00	1.51	5.07	1.03	0.89
Q1-5 DJ (SE) / Assign tasks to emp. fairly	5.20	0.78	5.13	0.74	0.74
Q2-1 PJ / Ask for emp. input on decisions	5.33	0.62	5.13	0.74	0.26
Q2-2 PJ / Emp. should be heard before decisions are made	5.33	0.72	5.13	0.83	0.42
Q2-3 PJ / Decisions are made with accurate info.	5.27	0.59	5.13	0.35	0.32
Q2-4 SE / Confident understanding of emp. rights	4.87	1.06	4.13	1.41	0.02
Q2-5 PJ / Create fair environment for employees	5.27	0.80	5.00	0.76	0.10
Q3-1 IJ / I offer explanations on decisions	5.87	0.35	5.53	0.52	0.06
Q3-2 IJ / Timely communication on decisions	5.67	0.49	5.60	0.51	0.71
Q3-3 IJ / Ability to explain decisions professionally	5.27	0.70	4.73	1.10	0.04
Q3-4 IJ / Seek information before speaking to emp. about decisions	5.53	0.64	5.67	0.49	0.41
Q3-5 IJ/ Emp. should be heard before decisions are made	5.13	0.74	5.20	0.78	0.74
Q4-1 IPJ/ Decisions made with kindness and consideration	5.00	0.85	5.20	0.56	0.32

(continued)



Table 2 (continued)

*Supervisor Survey*  $n = 15$ 

Item	Pre		Post		<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Q4-2 IPJ (SE) / Treat all emp. with respect/dignity	5.27	0.80	5.27	0.59	1.00
Q4-3 IPJ / Possible to make decisions about emp. needs with sensitivity	4.33	0.72	4.60	1.12	0.29
Q4-4 IPJ (SE) / I make compassionate decisions about my employees	5.20	0.86	5.13	0.83	0.56
Q4-5 IPJ (SE) / Confident I have sought, and have been informed of, necessary info. to explain decisions	5.00	0.93	5.00	0.54	1.00

statements made by the participants findings emerged. Table 4 displays the themes and their associated components and findings that developed using the process described. Each theme is discussed, including quotes from the interviews to support the findings. These interviews were conducted with five supervisors who were randomly selected from the AC4P training attendance roster. The supervisors are identified by pseudonyms as Sgt. Rose, Lt. Cobalt, Supervisor Sage, Lt. Pine, and Sgt. Blue. It should be noted that although supervisors were being interviewed, they often answered the questions as employees. Although they are supervisors (first-line level), they saw themselves as employees who also have supervisors. This gave a unique perspective as they seemed to switch back and forth between how they supervise and how they like to be supervised, and in the process, they addressed all of the research questions. For a copy of the interview protocol please see Appendix A.

Table 3

*Employee Survey*      *n* = 34

Item	Pre		Post		<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Q1-1 DJ / Process for time off is fair	4.82	1.11	4.44	1.58	0.06
Q1-2 DJ / Tasks are assigned fairly	4.65	1.54	4.44	1.50	0.19
Q1-3 DJ / Work distributed evenly	4.15	1.78	4.18	1.47	0.98
Q1-4 DJ / Rewards distributed fairly	3.97	1.88	4.32	1.43	0.11
Q1-5 DJ / Resources are distributed fairly	5.50	0.71	5.12	1.15	0.12
Q2-1 PJ / Free to express my views about work	4.59	1.48	4.71	1.34	0.32
Q2-2 PJ / Input is sought on decisions	4.06	1.67	4.24	1.42	0.44
Q2-3 PJ / Supervisor seeks accurate/complete information	4.41	1.54	4.68	1.36	0.18
Q2-4 PJ / Supervisor understands procedures/ rights of emp.	4.59	1.40	4.68	1.45	0.50
Q2-5 PJ / Supervisor open to being procedurally sound with employees	4.79	1.32	4.71	1.47	0.67
Q3-1 IJ / Supervisor offers explanations on decisions that affect me	4.68	1.15	4.88	1.09	0.15
Q3-2 IJ / Supervisor is timely in their explanations of decisions made	4.50	1.42	4.59	1.26	0.50
Q3-3 IJ / Supervisor's explanations are transparent	4.47	1.50	4.62	1.23	0.28
Q3-4 IJ / Supervisor is prepared to answer my questions	4.29	1.49	4.38	1.37	0.67
Q3-5 IJ / Supervisor doesn't gossip and stops rumors	4.15	1.76	4.09	1.78	0.91

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

*Employee Survey*      *n* = 34

Item	Pre		Post		<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Q4-1 IPJ / Supervisor treats me with kindness	4.76	1.21	4.50	1.38	0.05
Q4-2 IPJ / Supervisor gives me the benefit of the doubt	4.21	1.68	4.24	1.72	0.79
Q4-3 IPJ / Supervisor takes my needs into account when making decisions	4.56	1.40	4.38	1.37	0.29
Q4-4 IPJ / Supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee	4.53	1.42	4.50	1.50	0.96
Q4-5 IPJ / Supervisor seeks out info. on important decisions about my job	4.18	1.59	4.09	1.69	0.66

Post-intervention interviews with five supervisors within the ASUPD who attended the AC4P training provided insights into the value of relationships between supervisors and employees. By using the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1992), the interview transcripts were analyzed and coded into topics in HyperResearch (HyperResearch 4.5.0, 2018). Next, the frequency with which the topics were expressed by the participants were analyzed. As a result of this analysis the following themes and their associated components and findings were formed.

**Theme 1: Importance of relationship building.** *Finding 1 – Supervisors recognized the need for genuine relationships between supervisors and employees for organizational health.* The following associated components related to this finding

showed supervisors were: (a) exhibiting dedication to employees personally and professionally; (b) taking employees’ concerns to heart; and (c) mentoring employees.

Table 4

*Themes, Theme-related Components, and Findings*

Themes, Theme-related Components	Findings
<i>Theme 1: Importance of relationship building between the employee and their supervisor</i>	
1. Exhibiting dedication to their employees personally and professionally	1. Supervisors recognized the need for genuine relationships between supervisors and employees for organizational health
2. Taking employee concerns to heart	
3. Mentoring employees	
<i>Theme 2: Employee success and how that occurs</i>	
1. Developing employees	2. Supervisors saw the value of each employee’s success and how that accelerated their productivity/job satisfaction as well as service to community
2. Valuing employees	
3. Challenging employees to do their best	
4. Showing genuine interest in employees’ success	
<i>Theme 3: Effective communication skills</i>	
1. Giving employees voice	3. Communication skills were critical for employees to feel valued and happy, which built loyalty
2. Providing open communication	
3. Engaging in active listening	

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

*Themes, Theme-related Components, and Findings*

Themes, Theme-related Components	Findings
Theme 4: <i>Barriers to successful relationship building between supervisors and employees</i>	
1. Showing closed mindedness/stubbornness	4. Lack of communication, devaluing employees, and not caring about them individually was damaging to an organization
2. Engaging in miscommunication	
3. Demonstrating controlling behavior	
4. Fostering fear of retaliation or being ostracized for speaking up	

***Exhibiting dedication to their employees personally and professionally.*** Three of the five supervisors interviewed after the AC4P training said they recognized during the AC4P\_training how important it is to be dedicated to the employee and to know the whole employee – in other words, not just to show an interest in the employee when they were in the office conducting their work, but rather to learn and know what was important to them in their lives. For example, Lt. Cobalt said:

I believe that in order to be a good supervisor, you have to understand and you have to be part of your subordinates’ life ... you have to have that open flow of communication, ... Somebody else actually cares about me [the employee] and they understand that I have a life outside of work and then that’s going to make me want to do the best I can because people here care and we’re like a family.

Sgt. Rose confirmed this, describing a good supervisor as “somebody who is truthful and will stick with their word, have your back, really. So, a dedication to the employee, where

you feel like they're supportive and doesn't undermine. An educator, somebody who likes to teach."

Interestingly, several supervisors used the phrase "have your back" indicating they, themselves, want a supervisor that watches over them and looks out for them, a sentiment that reoccurred throughout the interviews. Supervisor Sage, following the training, described her previous supervisor, who was dedicated to her employees, thus:

She always made sure that people were held accountable but then at the same time, she identified characteristics in all of her dispatchers and our supervisors and knew where they fit best, and she really groomed them to excel in those areas.

