The impact of CAF enablers on job satisfaction: the case of the Slovenian law enforcement agency

Tomaževič, Nina and Seljak, Janko and Aristovnik, Aleksander

University of Ljubljana

2014

THE IMPACT OF CAF ENABLERS ON JOB SATISFACTION:

THE CASE OF THE SLOVENIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Nina Tomaževič, PhD, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Administration, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, nina.tomazevic@fu.uni-lj.si

Janko Seljak, PhD, Researcher, Faculty of Administration, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, janko.seljak@kabelnet.net

Aleksander Aristovnik, PhD, Assoc. Professor, Faculty of Administration, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, aleksander.aristovnik@fu.uni-lj.si

Abstract

In recent decades, public sector organizations in Slovenia and across the European Union have been placing ever more emphasis on the quality and excellence of their operations. For this purpose, they use different management tools and/or excellence models such as the EFQM model (European Foundation for Quality Management), CAF (Common Assessment Framework), BSC (Balanced Scorecard) etc.. An important aspect of excellence in any organization involves the employees, i.e. human resources management. In spring 2012 a study was conducted within the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency. The main purpose of the paper is to investigate the correlation between the results of a self-assessment of the CAF enablers and job satisfaction of employees, having in mind that the evaluation regarding both the CAF enablers and job satisfaction was made by the employees within the same questionnaire. A multiple regression model was applied to test the intensity of the influence of the CAF enablers on total job satisfaction and on three sets of facets of job satisfaction, designed with factor analysis. The correlation between the employees' evaluation of their total satisfaction and individual facets of their satisfaction and the evaluation of specific CAF enablers can provide management with a useful starting point for improving management and execution processes in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency.

1. Introduction

Public administrations all over the world are being challenged by society to demonstrate and improve their value to sustain and further develop the social welfare state and to adapt to societal changes (EIPA, 2013; Pollitt, Talbot, 2004). In the European Union, the Lisbon Strategy is one of the key incentives, among other things striving to develop public administration (PA) operations on the basis of a focus on customers and all other stakeholders. There is no prescribed tool for quality development in European public administration organizations, but the European Commission especially recommends self-assessment and external benchmarks as well as improvements according to the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) (EIPA, 2013) for organizations in the public sector in the context of overall reforms of public administration.

In the Slovenian public administration different standards and models are used to develop quality management, mainly the ISO standards, the EFQM excellence model within the framework of annual national awards for business excellence and the CAF model (Kovač and Tomaževič, 2008). From 2002 till 2007, approximately 80 Slovenian administrative organizations carried out a self-assessment with the CAF model; in this way they became part of the group of 800 CAF model users from all over Europe (Engel, 2003, Staes and Thijs, 2005). In 2011 there were more than 2,380 European organizations using the model and it has been translated into 20 languages. The model is applied across a wide range of sectors, like: local administration (municipality, province); education and research; customs, taxes and finances; police and security; health; social services and social security; criminal, justice and

law and less in other sectors, such as: home affairs; the economy, agriculture, fisheries and trade; the environment; culture etc. (Staes, Thijs, Stoffels and Geldof, 2011).

Many studies have already been done on job satisfaction where job satisfaction was explored as a dependent variable (e.g. Abdulla, Djebarni and Mellahi, 2011; Balci, 2011; Davey et al., 2001; Zhao, Thurman and He, 1999) as well as an independent variable (Gershon, Borocas, Canton, Li and Vlahov, 2009). Studies on different management/quality/excellence models and their influence on performance and/or job satisfaction are also numerous (e.g. CEBR, 2012; Dahlgaard et al., 2013, Moullin 2011, Radnor, 2009, Zelnik et al., 2012). A study by Tutuncu and Kucukusta (2010) showed that the relationship between job satisfaction and the EFQM excellence model was significant. Eskildsen and Dahlgaard (2000) found that the enablers from the EFQM excellence model have a positive effect on the criterion "People Results", an important part of which includes job satisfaction. Some research has also been done on CAF itself, especially on its use (e.g. Thijs and Staes, 2010; Staes, Thijs, Stoffels and Geldof, 2011; Radej, 2011), but we found none that investigates the relationship between CAF enablers and job satisfaction.

The purpose of the study presented in this paper was therefore to investigate the correlation between the results of a self-assessment of CAF enablers, i.e. "CAF-Strategy and Planning", "CAF-Leadership", "CAF-People", "CAF-Partnerships and Resources", and "CAF-Processes" and satisfaction of employees in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency. The first part of the paper therefore offers a literature review regarding the CAF model, job satisfaction and their connection. In the second part of the paper we present a study on the self-assessment of CAF enablers and job satisfaction facets, both by employees of the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency.

2. The CAF model and job satisfaction

The theoretical part of the paper first describes the CAF model and its role in improving the excellence of European public administration organizations. Second, the concept of and the previous studies on job satisfaction are presented and, third, the correlation between the CAF model and job satisfaction is described.

2.1 The CAF model

There are many quality management and business excellence tools/models being used in the private and public organizations, each of them bringing benefits but also having various weaknesses when using them in practice (Dahlgaard et al., 2013). The European Public Administration Network (EIPA) launched the CAF in May 2000 as the first European quality management instrument specifically tailored to and developed by the public sector itself as a general, simple, accessible and easy-to-use model for all public sector organizations across Europe which deals with all aspects of organizational excellence. It was designed on the basis of the EFQM model and after taking the criteria of the Speyer award into account (EIPA, 2013). The model was revised three times – in 2002, 2006 and with CAF 2013 being revised in September 2012 (EIPA, 2013).

Since the CAF was launched in 2000, its implementation and use have evolved considerably – from a self-assessment tool to an improvement cycle and the implementation of modern management instruments in the different areas covered by various CAF model criteria which have helped organizations become more efficient and effective (Thijs and Staes, 2010). But there are also opportunities for improvements such as external feedback (Thijs and Staes, 2010; Staes, Thijs, Stoffels and Geldof, 2011) as well as questions connected with use of the

4

model in practice, e.g. the financial resources, training and time needed for self-assessment, management support etc. (Radej, 2011). When an organization decides on the model that will be introduced, it is of course also very important to use the model through the proper implementation process (Kanji, 1996).

The CAF model consists of nine criteria. The first five criteria deal with managerial practices, i.e. enablers, which determine what the organization does and how it approaches its tasks to achieve the desired results. Criteria six to nine include the results achieved in the fields of citizens/customers, employees (people), social responsibility and key performance and measured by perception and performance measurement. Each criterion is further broken down into sub-criteria – 28 in total. Integrating the conclusions from the assessment of enablers and results criteria into managerial practices constitutes a continuous innovation and learning cycle that accompanies organizations on their way towards excellence (EIPA, 2013).

2.2 Job satisfaction

Job (job) satisfaction is one of the most widely studied constructs in industrial psychology (McShane and Von Glinov, 2007). It has most often been defined as a pleasant or positive emotional state resulting from the perception of work, conception and assessment of the work environment, work experience and the perception of all elements of the work and workplace (Mihalič, 2008). Spector (2003) defines job satisfaction as "the extent to which people like their job". According to Weiss (2002), job satisfaction is an individual's attitude toward their job resulting from the net sum of the positive and negative emotions they experience at work. Job satisfaction is a pleasant feeling a person has when their expectations from work have been fulfilled.

Job dissatisfaction is commonly associated with salaries, a lack of information, the reward system and insufficient commendations from superiors (SiOK, 2001–2008). According to Robbins (1991), job dissatisfaction manifests itself in employees leaving the organization, their attempts to actively voice their opinions (proposals for improvements, activity in trade unions, conversations with superiors etc.), passive loyalty (waiting for the situation to improve and being confident that the management will take the right decisions) and negligence (absences, being late, a large number of errors etc.). The consequences of dissatisfaction observed in employees also include problems with their mental and physical health (Garland, 2002) as well as low morale (Lambert, 2001). Other areas influenced by low job satisfaction include absenteeism, performance and organizational commitment (Lambert, Edwards, Camp and Saylor, 2005) as well as burnout (Whitehead, 1989). All of the above-mentioned result in additional costs (Camp and Lambert, 2006) and lost time for the organization and, consequently, negatively affect its competitiveness and development opportunities. Tutuncu and Kucukusta (2010) claim that the extent to which employees are satisfied with what they are responsible for may directly influence the level of customer satisfaction with their services and products.

Regardless of the delicate nature of the subject, there are some interesting studies where job satisfaction has been discussed as a dependent variable. These studies have delved into the following:

- the influence of demographic factors (e.g. sex, age, education, race, length of service (tenure), years of work experience etc.) and psychological factors (e.g. personality characteristics, emotional intelligence, perception of the goal-setting process etc.) on job satisfaction (Abdulla, Djebarni and Mellahi, 2011; Balci, 2011; Dantzker, 1992; Garland

et al., 2009; Kakar, 2002; Ortega, Brenner and Leather, 2007; Zhao, Thurman and He, 1999), where the results of the studies differ regarding the direction of the correlation (positive/negative) and the size of the correlation coefficient; and

- the influence of organizational factors (e.g. work-related factors like tasks and their significance, the variety of work, autonomy etc.), the promotion and reward system, leadership, training, relationships, working conditions, administration, organizational commitment, organizational support, organizational learning) and environmental factors (e.g. public image, frustration with the judicial system) on job satisfaction (Abdulla et al., 2011; Boke and Nalla, 2009; Coman and Evans, 1988; Davey et al., 2001; Dick, 2011; Griffin and McMahan, 1994; Hwang, 2008; Johnson, 2012; MacKain, Myers, Ostapiej and Newman, 2010; Miller, Mire and Kim, 2009; Morris, Shinn and Dumont, 1999; Nalla, Rydberg and Meško, 2011).

In some studies job satisfaction has also been discussed as an independent variable, e.g. in those investigating the comprehension of stress among law enforcement agency officers (Gershon, Borocas, Canton, Li and Vlahov, 2009).

Over the last two decades the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency has undergone many changes, especially regarding its goals, values, organization and infrastructure. Since 2008, when the public employee reward system was altered, the management of Law Enforcement Agency employees has become even more challenging. At the time all uniformed professions were classified in the same salary brackets, which is why – according to Law Enforcement Agency representatives and many experts in organization and payment systems – the Law Enforcement Agency staff were inappropriately rewarded. In subsequent years, as part of austerity measures in the public sector promotion was also abolished and additional measures were adopted in spring 2012 that have caused a radical deterioration of the financial position

of the Law Enforcement Agency as an institution (in terms of both equipment and infrastructure) and its employees.