***Taking employee concerns to heart.*** When talking about what they had learned in class, as well as experiences with good supervisors in the past, three of the five participants noted valuing a supervisor who had their subordinates' concerns in mind and showed general interest in them. Interviewees conveyed this helped them stay loyal to the organization and that supervisor. Lt. Pine described these types of supervisors as "basically, the ones that are more engaged, have been the better supervisors, the ones that are with their people going out there on the scenes and everything." To the employees of the department, a supervisor coming out on scene shows them that they are cared about and that the supervisor is willing to put themselves in the same situation they expect the employee to be in. Lt. Pine further emphasized this point:

That's kind of the way I've always tried to do it is I show up. I ask what's going on. I tell my people, "I like to check in with you instead of check up on you."

That's always been an important thing for me is going out there and seeing what's going on. I ask my people, "What's going on?" If they tell me, I say, "Okay,

sounds like you got it” and I leave. That to me is one of the most important aspects, especially as a field supervisor, is you’re going out there and checking in with your people, making sure things are done.

Supervisor Sage stated she strove to prioritize the needs of her employees. As she did so, she found the employees were reciprocating. She illustrated this by giving an example of a project she assigned to one of her employees:

When I was talking to her, I was like, ‘Have I told you how amazing you are today?’ You know, because I try and constantly tell her how grateful I am for everything she does. So as soon as we were done with that, we received an email from the registrar’s office, so we’re going to have to send off all of these letters and stuff. And so, she came upstairs without being prompted. She’s like, ‘Hey, I just saw Jen’s email. I’m going to get started on those if you want.’ Which is something that I would normally have to prompt her to do because she really doesn’t prioritize the tests where I kind of oversee them. I say, ‘Okay, we really need to get started on this one.’

Sgt. Blue shared similar experiences by discussing how he advocated for an employee who needed time off and specific work hours that did not interfere with his academic classes at the university and felt undervalued as though he was not being listened to by the university. Ultimately, Sgt. Blue was not able to change the university’s mind because of policy but was able to come back to the employee and explain why. The fact that Sgt. Blue listened to him and tried to help made all the difference despite the outcome.

***Mentoring employees.*** The supervisors indicated AC4P training allowed them to start to realize the importance of mentoring and not just supervising for overall

organizational health. Sgt. Rose explained that she recognized the importance of grooming and mentoring her newer officers so they could better serve the university:

I'm offering them the resources, but I'm letting them come to that conclusion on their own, because I don't want to spoon-feed them. I feel like they're not going to learn anything if I do that. I've got plenty of my own ideas that I want to do. Sometimes I will throw hints out there. So, I said, 'have you checked the stairwell doors? Have you spoken with the facilities workers that work on the building? Is there anything like that?' Then that usually gets them going, 'Oh, okay.' Then they go off in their direction of what they're going to do.

Supervisor Sage affirmed the value of mentoring and what it did to employee morale when she said this about a challenging project, she let an employee take over:

So, it's kind of her baby. And she was very ... 'I thought those were great ideas.' She was receptive to [my ideas], and I think like she felt validated when we confirmed that her ideas were good [also].

Discussing how he helps mentor his employees and what effect it has on them, Sgt. Blue said:

[When people are deficient] I put them in touch with someone that you work with who also has those strengths so you can kind of use peers to train each other and make each other better. And then they not only have the confidence in you, but it also builds confidence internally where, 'Hey, I know if I have this issue and I'm not the best [at conducting] driving under the influence investigations (DUIs), I can go see officer A. I'm not the best at impounding property, so I go to officer



B.’ And we’re human and I think it’s okay to make mistakes and it’s okay to want to learn from our mistakes. That’s how we get better.

**Theme 2: Employee success and how that occurs.** *Finding 2 – Supervisors saw the value of each employee ‘s success and how that accelerated their productivity/job satisfaction as well as service to community.* Beyond mentoring, employees had a desire to develop and to be challenged. When employees experience this growth, they felt valued and in turn added value and engagement (Stamper & Masterson, 2002). The following themes surfaced during interviews of the five supervisors: (a) developing employees, (b) valuing employees, (c) challenging employees to do their best, and (d) showing genuine interest in employees’ success.

Developing *employees*. Employees have needed to be developed and be in a constant state of growth to feel happy in their jobs (Stamper & Masterson, 2002). Supervisors played critical roles in allowing employees to test new theories and update current practices. Sgt. Rose realized as she took the AC4P training that even her role as a first-line level supervisor was key in allowing an employee to grow:

So, when I go to my supervisor, I can say, hey listen, we’ve got this and this and this has been proven to help, so why can’t we do it this way? Need to stop saying just no and say, hold on, let me think about it and then have a reason for why you’re going to say no. I think that this training has actually enabled me to help other people maybe care for other people too. So, I’m extremely confident that it’s going to be a good thing for me.

Sgt. Rose was indicating here that when she went to her own supervisor with a solution to a problem, she appreciated it when her supervisor gave her idea some thought rather than

just dismissing it immediately. If the supervisor dismissed it, she wanted an explanation for why it was a bad idea so she could learn. She realized she had the opportunity to take her preferred approach with her own employees when they came to her with their own ideas.

Lt. Pine realized it was important for his employees to continue their professional development and his participation in that process:

I just sit down with them and ask them, ‘Okay, what are your goals here?’ We don’t have all these other specialty assignments, but let’s see what we can do within our working area. For example, when I was on nights with ‘James,’ he was big on doing the online stuff [using social media to fight crime and develop leads] and everything. We let him run with that to a certain point, it gave him and it gave the people around him something else to do besides just patrol and get into that routine where employees get bored and complacent.

Lt. Pine indicated that some employees had to be pushed towards development since many of them will not map their own route. Supervisor Sage recognized the reciprocating benefit of employee development while talking about an employee she mentored who possibly felt indebted:

... in some form I feel like I’ve helped her excel at something or develop her and then there’s some sort of appreciation ... she feels some sort of loyalty to me in the sense that I would go out of my way to do anything for her and develop her career.

Sgt. Blue explained he felt the department and community benefited from his engagement with his employees. He said that he saw his job as developing the next group of supervisors:

My biggest thing is preparing them to take my spot if I leave and if they want it or to be the best sergeant that they can for their people so then they can prepare their people to eventually be their successor.

***Valuing employees.*** During the interviews with the supervisors, many of them said they recognized that if an employee did not feel valued, they would go somewhere else to work. As documented in the problem of practice in chapter one, ASUPD has lost many employees to other agencies, which damaged the morale of the department. Lt.

Cobalt explained how making sure an employee felt valued was important:

Acknowledge that they are humans, that they are part of this bigger team, and by doing that, I think we're showing them that they're not just a number. ... And I think that by us showing that we do care about them as individuals and as employees, there will be reciprocation. They'll actually start to care about their job because they know, 'If I do a good job, they respect me for it. But then I also respect myself and I'll continue in it.' It just builds that positivity.

Showing employees that supervisors truly cared about them and valued them did not always come naturally. During our interview, Supervisor Sage stated this was something on which she had to work:

I am very work driven. I am very much a driver. I'm not touchy-feely or really personable. I tend to just be very focused on work. So, I've had to make a very conscious effort to say, 'Hey, how was your weekend?' And those general

conversations that I don't normally have. Then on top of that, just understanding what her goals are and how I as a supervisor can help her get there.

***Challenging employees to do their best.*** Similar to developing employees, challenging employees was an important part of ensuring employees' satisfaction and engagement. Some employees challenged themselves on their own, while others needed a proverbial push from the nest. During our interview, Sgt. Rose explained how she challenged her employees:

What I want to see from you [the officer] is something creative. You plan it, you pick an issue and let's see where we can take it ... You let me know what you need, and we'll get it for you. But I said, but it needs to be done. It can't be a stalemate. You can't just sit there and go, 'Oh, there's nothing going on, so there's nothing for us to do.'

She recognized employees will blame an organization for their lack of growth if not challenged and that not all employees intrinsically pushed themselves. She also knew she would have to be the one to challenge them:

We can't just sit around, we're not firefighters, we're police officers. Part of our job is active patrolling. 'You're doing a great job so far, what can I do to help you take it to the next step and do something further?'

Sgt. Rose was advocating for something more than basic activity from her officers, something that they can invest in and build upon. Supervisor Sage described the same issues when dealing with her non-police officer employees within the police department. Again, she noted employees must be challenged and pushed to excel; otherwise, they

would find the path of least resistance, which ultimately led to them being dissatisfied (Graen et al., 1982). She illustrated this point with the following example:

I have been trying to find out what the end goal is or where she's trying to go, and I guess it's supportive in some sense. I'll say, 'Hey, these are the three tasks I have. Which one would you feel comfortable doing? And then if you don't feel comfortable doing these other two, tell me why. And then what do we need to do in order to sharpen those skills or to provide you with the knowledge for you to feel comfortable, so we can get you that training.'