2.3 The CAF model and job satisfaction

In June 2012 the Centre for Economic and Business Research (CEBR, 2012) issued a report in which it claims that not only has the effective application of quality management procedures already contributed to past UK business and economic success and that it will continue to do so in the future, but that it could well provide an important foundation on which future business and institutional success can be built. The report's main findings are that effective quality management programmes can contribute to increases in share price, profit, revenue and customer retention, as well as job and customer satisfaction. There is also other empirical evidence that the application of holistic management tools such as EFQM (which is the basis of CAF) positively affect corporate performance (Kristensen et al., 2000). Similar evidence has been found for the public sector (e.g. Moullin 2011, Radnor, 2009). A proper understanding and use can therefore bring many benefits to any organization.

Some empirical studies have assessed cause-effect linkages or correlations among organizational performance measures (Evans and Jack, 2003), e.g. between job satisfaction and customer satisfaction (Dahlgaard et al., 1998). Like in many other excellence models, in the CAF model a great deal of emphasis is given to the cause-effect relationship between the enablers (causes) and the results (effects), i.e. between the left and right sides of the model (EIPA, 2013). Dahlgaard-Park (2012) laid great stress upon the role of human resource management and leadership (both enablers) in the time of the global and environmental crisis and the need for a different paradigm when dealing with ethical aspects and core values in

praxis. Similarly Zelnik et al. (2012) point out that managerial practices (e.g. communication) have a significant impact on job satisfaction.

Since we found no study on the impact of CAF enablers on job satisfaction in the existing literature, we were interested in finding out how the (self)assessment of CAF enablers correlates with job satisfaction (also one of the CAF results). The purpose of the study conducted in March 2012 was thus to define different facets of job satisfaction and to establish how CAF enablers influence those facets. After examining a selection of theoretical contributions and reviewing similar studies conducted abroad and in Slovenia the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Job satisfaction is a multidimensional concept.

The hypothesis was formulated on the basis of the cognition that there are generally two types of studies on job satisfaction. The first investigate overall job satisfaction (Davey et al., 2001; Garland et al., 2009; MacKain et al., 2010, Nalla et al., 2011) and their primary purpose is to define and establish the intensity of the influence of various factors (demographic, job-related, organization-related) on overall job satisfaction. Another group of studies focuses on individual facets of job satisfaction with concrete, narrower areas such as the work itself, salary, leadership, promotion, colleagues, working conditions etc. (Balci, 2011; Boothby et al., 2002; Johnson, 2012; Noblet, Rodwell and Allisey, 2009; Verhaest and Omey, 2009). Our study examined different facets of job satisfaction and tried to separate them into specific groups.

H2: Facets of job satisfaction are influenced by CAF enablers.

9

CAF enablers represent the left part of the CAF model and include the managerial practices and approaches that should be implemented in order to achieve the desired results. Job satisfaction is one of the results criteria (sub-criterion 7.1 'People Results' – Perception Measurement) and should therefore be an outcome of activities in the field of human resources management as well as leadership and other areas that deal mainly with people and have an influence on their satisfaction.

3. Research

3.1 Methodology

Participants

The online survey "Study of job satisfaction and trust in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency" was carried out in the period from 27 February to 23 March 2012. The authors of the study as well as the Law Enforcement Agency management and trade unions invited all employees of the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency to fill out the online questionnaire. As at 31 December 2011 the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency employed 8,808 staff, and 1,848 respondents (21.0 percent) answered at least one question.

Table 1 to be placed about here.

The share of women in the sample is lower than in the population. The share of female employees in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency rose in the last ten years from 20.1 to 24.0%. The educational structure of the sample is much better than of the total population.

The educational structure of Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency employees also improved significantly from 2002 till 2011. In 2002, 78.8% employees had completed secondary school or less, while in 2012 the figure was 68.3%. The age of employees in the sample was almost the same as the age of all employees. The average age rose from 2002 till 2011 from 33.0 to 38.1 years (MNZ-Policija, 2003; MNZ-Policija, 2012).

The questionnaire on job satisfaction formed part of the broader "Study of job satisfaction and trust in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency". The set of 24 items was designed to measure job satisfaction (Table 2). The collection was based on the "Questionnaire on job satisfaction in the Law Enforcement Agency" which has already been used to study satisfaction in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency (Umek et al., 2009). In order to simplify the analysis and add to its transparency, the items of job satisfaction were defined relatively broadly (including the highest possible number of items). The respondents had to rate the degree to which they were satisfied with specific elements of their job on a five-point scale, ranging from "extremely dissatisfied" (1) to "extremely satisfied" (5). Besides the questions on job satisfaction the questionnaire included questions regarding the CAF Enablers. The employees had to give their assessment of five enablers (criteria) and therefore on 20 sub-criteria, where (1) meant "in our organization we are not concerned with this field, the field is poorly taken care of, we are not active in this field" and (5) meant "in our organization this area is excellently taken care of, all employees actively cooperate in activities in this field, we are continuously improving the field".

The data were analyzed using SPSS 19.0. Pearson's correlation test (r) was employed to measure the correlation between two continuous variables. Factor analysis was used to formulate facets of satisfaction (Rattray and Jones, 2007). In the factor analysis, a principal

component analysis with varimax rotations was used to examine which factors of the scale comprised coherent groups of items. The Kaiser criterion was used to select the number of factors (Blaikie, 2003). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett's test of sphericity were applied to measure the sampling adequacy (Munro, 2005). In case of missing values, cases were excluded listwise. An ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression model was applied to test the intensity of the influence of the CAF enablers on facets of job satisfaction. The goodness of fit was measured by the coefficient of determination. Multicollinearity was tested with variation inflation factors (VIF) (Maruyama, 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996).

Dependent variables

Job satisfaction was used as a dependent variable. The purpose of our study was to explore different facets of job satisfaction in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency and the CAF enablers influencing them. Therefore, a large number of facets was used in the assessment of job satisfaction (a 24-item list) (e.g. Balci, 2011; Johnson, 2012; Noblet et al., 2009).

Independent variables

CAF enablers were used as independent variables. The logic followed the idea of a cause-effect relationship between the enablers (causes) and the results (effects) in the CAF model (EIPA, 2013). We wanted to explore whether and which enablers influence the job satisfaction, which represents one of the result sub-criteria in the CAF model. Both dependent and independent variables were assessed by employees in the same online questionnaire.

3.2 Results and findings

Job satisfaction

The results of the study show that employees of the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency are most dissatisfied with the reward and promotion systems as well as with the payment for normal working hours and overtime (Table 2). They are most satisfied with job location, a feeling of belonging to the staff, and the working time.

Table 2 to be placed about here.

Based on the answers to these questions a limited number of (three) factors was defined using a factor analysis. The reliability of the entire scale using the Cronbach alpha reliability test showed a high level of internal consistency with a coefficient of .91. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.933, indicating that the factor analysis was appropriate. Bartlett's test was significant (a p-value of less than 0.005). The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) method was applied to the extraction of components. According to the Kaiser criterion, only factors with eigenvalues greater than one are retained. A varimax rotation was applied in order to optimize the loading factor of each item on the extracted components.

The factor analysis revealed a three-factor structure accounting for 47.1% of the variance. In the continuation of the analysis the following three factors will represent groups of facets of job satisfaction: (1) Relationships and leadership; (2) Salary and security; and (3) Tasks and working conditions. The level of reliability of the measurement instrument was tested for each of them. The Cronbach alpha reliability test showed high internal consistency with coefficients of 0.77 to 0.87 (Table 3). Based on the above factors, arithmetic means were calculated by individual groups with higher values meaning a higher level of job satisfaction.

The satisfaction facet "Salary and security" was assessed the lowest, which is probably a consequence of the changes to the payroll system after 2008 and the resulting dissatisfaction of Law Enforcement Agency employees with the reward and promotion systems. There were no substantial differences between the two other facets in terms of the assessment (Table 3).

Table 3 to be placed about here.

CAF Enablers

Table 4 presents the results of the employees' assessments of the enablers. They assessed as highest the sub-criterion within the enabler "CAF-Leadership", namely "Manage the relations with politicians and other stakeholders in order to ensure shared responsibility". High scores were also given for the sub-criteria "Provide direction for the organization by developing its mission, vision and values" (sub-criterion within "CAF-Leadership") as well as for "Develop and implement key partnership relations" (sub-criterion within "CAF-Partnerships and Resources"). These are the areas strongly connected with leadership styles and on which managers of the Law Enforcement Agency have the strongest impact. The employees assessed them as highest, meaning that they recognize the efforts in the enumerated fields.

The employees gave the lowest assessment to the sub-criterion "Planning, managing and improving human resources transparently with regard to strategy and planning" (criterion "CAF-People"). Low scores were also given to "Managing facilities" and "Managing finances" (criterion "CAF-partnerships and Resources"). This indicates that the employees are dissatisfied with the management of human resources as well as the management of material resources, such as finance and facilities (premises, equipment).

Table 4 to be placed about here.

Taking into account that there is a prescribed structure of CAF enablers (criteria and sub-criteria), five groups of CAF enablers (criteria) were used for the purpose of our study. The reliability of the entire scale using the Cronbach alpha reliability test showed a high level of internal consistency with a coefficient of 0.97, and for specific enablers from 0.85 to 0.91. The enabler "CAF-People" was assessed the lowest and the enabler "CAF-Leadership" was assessed the highest. The average assessment of all enablers was 2.77 (out of 5).

Table 5 to be placed about here.

Impact of CAF enablers on job satisfaction

In the next phase of the study, we investigated the impact of the assessments of the CAF enablers on the three facets of job satisfaction. Since the enablers represent the left part of the CAF model and job satisfaction is on the right side of the model, we expected to find a correlation between the five criteria and the three (group) facets of job satisfaction that were designed out of 24 different facets following a factor analysis.

First, the correlations between the facets and the CAF enablers were investigated. Table 6 shows the correlation coefficients. All correlation coefficients are of a medium height and are statistically significant at $p < 0.0005$. The strongest correlation was detected between the facet

"Relationships and leadership" and the CAF enablers (criteria) "CAF-Leadership" and "CAF-Strategy and Planning".

Table 6 to be placed about here.

An ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression model was applied to test the intensity of the influence of individual factors (or CAF enablers) on the three facets of job satisfaction. Multicollinearity was not a problem for any of the four OLS regression equations. For all four equations, the highest variation inflation factor (VIF) value was 3.9 and the lowest tolerance statistic value was .25. VIF values greater than 6 and tolerance values less than 0.20 indicate that multicollinearity may be a problem. (Maruyama, 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996).

Table 7 to be placed about here.