Sgt. Blue provided similar examples, such as when he pulled employees aside to help them to attain the next level of promotion all while teaching them the police department's internal political landscape. Here, he helped the employee challenge their way of thinking rather than their behavior or work performance:

He's an officer and he's currently on the sergeant's list and he said some incidents where he feels like he's butting his head against a wall and he's not getting some of the answers that he wants. And at one point, he was a little vocal and negative and it was in front of a larger audience and I just pulled him to the side one day ... when it comes time to promote, if there's an opening, they start thinking like, 'Is this really the next guy we want moving up the chain in order to promote the message of the chief's office?'

Sgt. Blue was clearly confident in his ability to coach this younger officer and engage him in an uncomfortable conversation.

***Showing genuine interest in employees' success.*** Often employees had personal needs outside the scope of the organization that needed to be resolved. It was very easy

for supervisors to back away from this and not want to get involved, much to the employee's detriment. Two of the supervisors brought up the need to refer officers to counseling outside of the police department. The following were just a few quotes from the supervisor interviews that illustrated supervisors going further than they typically would have prior to AC4P training to ensure that employees could be successful in the future. Lt. Pine said:

So, I said, 'If you're [the officer] looking for counseling, that could take a little while to find the right counselor that works for you.' We worked with what we had within the department and also with outside resources. But we were still dealing with issues with this particular officer when it comes to work stuff. We're still on that cusp of do we have to go to a PIP (performance improvement plan) now? Or are the personal problems interfering with the job performance to where it's becoming a performance issue?

By showing a genuine interest in employees' personal well-being, a level of trust builds within the employee/supervisor relationship. Sgt. Blue gave an example of when an employee had missed coming into work on a day they had been scheduled to work, but which they would not usually work. Because the employee trusted Sgt. Blue, he was honest about being late, and because Sgt. Blue trusted the employee would not do it again and that missing work had been unintentional, Sgt. Blue did not pursue any disciplinary action, which would ultimately have damaged the employee's career over a slip of the mind:

He came in, self-reported to me. We sat down, he called me the next day expecting discipline. I said, 'Wait a minute, it's one mistake. You're human. Float

days come and go. Sometimes you come when you're not supposed to be here.' Whether it is professional or personal counseling that is needed, the supervisors must be willing to help steer employees in the right direction to accelerate personal development and success, and employees must trust that guidance.

**Theme 3: Communication skills are critical for effective supervisors.** *Finding* – *Communication skills were critical for employees to feel valued and happy, which built loyalty.* From the interviews, four theme components emerged: (a) giving employees voice, (b) providing open communication, (c) offering employees praise, and (d) engaging in active listening.

***Giving employees voice.*** During the supervisor interviews, all agreed that hearing an employee's opinions was critical to that employee's commitment to the department's mission. The supervisors commented that by listening to the employees and being open to feedback from them makes working with them much easier and makes for much happier employees. One supervisor gave an example of giving the employees voice when it came to a particular tedious task that they were required to do. Sgt. Blue described the response:

They appreciated that I asked them for their input because it directly affected them, and they appreciated the fact that they wouldn't have to stay on a detail for three hours and they got a little change ... and they created the schedule.

By allowing the employees to be heard, this supervisor was able to create buy-in. Lt. Cobalt explained that for his employees, allowing them to have a voice and be heard meant that they felt their supervisor cared about them and that they were important:

... sometimes my employees just want to feel like they're heard. They want people to understand their issues and they want to understand the reasoning behind some of the things that we do. I had a squad briefing with my police aides the other day, and one of them brought up the fact that it feels like nobody cares about them, and I took that personally, not offended, but like, it was a failure on my part. So, I said, 'Well that's probably partly my fault.' And they said, 'No, it's not your fault because you're actually listening to us.'

***Providing open communication.*** The five supervisors repeatedly spoke about open communication. They discussed that they appreciated it in previous supervisors they had, and now they tried to communicate openly with their subordinates. The benefits of this included the building of trust between employees and their supervisors and allowing the employee to know there was no hidden agenda. When asked how he went about being an open communicator, Lt. Cobalt shared that he liked to meet with his employees outside the office out on campus where they had open conversations that approached topics beyond work issues:

... what do you want to do a year from now? Where do you see yourself? Are you going to apply for the next sergeant position? ... get their career goals, a better understanding. [During that time] I can talk about family life, home life. How are your kids doing in college? How are your kids doing in school? Any problems on the home fronts? I have no problem with the personal part of it. But I think through individual time, it's kind of like, I treat them kind of like, and I know this is condescending, like children. Like they're my kids.



For some of the supervisors, being an open communicator meant that they were blunt, and although there was no intent to insult the employees, these supervisors tended to be frank in their conversations. Sgt. Blue said:

I try to balance the negative with the positive when I'm talking to them. Even if it's just in a casual conversation, I like to give them something positive to kind of soften the negative part that I do.

During the interviews with supervisors, the component of being transparent had several different names, including *integrity*, *trustworthiness*, and *being truthful*. Ultimately, the supervisors emphasized the value of being genuine and people being able to take them at face value and not having ulterior motives. Sgt. Blue explained in his interview:

I would say the key for the best [supervisor] would be honesty, integrity, trustworthy, transparent. I don't know what word I want to ... just caring. I find that I've been successful working with people that care, and they let their people know that they are valued. And I think that goes both ways between the employee and the supervisor.

Several of the interviewed supervisors stated they respected supervisors they had in the past who stood up for what was right regardless of the potential for unfavorable outcomes by those higher in the organization feeling like they are being challenged. They also had clear work expectations that were communicated to their employees. Supervisor Sage discussed a former supervisor she had who she respected greatly for her high level of integrity; "She always fought for her people. She had a backbone. She didn't care if it was really going to ruffle feathers. If she knew that it was right, she was going to say

something.” Having a supervisor who was trustworthy and transparent is critical to the sense of security of the employee and their feeling of well-being. Sgt. Blue warned, in his opinion, what a lack of transparency and truthfulness would bring:

I just think honesty is the biggest thing. If someone’s dishonest and they’re leading you, it doesn’t go anywhere because eventually they may be dishonest enough to make you believe for so long, but eventually they’re going to step on it and you’re going to catch them, and then all your work trust is gone.

***Engaging in active listening.*** During the supervisor interviews, four of them indicated they felt active listening was critical to being a good supervisor and supporting employees. Sgt. Rose indicated since the training she has noticed more supervisors listening to their employees and being empathic. She expressed that this was a departure from what she had seen in the past:

I’ve seen a lot of that happen lately. I don’t know if there’s a lot of stress or what going on, but when somebody is aggravated or irritated, I’ve seen ... a couple of supervisors, instead of making a joke, like we normally would, or say, ‘Oh, you’re just being crabby,’ it’s actually, ‘Hey, why don’t you come and see me?’ Then you hear them say, ‘What’s going on? I noticed that you’re a little irritated today.’ Rarely do I hear that happening. It’s never like that. It’s always like, ‘Oh, get over it, dude. You’re just going through something.’ But people have been opening up and I don’t know if that’s because there’s a proactive asking of Hey, what’s going on? Why are you so upset?’ I think it’s they’re more aware.

Sgt. Blue explained that by using active listening they were able to resolve an issue for an employee in a way that probably would not have happened in the past. By asking a few

questions and hearing the employee's request, the supervisor was able to come to a compromise that benefited the employee and the department simultaneously. The supervisor described the situation:

... I'm going to revert back to my first employee who had the job and school [simultaneously]. The employee came to me and stated that they asked for permission to alter their schedule for the rest of this rotation. Not something that I can just say yes to, so they came to me with the problem, asked for the change in schedule, provided the solutions and gave me information to pass up the chain. I passed it up through the chain of command and my commander was very open to it .... We were able to adjust his schedule for the remainder of the year so we were able to meet the needs [of the employee] and still meet the needs of the department.

Many supervisors find it easier to say "no" rather than examining the options and doing a little work to make a positive impression on their employees. Without active listening and some effort on the supervisor's part of working towards a mutually beneficial solution, it was difficult for today's employee to feel like the organization "has their back." On the other hand, according to the supervisors interviewed, if the supervisor listens to the employee, weighs the options, and still is unable to meet the employee's request, the employee is much more likely to accept the answer. Sgt. Blue discussed this in his interview when he talked about an employee who was trying to get a day off on a day that was already blacked out on the schedule (meaning there are no permissible absences for that day):

Another issue I'm working with now is we have mandatory football games that our officers and police aides are expected to work at. One of them [blacked out day] is in direct conflict with one of my [police]aide's, my civilian employee's annual family get together. And so, they [the police aide] proposed to me that they were able to find somebody else to work their game. They came up to me and provided me [with] a solution and they also tried to come up with another solution for the future so that this wouldn't happen again. And there is the Thanksgiving game, it's an 'all hands-on deck' game and the department is having a hard time meeting the needs of this employee. So, we're still in the process right now, but the employee understands that. I don't think they will be so happy with it, but they'll understand the reason behind it if we're not able to meet the need of the employee.