When observing the facets of job satisfaction, the largest share of the variability of job satisfaction is explained in the facet "Relationships and Leadership", which was statistically significantly influenced by all of the investigated factors (r^2 = .416, p < .01). The value of R^2 showed the goodness of fit of the model. Among the CAF enablers, by far the strongest impact was found in the case of "CAF-Leadership" (t = 16.4, p < 0.0005), as well as for "CAF-Partnerships and Resources" (t = -3.5, p < 0.0005) and "CAF-Processes" (t = 3.6, p < 0.0005).

When including the influence of the studied CAF enablers 39.8% of the variability of total satisfaction was explained (r^2=.398, p<.01). The strongest influence was detected for the

16

enabler "CAF-Leadership" (t=12.2, p<0.0005), while the enabler "CAF-Processes" was also statistically significant (t=5.8, p<0.0005). The enabler "CAF-Partnerships and Resources" had a statistically significant negative influence on the facet "Relationships and leadership" (t=-3.5, p<0.0005) and a statistically significant positive influence on the facet of satisfaction "Salary and security" (t=2.5, p<0.05). The enablers "CAF-Leadership" and "CAF-Processes" had a statistically significant positive influence on all facets of job satisfaction.

3.3 Discussion

The data in Tables 2 and 3 show that three factors were extracted out of 24 facets of job satisfaction: (1) "Relationships and leadership"; (2) "Salary and security"; and (3) "Tasks and working conditions". This supports the first hypothesis (H1) and can be compared to the findings of Johnson (2012) and MacKain et al. (2010). In our research, the first and third factor received similar (average) assessments and the second was assessed very lowly. This reflects the situation in the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency whose financial and material conditions have, due to the macroeconomic situation in the country, steadily deteriorated in the last 10 years, in particular since 2008 following the introduction of the renewed public servants payment system and the severe austerity measures first applied in 2010 and also later in order to reduce the public finance deficit.

With the second hypothesis (H2) we sought to verify the logic of the cause-effect nature of the CAF model where it is assumed that efficiently executed activities/processes within the enablers lead to higher results. In our study we took just one of the results (job satisfaction with 24 facets within "People Results") and gave the Law Enforcement Agency employees an opportunity to assess both the enablers and the results. As seen in Tables 6 and 7, there is a positive correlation between the CAF enablers and all three factors (of facets) of job

satisfaction. This supports hypothesis 2, namely that Law Enforcement Agency employees assess the impact of the effective and efficient implementation of the enablers on job satisfaction as very important. These results are similar to the findings of Eskildsen and Dahlgaard (2000) and Tutuncu and Kucukusta (2010) who performed a similar investigation of the EFQM model and were expected by us since the CAF model was designed on the basis of the EFQM model.

The highest correlation was found between the enablers "CAF-Leadership" and "CAF-Strategy and planning" for all three job satisfaction factors which means the employees see the strongest basis for their satisfaction in those activities for which the responsibility is shouldered by their managers. Similar results were reported by Dahlgaard-Park (2012) where a strong relation between the companies' practice of core values (by managers) and job satisfaction were discovered. Zelnik et al. (2012) claimed that communication between employees and management has significant impact on job satisfaction. The study by Tutuncu and Kucukusta (2010) also showed that leadership and supervision are the strongest determinants of job satisfaction. One can infer that the low satisfaction regarding salaries and security (and other financial issues, e.g. premises and equipment) is, in the employees' opinion, connected more with the external situation, namely the political and macroeconomic circumstances facing the country in the last five years. The main contribution of our study is therefore to make the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency management aware of the important impact its leadership and management approaches have on the satisfaction of their employees.

4. Conclusion

Job satisfaction has become an increasingly important category, especially for those organizations that are aware of the value of business excellence and perceive job satisfaction

as one of its essential parts. A satisfied employee works more and better. In the opinion of Sakanovič and Mayer (2006), the same things do not satisfy all employees. What may satisfy one person in their work may dissatisfy another. Satisfaction is a complex phenomenon as every individual enters an organization in their own unique fashion, with their own expectations, beliefs, values, views, endeavours and longings. However, the feeling of satisfaction being shared by a larger number of employees is clearly to the advantage of any organization. Authors have delved into the factors that influence job (dis)satisfaction and investigated their correlation with an organization's effectiveness. The CAF and other similar business excellence models firstly suggest that there are enablers which have to be soundly implemented in order to achieve the desired results and, secondly, the results have to be carefully monitored in order to learn and to improve the business in the long run. Job satisfaction is one of the results that have to be measured as an important foundation for future decisions regarding the activities within the enablers.

Slovenian public sector organizations have already become aware of the importance of job satisfaction but, regrettably, there are still too few examples of this issue being addressed systematically and holistically. The management of the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency decided to support the study regarding the CAF model and job satisfaction in 2012. The survey was performed in order to identify opportunities for improvements in Law Enforcement Agency management. The results support previous research that advocates the vital role of leadership and management (besides leadership, also including planning, organizing and controlling). The improvements in job satisfaction can be divided into two groups – one connected with the external (macroeconomic) situation and the second with internal approaches within specific enablers. The "Salary and security" factor mainly depends on the political and economic situation and has an external nature over which the Law

Enforcement Agency management has little influence and power but has an important role to play when communicating the external circumstances to the employees. Job satisfaction could therefore be improved through adequate leadership approaches, e.g. communication, empowerment, training and teambuilding in order to increase the feeling of belonging, commitment and trust, especially during a period of deteriorated financial resources. In order to approach the situation systematically and holistically, the management of the Law Enforcement Agency could introduce the CAF model as a basic management tool at all levels to improve both the enablers and results.

The study is subject to the following limitations. First, the current economic situation facing the country, especially the public sector and the Law Enforcement Agency, definitely impacted the results of the survey. The survey was conducted just before the announcement of savings measures in the Slovenian public sector. There is a high probability that the results would have been much worse than presented here had the survey been conducted just a few weeks later, perhaps also to the detriment of Law Enforcement Agency managers who had little influence on the austerity measures and their effect on job satisfaction. Second, since the study was conducted online we assume that for some employees this probably meant that anonymity could not be assured. Third, the structure of the sample, regarding the gender and education, is not appropriate. The share of women in the sample is much lower than in the total population. It is typical of occupations with an explicitly asymmetrical gender structure that a smaller group usually has lower response rates (e.g. nurses – fewer men, police – fewer women). The education of the sample is significantly higher than that of the population, which is probably due to the way the data were collected (an online survey). Fourth, due to the methodology applied (survey based on a questionnaire), the results are only valid for the Slovenian Law Enforcement Agency and cannot be generalized and used in other countries.

There are two suggestions for further research avenues: first, to use a standardized, internationally comparable questionnaire to measure job satisfaction and, second, to apply the study to organizations of different types in both the public and private sector.

References

1. Abdulla, J., Djebarni, R. and Mellahi, K. (2011). Determinants of job satisfaction in the UAE: A case study of the Dubai police. *Personnel Review, 40* (2), 126-146.

2. Balanced Scorecard Institute (2013). Balanced Scorecard, http://www.balancedscorecard.org/ (accessed February 1, 2013).

3. Balci, F. (2011). The effects of education on police officer job satisfaction: The case of Turkish National Police. *International Journal of Human Sciences, 8* (2), 265-285.

4. Blaikie, N. (2003). *Analyzing Quantitative Data: From Description to Explanation*. London: SAGE Publications.

5. Boke, K. and Nalla, M.K. (2009). Police organizational culture and job satisfaction: a comparison of law enforcement officers' perceptions in two Midwestern states in the U.S.. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Security, 11* (1), 55-73.

6. Boothby, J.L. and Clements, C.B. (2002). Job satisfaction of correctional psychologists: Implications for recruitment and retention. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33* (3), 310-315.

7. Camp, S.D. and Lambert, E.G. (2006). The influence of organizational incentives on absenteeism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 17* (2), 144-172.

8. Centre for Economic and Business Research (CEBR) (2012). The Contribution of Quality Management to the UK Economy, http://www.mbsportal.bl.uk/taster/subjareas/mgmt/cmi/132790contribution12.pdf (accessed August 8, 2012).

9. Coman, G. and Evans, B. (1988). What police don't like about their job: Sources of dissatisfaction in police work. *Australian Police Journal, 7*, 116-117.

10. Dahlgaard, J.J., Chen, C.-K., Jang, J.-Y., Banegas, L.A., Dahlgaard-Park, S.M. (2013). Business excellence models: limitations, reflections and further development. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 24* (5-6), 519-538.

11. Dahlgaard, J.J., Kristensen, and K., Kanji, G.K. (1998). *Fundamentals of Total Quality Management*. London: Chapman & Hall.

12. Dahlgaard-Park, S.M. (2012). Core values – the entrance to human satisfaction and commitment. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 23* (2), 125-140.

13. Dantzker, M.L. (1992). An issue for policing: Educational level and job satisfaction: A research note. *American Journal of Police, 12* (2), 101-118.

14. Davey, J.D., Obst, P.L. and Sheehan, M.C. (2001). Demographic and workplace characteristics which add to the prediction of stress and job satisfaction within the police workplace. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 16* (1), 29-39.

15. Dick, G.P.M. (2011). The influence of managerial and job variables on organizational commitment in the police. *Public administration, 89* (2), 557-576.

16. EFQM. 2013. http://www.efqm.org/en/ (accessed February 18, 2013).

17. EIPA. 2013. CAF 2013: Improving Public Organisations through Self-Assessment, http://www.eipa.eu/en/pages/show/&tid=102 (accessed February 18, 2013).

18. Engel, C. 2003. *Quality Management Tools in CEE Candidate Countries – Current Practice, Needs and Expectations*. Maastricht: EIPA.

19. Eskildsen, J.K. and Dahlgaard, J.J. (2000). A causal model for employee satisfaction. *Total Quality Management, 11* (8), 1081-1094.

20. Evans, J.R. and Jack, E.P. 2003. Validating key results linkages in the Baldrige performance excellence model. *Quality Management Journal*, *10* (2), 7-24.

21. Garland, B.E. (2002). Prison treatment staff burnout: Consequences, causes, and prevention. *Corrections Today, 64* (7), 116-121.

22. Garland, B.E., McCarty, W.P. and Zhao, R. (2009). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in prisons: An examination of psychological staff, teachers, and unit management staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36* (2), 163-183.

23. Gershon, R.R.M, Barocas, B., Canton, A.N., Li, X. and Vlahov, D. (2009). Mental, physical, and behavioural outcomes associated with perceived work stress in police officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36* (3), 275-289.

24. Griffin, R.W. and McMahan, G.C. (1994). Motivation through job design. In Greenburg, J. (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 23-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

25. Hwang, E. (2008). Determinants of job satisfaction among South Korean police officers: The effect of urbanization in a rapidly developing nation. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 31* (4), 82-104.