The qualitative data suggested that by genuinely listening to employees, trying to meet them in the middle, and openly communicating with them helped increase their feeling of value and importance to the organization, regardless of whether or not their request could be met. This in turn, built employees' loyalty to the organization.

**Theme 4: Barriers.** *Finding 4 – Lack of communication, devaluing employees, and not caring about them individually was damaging to an organization.* Several theme-related components appeared in the interview data that supported the finding and indicated supervisors were concerned about those who were: (a) showing closed mindedness or stubbornness, (b) engaging in miscommunication, (c) demonstrating controlling behavior, and (d) fostering fear of retaliation or being ostracized for speaking up.

*Showing closed mindedness/stubbornness.* During the interviews, the supervisors recognized that being close minded on new approaches or new ways of doing things would be detrimental to the organization (AC4P training). All of the supervisors interviewed referred to their own experiences as employees and some of the supervisors they had worked for in the past or under whom they currently worked. Many first-line supervisors within the police department, who probably could have benefited the most from the AC4P training, failed to attend since the training was optional. Two of the supervisors in the interviews felt the training would be beneficial for all supervisors, and specifically named a few. They expressed hope that the training would be mandatory in the future. Sgt. Rose gave the following information when describing some of her past supervisors who she felt stood in the way of creating a positive community at work:

They are set in their ways, very selfish. They don't see the big picture, it's very 'my way or the highway.' They don't care about personal wellbeing. They don't care about the morale or well-being of anybody, really, as long as you're doing what's he or she thinks that you should be doing. Micromanager. Somebody who doesn't trust the employees to do the things that need to be done, even if it's been proven that they can do it and they've never made an error. Letting go of some of control, too controlling.

During the interviews, many supervisors discussed their experiences with supervisors who operated by a "because I said so" mentality. Lt. Cobalt gave an example:

I've seen it here [ASUPD], we've had authoritative leaders that say, 'You're going to do this because I told you to do it.' And every time somebody below

them would ask up, they would say ‘no, no, no, no’ to the point where the subordinates stopped asking and they just gave up.

Additional concerns came up during interviews regarding supervisors who persisted in mistreating employees because that was how they themselves were treated – as if such behavior was some sort of rite of passage. Sgt. Rose recounted hearing another supervisor reject an idea by saying: “Well I didn’t get to do that as police aide, and I was just fine, so they don’t get to do that.”

***Engaging in miscommunication.*** Among the many barriers that prevented supervisors from succeeding was miscommunication. The overall perception of communication by the supervisors interviewed was that clear communication was critical. Quite often things were misconstrued, and assumptions were made based on partial information or flawed information. In response to the question of how they liked to communicate with their employees Sgt. Blue stated:

I’m not a big fan of email communication because you lose tone, you lose intention, you lose all of these different non-verbal cues through the written word if you’re not a[n] English or literature arts major. So, I believe in face-to-face communication.

Lt. Pine pointed out that the receiver of the communication could also misconstrue the message based on their mindset or mood at the time of receiving it, “So they think that you’re being disrespectful when you’re not, you’re just asking a question.”

***Demonstrating controlling behavior.*** The overall perception of a controlling supervisor is that they do not trust the employee. Standing over an employee and micromanaging them, telling the employee that they are not to be trusted and must be

supervised every step of the way. In support of this, Sgt. Blue shared his perception of a controlling supervisor that he has observed as “a micromanager. Somebody who doesn’t trust the employees to do the things that need to be done, even if it’s been proven that they can do [those things], and they’ve never made an error.”

*Fostering fear of retaliation or being ostracized for speaking up.* Another barrier that kept employees from engaging with supervisors on issues they were concerned about was the fear of retaliation or being targeted. The perception by some supervisors of being called into question by employees caused the supervisor to not share information because they may have perceived it was being second-guessed by a subordinate. Another reason why supervisors may not have communicated with employees was because the information was privileged. Sgt. Blue explained how he felt supervisors higher in the chain of command (executive staff) were not forthcoming with information when an employee assigned to another squad (not his employee) had been disciplined, in his opinion, more harshly than someone else who had done something similar. That employee ultimately left the organization because they felt targeted. Sgt. Blue explained:

Recently, we had an officer go to another department, and I know that officer got discipline and that another officer, who did the exact same thing more publicly, did not get the same amount of discipline. The officer who left got a first written reprimand and the officer who did it more publicly got a letter of instruction [less severe and by policy not counted as discipline in the employee record]. It was brought to the attention of the people who I was working for and the supervisor of the employee who left [the department]. Basically, [what I was told each instance

is going to be different] ... after the fact that officer ended up leaving the department because, I guess, they felt like they were being targeted.

Sgt. Rose raised similar concerns and shared a personal experience of drawing attention to unequal treatment of employees who had performed the same actions. Sgt. Rose stated in her interview that she was treated differently from the moment she brought the issue to the attention of her supervisors. She said she regretted bringing the matter to the supervisors' attention and that pointing out the inequality had only made her feel like she was no longer accepted within the group.

### **Summary of Results**

Quantitative results from the pre-intervention and post-intervention surveys, SOJS and EOJS, showed the AC4P training had no effect on either the supervisors' or the employees' ratings, and, therefore, the researcher accepted the null hypothesis.

Qualitative data demonstrated four themes that emerged from the supervisors interviewed after the AC4P training has been administered. The four themes were (a) the importance of relationship building between the employee and their supervisor, (b) employee success, (c) effective communication skills, and (d) barriers to successful supervision. These themes reflected supervisors' understandings and perceptions of what effective supervision is.

Despite the quantitative data analysis showing no change in the ratings between the pre-intervention SOJS/EOJS and the post-intervention SOJS/EOJS, the qualitative results from the post-intervention supervisor interviews suggested there was a positive effect on the supervisors' attitudes and possibly their behavior, attributable to the AC4P



training they received. In the next chapter, I will interpret the results of these data and explore possible explanations for the results.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter, data are presented and analyzed pertaining to this study. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, an interpretation of the findings as they pertain to the research questions, implications for practice, and limitations and recommendations for further research and practice.

This study's purpose is to understand the importance of organizational justice (OJ) within the ASUPD and how first-line level supervisors could learn and use OJ practices to improve supervisor–employee relationships. Prior to the study, the ASUPD was experiencing difficulty with employees leaving for other employers, excessive sick time usage, in-fighting within the ranks of the organization, and terminations and discipline in response to policy violations. I understand many supervisors within the ASUPD had never been trained in or witnessed OJ as they rose through the ASUPD hierarchy. As a result, many first-line level supervisors feel they are doing good jobs simply by completing their administrative tasks in a timely manner and managing employee issues as they arise. My desire is to teach first-line level supervisors how to use OJ to create an environment of accountability *and* equitable treatment with compassion, understanding, patience, and respect. Toward this end, I modified an existing professional development plan called “Actively Caring for People” (AC4P) written by Dr. Scott Geller and Mr. Bobby Kipper (Geller & Kipper, 2017) that focuses on applying OJ constructs.

Since a majority of the first-line level supervisors in the ASUPD had never received this type of training before, I wanted to study the effect of the AC4P training on

their abilities and self-efficacies to apply OJ leadership principles. I also wanted to understand how they would implement OJ once the training had been provided for them. Once the first-line level supervisors were trained, I also wanted to understand if the supervisors' subordinates, referred to as 'the employees' sensed differences in the following: their supervisors' uses of OJ; the pursuit of employee input on decisions that affected them; and increased employee willingness to engage with supervisors and/or the organization.

### **Interpretation of Findings**

A review and analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data—including the EOJS, the SOJS both pre- and post-intervention, and supervisor interviews—suggest that the AC4P does not have a statistically significant effect on the supervisors or employees with a few exceptions, as described in Chapter 4.

In the pre-intervention SOJS, supervisors rate themselves highly in their abilities to recognize opportunities to apply OJ within the ASUPD, leaving little or no room for improvement in the future. After the AC4P training was given to the supervisors and the post-intervention SOJS was administered, supervisors rate themselves slightly lower than previously, but not enough to be statistically significant. In other words, after the supervisors receive the training, the data suggest they rate themselves with slightly less confidence than before. Quite often, people are unaware of their low levels of proficiency (Dunning, Johnson, Ehrlinger, & Kruger, 2003). That is to say, overconfidence can drown any sense of lack of skill, allowing individuals to overestimate their performance in particular areas and be blind to their shortcomings (Dunning et al., 2003). A similar interpretation is called 'response-shift bias' (Howard & Dailey, 1979). In response-shift

bias respondents' lower ratings occur because they use more stringent criteria to make their post-intervention judgements, whereas, they used more 'liberal' criteria at the pre-intervention assessment (Howard & Dailey, 1979).