26. Johnson, R.R. (2012). Police officer job satisfaction: A multidimensional analysis. *Police Quarterly, 15* (2), 157-176.

27. Kakar, S. (2002). Gender and police officers' perceptions of their job performance: an analysis of the relationship between gender and perceptions of job performance. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 13* (3), 238-256.

28. Kanji, G.K. (1996). Implementation and pitfalls of total quality management. *Total Quality Management*, 7 (3), 331-343.

29. Kovač, P. and Tomaževič, N. (2008). *National Assessment of Excellence in Slovenian Public Administration – Pilot Project 2007*. Paper presented at the 16 annual international conference NISPAcee, May 15-17, in Bratislava, Slovakia.

30. Kristensen, K., Juhl, H.J. and Eskildsen, J.K. (2000). The excellence index as a benchmarking tool. In: Edgeman, R. (ed.) *First International Research Conference on Organizational Excellence in the Third Millenium* (pp. 155-161). Colorado.

31. Lambert, E.G., (2001). To stay or quit: A review of the literature on correctional staff turnover. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 26* (1), 61-76.

32. Lambert, E.G, Edwards, C., Camp, S.D. and Saylor W.G. (2005). Here today, gone tomorrow, back again the next day: Antecedents of correctional absenteeism. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33* (2), 165-175.

33. MacKain, S.J., Myers, B., Ostapiej, L. and Newman, R.A. (2010). Job satisfaction among psychologists working in state prisons: The relative impact of facets assessing economics, management, relationships, and perceived organizational support. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27* (3), 306-318.

34. Maruyama, M. G.. 1998. *Basics of Structural Equation Modelling.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

35. McShane, S.L. and Von Glinow, M.A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

36. Mihalič, R. (2008). *Povečajmo zadovoljstvo in pripadnost zaposlenih. (Let's increase the satisfaction and commitment of employees)*. Škofja Loka: Založba Mihalič in Partner.

37. Miller, H.A., Mire, S. and Kim, B. (2009). Predictors of job satisfaction among police officers: Does personality matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37* (5), 419-428.

38. Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve MNZ (Ministry of Interior) – Policija (Police). Annual Reports, http://www.policija.si/eng/index.php/aboutthepolice (accessed January 25, 2013).

39. Morris, A., Shinn, M. and Dumont, K. (1999). Contextual factors affecting the organisational commitment of diverse police officers: A levels analysis perspective. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27* (1), 75-105.

40. Moullin, M. (2011). Using the Public Sector Scorecard to Measure and Improve Performance. *Perspectives on Performance*, *8* (3), 37–40.

41. Munro, H.B. (2005). *Statistical Methods for Health Care Research*, 5th edition. New York: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

42. Nalla, M.K., Rydberg, J. and Meško, G. (2011). Organizational factors, environmental climate, and job satisfaction among police in Slovenia. *European Journal of Criminology, 8* (2), 144-156.

43. Noblet, A., Rodwell, J. and Allisey, A. (2009). Job stress in the law enforcement sector: comparing the linear, non-linear and interaction effects of working conditions. *Stress and Health, 25* (1), 111-120.

44. Ortega, A., Brenner, S.O. and Leather, P. (2007). Occupational stress: Coping and personality in the police. *International Journal of Police Science & Management, 9* (1), 36-50.

45. Pollitt, C. and Talbot, C. (eds.). (2004). *Unbundled Government, A critical analysis of the global trend to agencies, quangos and contractualisation.* London and New York: Routledge.

46. Radej, B. Poročilo Fokusne skupine za CAF (The Report of CAF Focus Group), http://www.sdeval.si/Objave/Porocilo-Fokusne-skupine-za-CAF.html (accessed February 4, 2013).

47. Radnor, Z. (2009). Understanding the relationship between a national award scheme and performance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 75* (3), 437–457.

48. Rattray, J. and Jones, M.C. (2007). Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 16* (2), 234-243.

49. Robbins, S.P. (1991). *Organizational behaviour*. Englewodd Cliffs: Prentice Hall International.

50. SiOK. (2011), http://www.biro-praxis.si/?viewPage=38 (accessed 1 June, 2012).

51. Spector, P.E. (2003). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

52. Staes, P. and Thijs, N. (2005). *Quality Management on the European Agenda*, http://www.eipa.nl/CAF/Articles/scop05_1_6.pdf (accessed February 8, 2008).

53. Staes, P., Thijs, N., Stoffels, A. and Geldof, S. (2011). Five Years of CAF 2006: From Adolescence To Maturity – What Next? A study on the use, the support and the future of the CAF. EIPA, CAF Resource Centre, http://www.eipa.eu/en/pages/show/&tid=143 (accessed February 4, 2013).

54. Thijs, N. and Staes, P. (2010). From Self-Assessment to External Feedback: Tha CAF External Feeedback – Labelling Effective CAF Users, http://www.eipa.eu/en/pages/show/&tid=73# (accessed February 4, 2013).

55. Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

56. Tutuncu, O. and Kucukusta, D. (2010). Canonical correlation between job satisfaction and EFQM business excellence model. *Quality and Quantity, 44,* 1227-1238.

57. Umek, P., Meško, G., Areh, I. and Šifrer, J. (2009). Raziskava o ocenah in stališčih policistov o zadovoljstvu z delom in zaupanju v slovenski policiji. (A research on employee satisfaction and trust in Slovenian Police). Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Fakulteta za varnostne vede.

58. Verhaest, D. and Omey, E. (2009). Objective over-education and worker well-being: A shadow price approach. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 30* (3), 469-481.