Similarly, the employees respond with no statistically significant change between the pre-intervention EOJS and post-intervention EOJS. This suggests that the employees see no difference in supervisory OJ performance as a result of taking the class. When comparing the results of the EOJS (the employees rating their supervisors) to those of the SOJS (supervisors rating themselves), the employee mean scores are slightly lower on both the pre-intervention EOJS and the post-intervention EOJS than the corresponding pre- and post-intervention SOJS scores. This indicates supervisors rate themselves more highly at using OJ than employees do. A possible explanation of the ratings slightly dropping from pre- to post-intervention EOJS and SOJS is the training (for the supervisors) and the surveys (for the employees) make both groups more aware of the shortcomings of the supervisors. Although the employees do not take the training, they are being asked to note any difference in their supervisors' practices of OJ from the pre-EOJS to post EOJS. Another factor is that employees do not always work for the same supervisor in a given week. Due to scheduling shifts around the clock (24 hours a day), an employee may see their actual supervisor two times a week and work for someone entirely different the other days. It is also possible that the employees described different supervisors at different points in time as the study progressed, not just their primary supervisors. As mentioned, not all the supervisors attended the training, and employee participation was not limited to only those employees whose primary supervisors attended the training. This arrangement occurred because, as I have described, employees

may work with supervisors who attended the AC4P training, but who are not their actual supervisors. Therefore, it is plausible that some employees who participated in the study never had opportunities to work with supervisors who attended the AC4P training and thus would not have observed any noticeable difference in supervisory performance.

The qualitative data from the supervisors' interviews does not align with the quantitative data, however. Interviewed supervisors speak highly of the class and confirm they are using many more of the operationalized OJ constructs in their day-to-day interactions with their employees than they had before, feeling as if it is making a difference with their employees. Many supervisors provide examples of things they do or observe since the AC4P training. This suggests the training gave the supervisors more awareness of their shortcomings (possibly explaining the drop in their self-evaluations on the post-SOJS) and abilities to act on opportunities to present more OJ to employees.

## **Discussion and Implications**

### **Discussion of Research Questions and Findings and Implications**

Below are the research questions and the research findings that address them.

*Research Question One—What is the effect of an organizational justice-based professional development training program on first-line level supervisors' self-efficacies related to leadership?* The quantitative findings indicate no statistically significant increase in supervisor self-efficacy related to leadership after taking the AC4P training. The qualitative interviews of the supervisors, however, do exhibit positive changes in their self-efficacies related to leadership as a result of the AC4P training. Although this training is the first time many of the participating supervisors ever received information

or instruction on OJ, they overwhelmingly believe they are already using this information in their daily practices and interactions with their employees and feel confident in their ability to do so.

*Research Question Two—What is the effect of an organizational justice-based professional development training program on first-line level supervisors' planned implementation of organizational justice?* Similar to findings related to the first research question, the survey data reveal no change in supervisors' behaviors after participating in the AC4P training. According to the rating scores the supervisors give themselves, they are already highly involved in implementing OJ within their work units with their employees. The supervisor interviews indicate supervisors become more aware of the opportunities to use OJ in employee interactions and are acting on them. The supervisors also recognize the shortcomings of other supervisors who did not participate in the training and feel that they could benefit from the training. Some supervisors recognize areas in which they need to improve, especially making more efforts to build relationships with employees through OJ practices, which do not come to them naturally.

*Research Question Three—What is the effect of an organizational justice-based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' senses of organizational fairness?* An analysis of the survey data from the employees reveals no difference between their senses of organizational fairness before and after the supervisors received the training. Based on the means of the EOJS scores, as they pertain to the employees' senses of organizational fairness (both distributive justice and procedural justice), employees rate their supervisors as average with room to improve, meaning they likely do not observe their supervisors doing their best to ensure fair treatment. This

suggests there was simply no change in organizational fairness in the observed timeframe. Another explanation could be because employees not part of the AC4P training they are unaware of what changes to look for in their supervisors.

*Research Question Four—What is the effect of an organizational justice-based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' perceptions of their own influence in decision-making within the organization?* Similar to the third research question results, data from the employees reveal no difference in supervisors' behaviors from the employees' perspectives. Although interviews with the supervisors indicate they involve employees in more decision-making processes since the AC4P training, these data do not support that assertion. It is possible that the amount of time between the AC4P training and the post-intervention EOJS assessment is too short to allow supervisors to engage with employees in decision-making processes, as they claim to do.

*Research Question Five—What is the effect of an organizational justice-based professional development training program for supervisors on their subordinates' willingness to engage?* Again, the null hypothesis is accepted because the data from the employees reveals no notable difference in their willingness to engage with their supervisors and the organization. In interviews with the supervisors, they indicate they observe employees being more responsive—volunteering for committees, for instance—for no extra compensation. The supervisors attribute this change to their deeper connections with the employees, which would support the leader-member exchange theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) described in Chapter 2: Each side of the employee–

supervisor relationship reciprocates positive and negative interactions as they are received.

### **Threats to Validity**

The goal of this study was to investigate the effect of an OJ training (AC4P) on first-line level supervisors and employees of the ASUPD. The quantitative survey data collected to test the study's five research questions show no statistically significant changes induced by the training in either supervisor or employee perceptions of behavior. A qualitative analysis of the interviews conducted with supervisors who attended the AC4P training, however, show it had improved their use of OJ abilities. These findings are not what I had anticipated, which is possibly due to the study's limitations and threats to validity.

**History.** In my effort to bring leadership instruction to the ASUPD to improve its culture, the department could have been affected by the book *Improving Motivation and Morale: A Police Leaders Guidebook* that I bought for each supervisor. The book covers concepts like improving employee morale, defining goals, communication, employee wellness, and recognition (Kasper, 2012). This book was purchased for them in 2018 and was not a required read, but it was recommended that they read it. Also, during the timeframe of this study (Spring 2019 through Spring 2020), ASUPD executives championed a new pay plan that gave most of the employees and supervisors (both sworn and civilian) substantial raises, bringing their salaries up to competitive market rates which lifted morale and could have influenced employee outlook on how they were being treated at work. The employees also underwent continued education, which is mandatory



and is conducted during the same time period as the study which included mindfulness and stress reduction strategies which again may have positively influenced employees' perspectives on the department. All these factors could affect the results.

**Experimenter effect.** As the researcher and the Chief of Police of the ASUPD during the time of this study, I am highly aware of the possibility of influencing the responses of the participants, their anticipations of my desires may influence their answers and thus obscure their true feelings. To avoid this, all correspondence and surveys (including the SOJSs and EOJSs) were administered by my dissertation chairperson to hide the participants' identities from me. Instructions are also shared with the participants to clarify that they would remain completely anonymous. The AC4P training was also presented by Mr. Bobby Kipper, one of the authors of the book and the AC4P professional development (Geller & Kipper, 2017), instead of me. Finally, although, I serve as the interviewer for the supervisor interviews, I limit the questions to the supervisors' experiences and observations, making it clear through consent forms that there would be absolutely no repercussions whatsoever as a result of their responses (see Appendix D for the consent form).

**Social desirability effect.** It is important to note that in the SOJS and supervisor interviews I asked solely for the supervisors' self-evaluations of performance. Participants may answer questions or respond in ways socially acceptable to me, their supervisor; This phenomenon is referred to as the "social desirability effect." Therefore, when the supervisors are asked to rate themselves on actions and skills, they may answer in ways they consider socially acceptable for leaders in the ASUPD. To reduce this effect, the participants remained anonymous, as described in Chapter 3.

## **Lessons Learned**

One lesson learned from this study is the difficulty of simultaneously occupying both the role of researcher and Chief of Police. I often find myself weighing competing decision-making criteria as a police professional and as a researcher, assessing prioritization based on both the department's needs and research needs. A better approach would be studying another university police department at which I am not the chief and could be simply a researcher. This may reduce threats to the study's validity.

The length of time between the AC4P and post-training surveys is another issue that may influence the outcomes of the study. Preferably, I would allocate more time between the AC4P training and the post-intervention training surveys and interviews to afford supervisors and employees more time to observe and practice OJ.

This study was conducted while the police department was still operating and supervisors and employees were interacting, responding to police calls for service and conducting investigations. A control group in the study may provide more decisive evidence on the effect of the AC4P training, but including one would be difficult, as supervisors work closely with one another; isolating them from each other would be nearly impossible.

## **Recommendations for Future Research and Practice**

In this section, I emphasize some of the key takeaways that other law enforcement administrators, supervisors, and employees may find useful in implementing OJ internally.

As discussed in Chapter 2, studies have shown that practicing internal OJ theory within police organizations improves officers' perceptions of fairness within the

department and consequently officers become less likely to participate in police misconduct (Trinkner et al., 2016; Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). Unfortunately, I was unable to find research discussing how OJ is injected into those departments in the first place or how they practice it. It is unclear if OJ training needs to be presented in (a) a classroom setting over several sessions, (b) a mentoring fashion with one-on-one discussions over long periods of time, (c) by being modeled by command staff (department executives), or (d) presented at all. Data from this study do not support the idea that the 8-hour training on OJ is effective on first-line level supervisors within ASUPD.

For police departments interested in introducing OJ to their employees, I recommend using methods other than a classroom setting. Teaching OJ in a one-day training produced little evidence that the concepts were understood, performed, or maintained. I suggest examining ways where OJ can be more tangible for supervisors and employees, such as injecting it into performance appraisals where the supervisor's appraisal includes OJ constructs and employee input on how their supervisor performs in those areas.

Finally, I recommend examining department policies to ensure their alignment with the OJ framework. For example, if the departmental disciplinary process for policy violations does not allow investigated employees to have voices in the disciplinary process, this would directly oppose the OJ constructs of Procedural Justice and Informational Justice.

## **Conclusion**

This study's findings are built on the work of previous researchers in the field of OJ by applying OJ in a university police department in a major metropolitan city in the

United States. This study reveals that introducing OJ training to first-level supervisors within such a police department does not statistically significantly affect their behaviors or the employees' in the relatively short amount of time that it is introduced and subsequently measured. It does, however, operationalize the model behaviors the ASUPD should expect of its supervisors and employees.

There is current literature that discusses the importance of OJ within police departments (Trinkner & Tyler, 2018, 2016), but none discussing how to deliver related instruction on this important topic or best methods for introducing it to police organizations so that it takes root. Ultimately, an organizations' culture cannot be changed by one class or one leader, but OJ can be a model for police departments to strive for and continuously work towards.

## REFERENCES

- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? the spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (3).
- Ashforth, B. E. (2009). Petty Tyranny in Organizations: A Preliminary Examination of Antecedents and Consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences de l'Administration*.
- Babic, S. (2014). Ethical leadership and leader member exchange (LMX) theory. *CRIS Bulletin*, 1, 61–71.
- Beal, D. J., Trougakos, J. P., Weiss, H. M., & Green, S. G. (2006). Episodic processes in emotional labor: Perceptions of affective delivery and regulation strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In *Research on negotiations in organizations* (1st ed., pp. 43–55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bies, Robert J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of causal accounts. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 199–218.
- Bies, Robert J, & Tripp, T. M. (1998). Two Faces of the Powerless: Coping with Tyranny in Organizations. In *Power and Influence in Organization*, Chapter 9.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in Social Exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34(2), 193–206.
- Boies, K., & Howell, J. M. (2006). Leader-member exchange in teams: An examination of the interaction between relationship differentiation and mean LMX in explaining team-level outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*.
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Van Den Heuvel, M. (2015). Leader-member exchange, work engagement, and job performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30 (7), 754–770.
- Breevaart, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2017). Supervisor's HEXACO personality traits and subordinate perceptions of abusive supervision. *Leadership Quarterly*, 28 (5), 691–700.
- Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: Explaining organisational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22 (4), 428-441.

- Burns, J. Z., & Otte, F. L. (1999). Implications of leader-member exchange theory and research for human resource development research. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10 (3), 225-248.
- CALEA. (2018). Standards Titles | CALEA®. Retrieved October 21, 2018, from <http://www.calea.org/content/standards-titles>
- Can, S. H., Hendy, H. M., & Berkay Ege Can, M. (2017). A pilot study to develop the police transformational leadership scale (PTLS) and examine its associations with psychosocial well-being of officers. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 32, 105-113.
- Carlson, D., Ferguson, M., Hunter, E., & Whitten, D. (2012). Abusive supervision and work-family conflict: The path through emotional labor and burnout. *Leadership Quarterly*, 23 (5), 849–859.
- Cashman, J., Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1976). Organizational understructure and leadership: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15 (2), 278-296.
- Chen, C. Y., & Li, C. I. (2013). Assessing the spiritual leadership effectiveness: The contribution of follower's self-concept and preliminary tests for moderation of culture and managerial position. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24 (1), 240-255.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 286-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. *Handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cox, S. M., Fitch, B. D., & Marchionna, S. (2017). The police culture and work stress. In *Introduction to policing* (3rd ed., p. 456). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE Publications.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika*, 16 (3), 297-334.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management*, 27(3), 324-351.

- Dunning, D., Johnson, K., Ehrlinger, J., & Kruger, J. (2003). Why people fail to recognize their own incompetence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12 (3).
- Eskew, D. E. (1993). The role of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6 (3).
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural Justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Management*, 3, 141–183.
- Folger, Robert. (1977). Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of voice and improvement on experienced inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 108–119.
- Folger, Robert, & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, (32), 115–132.
- Gablíks, E. (2018). Recruiting: What's Working? What's Not? Orlando, FL.
- Gehani, R. (2002). Evolving leader-member exchange (LMX) theory and market-oriented lateral leaders in turbulent global markets. *Marketing Management Journal*, 12(2).
- Geller, E. S., & Kipper, B. (2017). *Actively caring for people: Building positive police/citizen relations*. New York, NY: Morgan James Publishing.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Goodman, A. M. (1990). A model for police officer burnout. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 5 (1), 85–99.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity. *American Sociological Review*, 25 (2), 161-176.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (2), 219–247.
- Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange [LMX] theory of leadership over 25 years. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (2), 219–247.

- Graen, G., Novak, M. A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: a new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5 (1), 95-110.
- Grandey, Alicia A. (2003). When “the show must go on”: Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46 (1). 86-96.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of Perceived Fairness of Performance Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 340–342.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16 (2).
- Grondel, D. T., Worthington, G., & Rowlanda Cawthon, E. (2016). *An Investigation of the Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Dark Leadership Behavior in Law Enforcement Executives*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Brandman Univesity.
- Gwynne, J. L. (2014). *The effects of low-quality LMX dyads on subordinate perceptions of organizational justice and organizational commitment: A phenomenological investigation*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Capella University.
- Harter, J., & Adkins, A. (2015). Employees Want a Lot More From Their Managers. Retrieved October 11, 2018, from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/236570/employees-lot-managers.aspx>
- Hester, J. (2013). The high cost of employee turnover and how to avoid it. *Nonprofit World*, 31(May), 20–21.
- Hochschild, A. R. (2012). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Univ. of California Press.
- Howard, G. S., & Dailey, P. R. (1979). Response-shift bias: A source of contamination of self-report measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64(2), 144–150.
- Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77 (1), 3-21.



- IACP. (2012). *Leadership in police organizations* (pp. 355–368). Washington DC: IACP.
- IBM SPSS Statistics. (2016).
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology, 92*(1), 269.
- Kasper, J. (2012). *Improving motivation and morale: A police leaders guide*. Flushing, NY: Looseleaf Law Publications.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims, 9* (4).
- Kirkland, J. (2019). How front-line supervisors impact police officer retention. Retrieved March 10, 2019, from <https://www.policeone.com/police-recruiting/articles/483159006-How-front-line-supervisors-impact-police-officer-retention/>
- Krimmel, J. T., & Lindenmuth, P. (2001). Police Chief Performance and Leadership Styles. *Police Quarterly, 4* (4), 469–483.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognitions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87* (1), 131- 142.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What Should Be Done with Equity Theory? In *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research* (pp. 27–55). New York, NY.
- Liao, H., Liu, D., & Loi, R. (2010). Looking at both sides of the social exchange coin: A social cognitive perspective on the joint effects of relationship quality and differentiation on creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 53* (5), 1090- 1109.
- Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal, 23* (3), 451- 465.
- Liden, Robert C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. I. J. (1997). Leader-member Exchange Theory: The Past and Potential for the Future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 15*, 47- 119.
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., Sikora, D., & Douglas, S. C. (2011b). Perceptions of abusive supervision: The role of subordinates' attribution styles. *Leadership Quarterly, 22* (4), 751–764.

- Matta, F. K., Scott, B. A., Koopman, J., & Conlon, D. E. (2015). Does seeing “eye to eye” affect work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior? a role theory perspective on lmx agreement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58 (6), 1686.
- McFarland, S., Webb, M., & Brown, D. (2012). All humanity is my ingroup: A measure and studies of identification with all humanity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103 (5), 830- 853.
- McRay, J. (2015). *Leadership glossary : Essential terms for the 21st century*. Mission Bell Media.
- Mertler, C. A. (2017). *Action Research: Improving Schools and Empowering Educators. 5th Edition. SAGE Publications (CA)*.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). *Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship? Journal of Applied Psychology (Vol. 76)*.
- Mudaly, P., & Nkosi, Z. Z. (2015). Factors influencing nurse absenteeism in a general hospital in Durban, South Africa. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 23 (5), 623- 631.
- Naidoo, L. J., Scherbaum, C. A., Goldstein, H. W., & Graen, G. B. (2011). A Longitudinal Examination of the Effects of LMX, Ability, and Differentiation on Team Performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26 (3), 347- 357.
- Neal, S. (2014). *Toxic boss blues*. Manakin, VA: Dementi Milestone Publishing.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Academy of Management Review*. Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive Versus Affective Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (1) 157- 164.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. SAGE Publications.
- Paese, M., Sinar, E., Smith, A., Watt, B., & Wellins, R. (2016). *A synthesis of 15,000 assessments into how leaders shape the business landscape high-resolution leadership*, 1- 48.
- P. E. R. F. (2018). *Promoting excellence in first-line supervision: new approaches to selection, training, and leadership development*. Washington D.C.

- Ramchunder, Y., & Martins, N. (2014). The role of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and leadership style as attributes of leadership effectiveness. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40 (1).
- Roethlisberger, J., & Dickson, W. J. (1964). Management and the worker. *New York Wiley Science Editions*, 615.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69 (3), 428-436.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (3), 219-227.
- Sheppard, B. H., & Lewicki, R. J. (1987). Toward general principles of managerial fairness. *Social Justice Research*, 161–176.
- Shirley, C. (2003). *A study of the effects of leaders-member exchange (lmx) on subordinate employment satisfaction and loyalty in the newly “reinvented” federal sector*. Nova Southeastern University.
- Stamper, C. L., & Masterson, S. S. (2002). Insider or outsider? How employee perceptions of insider status affect their work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 875-894.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1992). Basics of Qualitative Research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 21 (3).
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43 (2), 178–190.
- Trinkner, R., & Tyler, D. (2018). Organizational justice is an essential piece of effective police reform. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Trinkner, R., & Tyler, T. R. (2016). Justice from within: The relations between a procedurally just organizational climate and police organizational efficiency, endorsement of democratic policing, and officer well-being. *Psychology, Public Policy and the Law*, 22 (2), 158–172.
- Tyler, T. R., Goff, P. A., & MacCoun, R. J. (2015). *The impact of psychological science on policing in the united states: Procedural justice, legitimacy, and effective law enforcement. Psychological science in the public interest : a journal of the American Psychological Society* (Vol. 16).

- van Dijke, M., De Cremer, D., Mayer, D. M., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2012). When does procedural fairness promote organizational citizenship behavior? Integrating empowering leadership types in relational justice models. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117 (2), 235-248.
- Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E., & Pearce, C. L. (2010). Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21 (3), 530-542.
- Wang, Y. De, & Sung, W. C. (2016). Predictors of organizational citizenship behavior: Ethical leadership and workplace jealousy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135, 117-128.
- L. Wang, J. Huang, J. Li and X. Chu (2010), "Organizational Justice, Employment Relationship and Employee Job Attitudes," *2010 International Conference on E-Product E-Service and E-Entertainment*, Henan, 1-4.
- Wang, L., Tao, H., Bowers, B. J., Brown, R., & Zhang, Y. (2018). When nurse emotional intelligence matters: How transformational leadership influences intent to stay. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 26 (4), 358–365.
- Williams, E. A., Scandura, T. A., Pissaris, S., & Woods, J. M. (2016). Justice perceptions, leader-member exchange, and upward influence tactics. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 37 (7), 1000-1015.
- Wolfe, S. E., & Piquero, A. R. (2011). Organizational justice and police misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38 (4), 332–353.
- Woody, R. H. (2006). Family interventions with law enforcement officers. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 34 (2), 95–103.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(6), 1068.

APPENDIX A

SUPERVISOR PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

## Introduction

Thank you for participating in this research project. The intended purpose of this interview is to learn from your experiences as an employee/ supervisor at Arizona State University Police Department (ASUPD). The interview will take about one hour. During the interview, you have the right to decline answering any questions that you are uncomfortable with. As agreed to by you, through your completed consent form, I will be recording our conversation for the purpose of generating data for this research. Your response is completely confidential, and I will use pseudonyms in the report to guarantee your confidentiality. During this interview you will be audio recorded. The recording will be used for research purposes for generating data and analysis to get a better understanding on your experiences learning about and using organizational justice and emotional intelligence in policing. Your identity will not be disclosed, and the recordings will be destroyed/ deleted once this research project is completed. You are asked not to use your name or the real name of others during the recording of the interview to maintain confidentiality on open ended questions. Is it okay with you if I record the interview? Do you have any questions before we start?

Thank you,

Michael Thompson, Dr. Eugene Judson

Pseudonym:

ID# (first three letters of your mother's maiden name and the last four digits of your phone number. If your mother's last name was Wilson before she was married and your phone number ended in 6698, your ID# would be WIL6698).

Date:

Location:

Time:

#### Participant Background Information

- 1) How many years have you been a supervisor for ASU PD?
- 2) What made you want to be a supervisor within the police department?
- 3) What things did you do to personally prepare yourself to be a supervisor beyond studying for the exams?
- 4) When you think over your career, what are some of the characteristics of the best supervisors you worked for (short one-word descriptive characteristics)?
  - a. Characteristics of the worst supervisors?

#### Actively Caring for Employees (AC4E)/ Organizational Justice (OJ)

- 1) As a supervisor, how have/will you go about to understand the professional and personal needs of your officers and staff? What do you hope to observe or what results have you observed?
- 2) Since the AC4E training, in what ways, if any, have you used supportive feedback with your employees? What was the effect?
- 3) Since the AC4E training, what opportunities have you observed where either you or a co-worker used or had the opportunity to use empathic listening? What were the results?
- 4) Can you give me an example that you have either done yourself or observed since the AC4E training, where you felt the employee's needs were considered and efforts were made to meet those needs while also staying within the guidelines of

- the department? If their needs could not be met what was the result? How did the employee respond? What type of communication was used?
- 5) Can you give me an example that you have either done yourself or observed since the AC4E training, where an employee was asked for input in a decision or a project they were affected by? What was the result?
  - 6) In the time that you have been a supervisor, can you think of and describe a time where you feel someone on the department received something that they didn't deserve positive or negative?
    - a. How did that make you feel?
    - b. Did you protest it? How?
  - 7) From your perspective as a supervisor, how would you describe your confidence and abilities to apply/participate in AC4E/ OJ with your employees?

This concludes our interview; I would like to thank you once again for participating. Before we end do you have any questions for me or is there anything that I did not discuss with you that you feel is important or that you would like to add?



APPENDIX B

SUPERVISOR ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE SURVEY (SOJS)

Instructions: Thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey. This survey will gather your perceptions and thoughts on organizational justice (OJ) at Arizona State University Police Department (ASU PD) and future OJ training for supervisors at ASU PD. This survey should only take 10-15 minutes to complete. Your individual responses will be kept completely confidential and by using the ID# system above in the header, will ensure your anonymity. The ID is only used to compare answers today to those in the future. Please use the scale below to rate your perspectives on the following statements:

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------	----------------	-------	----------------

For the purposes of this survey please use the following definitions for Organizational Justice:

*Distributive Justice* (DJ) is employee perceived fairness of resource distribution or the outcome of decisions.

*Procedural Justice* (PJ) refers to employees perceived fairness of the procedures used to make decisions within an organization that affect them.

*Informational Justice* (INFJ) refers to perceived fairness of the way in which decisions are explained to employees.

*Interpersonal Justice* (IPJ) is the perceptions of fairness of interpersonal treatment during the enactment of the decision-making process in a respectful manner

Question 1: Distributive Justice

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------	----------------	-------	----------------

Q1-1 DJ- The manner in which I allow employees to adjust their work schedules is fair.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q1-2 DJ- I consider the workload across my employees to be equally distributed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q1-3 DJ- If asked, my employees would say the manner in which I reward/recognize them is fair.

Q1-4 DJ- I feel it is easy to be equitably sound in all employee matters making the decisions fair and equal for all employees.

Q1-5 DJ- I think the way I assign desired/undesired tasks amongst my employees is fair and equal to everyone.

Question 2: Procedural Justice

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.

Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Slightly Disagree    Slightly Agree    Agree    Strongly Agree

Q2-1 PJ- Generally speaking, when I make decisions about my work group, I seek their views and input.

Q2-2 PJ- I believe my employees' concerns should be heard before I make job decisions that personally or professionally affect them.

Q2-3 PJ- To make job decisions that affect my employees, I collect accurate and complete information.

Q2-4 PJ- I feel confident, as a supervisor, in my understanding of all protocols pertaining to employee rights and discipline.

Q2-5 PJ- I look for ways to consistently exercise procedures with employees creating a fair environment.

---

### Question 3: Informational Justice

---

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Slightly Disagree   Slightly Agree   Agree   Strongly Agree

---

Q3-1 IJ- When I make decisions that affect my employees, I offer explanations (e.g. denied time off, documentation in workstation).                 

Q3-2 IJ- I feel that it is important to communicate all decisions that affect my employees in a timely manner.                 

Q3-3 IJ- I allow my employees to have voice in decisions that I make that affect them.                 

Q3-4 IJ- I feel I have the ability to explain decisions made above me, *which I may not agree with*, to employees in a professional manner.                 

Q3-5 IJ- I believe my employees' concerns should be heard before I make job decisions that personally or professionally affect them.                 

---

### Question 4: Interpersonal Justice

---

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Slightly Disagree   Slightly Agree   Agree   Strongly Agree

---

Q4-1 IPJ- When I make decisions about my employees, I believe it is important to do so with kindness and consideration of their needs.                 

Q4-2 IPJ- When I make decisions about employees whom I may have conflict with; I am able to treat them with respect and dignity without them knowing my true feelings.

Q4-3 IPJ- I feel that it is always possible to make decisions that affect employees while being sensitive to their personal needs.

Q4-4 IPJ- When I make decisions about my employees, I am confident in my ability to show and exercise compassion.

Q4-5 IPJ- When I make decisions about my employees, I am confident that I have sought, and am fully informed of, the information necessary to explain that decision.

Question 5: Demographic Information

1. How long have you worked for ASU PD? Years \_\_\_\_ Months \_\_\_\_
2. Level of formal education completed beyond high school?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Gender: Female \_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_
4. Prior law enforcement experience prior to ASU PD? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_
5. I have actively sought employment (applied, interviewed etc.) outside of ASU PD in the last year. True \_\_\_\_ False \_\_\_\_

APPENDIX C

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE SURVEY (EOJS)

Instructions: Thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey. This survey will gather your perceptions and thoughts on organizational justice (OJ) at Arizona State University Police Department (ASU PD) and future OJ training for supervisors at ASU PD. This survey should only take 10-15 minutes to complete. Your individual responses will be kept completely confidential and by using the ID# system above in the header, will ensure your anonymity. The ID is only used to compare answers today to those in the future. Please use the scale below to rate your perspectives on the following statements:

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------	----------------	-------	----------------

For the purposes of this survey please use the following definitions for Organizational Justice:

*Distributive Justice* (DJ) is employee perceived fairness of resource distribution or the outcome of decisions.

*Procedural Justice* (PJ) refers to employees perceived fairness of the procedures used to make decisions within an organization that affect them.

*Informational Justice* (INFJ) refers to perceived fairness of the way in which decisions are explained to employees.

*Interpersonal Justice* (IPJ) is the perceptions of fairness of interpersonal treatment during the enactment of the decision-making process in a respectful manner

**Question 1: Distributive Justice**

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------	----------------	-------	----------------

Q1-1 DJ- The manner in which I am allowed to schedule personal time off is fair.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q1-2 DJ- I think the way desired/undesired tasks are assigned by my supervisor is fair and equal to everyone.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q1-3 DJ- I consider the assigned workload between myself and my coworkers is equally distributed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q1-4 DJ- The manner in which I am rewarded/ recognized by my supervisor is fair when compared to others in my work group.

Q1-5 DJ- I believe that my supervisor's ability to fairly distribute resources is important.

Question 2: Procedural Justice

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.

Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Slightly Disagree    Slightly Agree    Agree    Strongly Agree

Q2-1 PJ- Generally speaking, when my direct supervisor is making decisions about my workgroup or myself, we are allowed to express our views.

Q2-2 PJ- My supervisor makes sure employee concerns are heard before job decisions, that affect me personally or professionally, are made.

Q2-3 PJ- To make job decisions, my current direct supervisor seeks accurate and complete information.

Q2-4 PJ- I feel confident that my supervisor understands all protocols pertaining to employee rights and discipline.

Q2-5 PJ- I believe that my immediate supervisor is open to exercising procedurally sound practices with their employees on a daily basis



---

### Question 3: Informational Justice

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q3-1 IJ- When making decisions about my job, my supervisor offers explanations (e.g., denied time off, documentation in workstation).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3-2 IJ- My supervisor explains decisions made about my job in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3-3 IJ- I feel my supervisor is transparent in her/his explanations of decisions that affect my job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3-4 IJ- I believe that my supervisor is prepared with the necessary information to answer my questions about decisions that have been made that affect my job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3-5 IJ- My supervisor refuses to gossip and stops rumors when they hear them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

---

### Question 4: Interpersonal Justice

Survey Statement: Please respond to the following statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by checking the corresponding box to the right of each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q4-1 IPJ- When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q4-2 IPJ- When I violate a policy, my supervisor gives me the benefit of the doubt on whether it was intentional.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q4-3 IPJ- When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor tries to take my personal needs into account.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q4-4 IPJ- When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.

Q4-5 IPJ- When decisions are made about my job, I am confident that my supervisor has sought, and is fully informed of, all information necessary to make that decision.

Question 5: Demographic Information

1. How long have you worked for ASUPD? Years \_\_\_\_ Months \_\_\_\_
2. Level of formal education completed beyond high school?
3. Gender: Female \_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_
4. Prior law enforcement experience prior to ASU PD? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_
5. I have actively sought employment (applied, interviewed etc.) outside of ASU PD in the last year. True \_\_\_\_ False \_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D  
PARTICIPANT CONSENT

Dear ASU Police Employee:

I am the ASU Chief of Police, and also a doctoral candidate in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, conducting a study under the direction of Dr. Eugene Judson. As support staff and law enforcement here at Arizona State University, we are interested in providing the best services possible to all those who need it. We are conducting a research study to inform an Organizational Justice training program to increase the skill levels of police department supervisors at ASUPD.

We are asking for your help which will involve your participation in a workshop, a pre and post survey, and an interview which will be done individually. The workshop will include professionals including practitioners in the field of police leadership. We anticipate the workshop will take one (1) eight (8) hour day. Participation in the workshop is not contingent on your participation in the study. Supervisors who wish to attend the workshop and not participate in the study are welcome. This class will be eligible for Arizona POST training hours.

If asked to participate in an interview please know the interview will be audio recorded, with your permission for the purpose of generating data for this research. The interview should not last past one hour. The audio recordings will be used for research purposes for generating data and analysis and then destroyed after the study is completed. A pseudonym will be used to keep your information confidential.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty whatsoever.

The benefit to participation is the acquiring of skills needed to be a successful supervisor for ASUPD. Therefore, there is also potential to increase education and awareness amongst your peers who may benefit from this training.

Your responses will be confidential. Results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be known. It will not be distributed within the department. Your response is completely confidential, and I will use pseudonyms in the report to guarantee your confidentiality. You are asked not to use your name or the real name of others during the recording of the interview to maintain confidentiality on open ended questions.

Please read the following consent statement and if you agree, please indicate by signing below.

Consent Statement: I agree to participate in the interview being conducted. I understand the interview will take no more than an hour to complete. I understand that my evaluation, employment status nor my relationship with the university will be affected if I opt out of participating in the study. I am at least 18 years of age.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you,

Michael Thompson, Dr. Eugene Judson

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team—Michael Thompson at [Michael.l.thompson@asu.edu](mailto:Michael.l.thompson@asu.edu) (480)965-4929, Dr. Eugene Judson at [eugene.judson@asu.edu](mailto:eugene.judson@asu.edu)

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at (480) 965-6788.

APPENDIX E

UNIVERSITY APPROVAL FOR HUMAN SUBJECT TESTING

EXEMPTION GRANTED

Eugene Judson  
 Division of Educational Leadership and Innovation - Polytechnic Campus  
 480/727-5216 Eugene.Judson@asu.edu

Dear Eugene Judson:

On 9/4/2019 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Employing Organizational Justice Training Program for First Line Level Supervisors at Arizona State University Police Department.
Investigator:	Eugene Judson
IRB ID:	STUDY00010553
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michael Thompson Interview Protocol, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);</li> <li>• Eugene Judson email invitation sent on behalf of Michael Thompson.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials;</li> <li>• Michael Thompson Participant Surveys, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);</li> <li>• Michael Thompson IRB Protocol submission 3.docx, Category: IRB Protocol;</li> <li>• Participant Consent.pdf, Category: Consent Form;</li> </ul>

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 9/4/2019. In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Michael Thompson Michael  
Thompson