59. Weiss, H. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs, and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*, 173-194.

60. Whitehead, J.T. (1989). *Burnout in probation and corrections.* New York, NY: Praeger.

61. Zelnik, M., Maletič, M., Maletič, D. and Gomišček, B. (2012). Quality management systems as a link between management and employees. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 23* (1), 45-62.

62. Zhao, J., Thurman, Q. and He, N. (1999). Sources of job satisfaction among police officers: A test of demographic and work environment models. *Justice Quarterly, 16* (1), 153-174.

Table 1: Presentation of the research sample and population

Gender	Research sample		All Employees of the Law Enforcement Agency 31 December 2011	
	N	%	N	%
Women	312	16.9	2,116	24.0
Men	1,491	80.7	6,692	76.0
Missing	45	2.4	0	0
Total	1,848	100.0	8,808	100.0
Education	N	%	N	%
Secondary school and less	828	44.8	6,018	68.3
College, higher education and university	896	48.5	2,620	29.8
Postgraduate (Spec., Master's and PhD degree)	108	5.8	170	1.9
Missing	16	0.9	0	0
Total	1,848	100.0	8,808	100.0
Age (years)	N	Years	N	Years
	1,834	38.4	8,808	38.1
Missing	14			

Source: MNZ-Policija, 2012; Survey, 2012

Table 2: Facets of Job Satisfaction – Arithmetic Means, Standard Deviation and Factor Loadings

	M*	SD	Factor loadings**
Relationships and leadership			
Relationships among the staff	3.50	1.18	0.761
Feeling of belonging to the staff	3.83	1.09	0.750
Possibility of participating in decision-making on organization	2.93	1.19	0.747
Style of leading the organizational unit	3.33	1.24	0.740
Possibility of realizing one's abilities	3.07	1.09	0.680
Possibility of performing work autonomously	3.07	1.07	0.587
Supervision over work	2.91	1.07	0.413
Salary and security			
Reward system	1.49	0.78	0.728
Salary	2.11	1.00	0.693
Promotion system	1.84	1.04	0.671
Payment of overtime	2.10	1.14	0.633
Professional training system	2.44	0.97	0.492
Public attitude to the law enforcement agency employees	2.38	1.03	0.484
Psycho-hygienic care for law enforcement agency officers	2.60	1.08	0.437
Functioning of the trade union	2.57	1.15	0.407
Security of employment	3.12	1.07	0.406
Tasks and working conditions			
Volume of tasks	3.27	1.15	0.665
Administrative tasks	2.35	1.14	0.635
Volume of regulations, work guidelines	2.29	1.10	0.623
Working conditions (equipment, premises)	2.67	1.28	0.456
Job location	3.85	1.19	0.452
Variety of tasks	3.55	1.06	0.447
Work with people	3.54	0.94	0.430
Working hours	3.74	1.17	0.406

Note:* 1 – extremely dissatisfied, 5 – extremely satisfied. ** Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with a Kaiser Normalization
Source: Survey, 2012; calculations by the authors

Table 3: Arithmetic Means, Standard Deviations, Coefficient Alpha, KMO* and Bartlett's test for Three Facets of Satisfaction

Facets	M	SD	No. of facets	Cronbach alpha	KMO*	Bartlett's test of sphericity - Sig.
Relationships and leadership	3.24	0.86	7	0.87	0.869	0.000
Salary and security	2.29	0.66	9	0.80	0.881	0.000
Tasks and working conditions	3.15	0.71	8	0.77	0.809	0.000
Job Satisfaction – Total	**2.86**	**0.64**	**24**	**0.91**	0.933	0.000

Note:* Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test

Source: Survey, 2012; calculations by the authors

Table 4: CAF Enablers: Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations

	M*	SD
People – Plan, manage and improve human resources transparently with regard to strategy and planning	2.31	1.17
Partnerships and Resources – Manage facilities	2.51	1.20
Partnerships and Resources – Manage finances	2.55	1.13
Processes – Identify, design, manage and improve processes on an ongoing basis	2.59	1.10
People – Identify, develop and use competencies of employees, aligning individual and organizational goals	2.61	1.08
Strategy and Planning – Plan, implement and review modernization and innovation	2.61	1.08
Partnerships and Resources – Manage technology	2.68	1.08
People – Involve employees by developing open dialogue and empowerment	2.70	1.10
Leadership – Develop and implement a system for the management of organization, performance and change	2.75	1.11
Strategy and Planning – Implement strategy and planning in the whole organization	2.76	1.06
Strategy and Planning – Develop, review and update strategy and planning taking into account the needs of stakeholders and available resources	2.77	1.02
Processes – Innovate processes involving citizens/customers	2.79	1.03
Partnerships and Resources – Manage information and knowledge	2.80	1.00
Strategy and Planning – Gather information relating to the present and future needs of stakeholders	2.83	1.01
Leadership – Motivate and support people in the organization and act as a role model	2.92	1.24
Partnerships and Resources – Develop and implement partnerships with the citizens/customers	2.95	0.99
Processes – Develop and deliver citizen/customer-oriented services and products	2.95	1.00
Leadership – Provide direction for the organization by developing its mission, vision and values	3.00	1.06
Partnerships and Resources – Develop and implement key partnership relations	3.04	1.03
Leadership – Manage the relations with politicians and other stakeholders in order to ensure shared responsibility	3.07	1.14

Note.* 1 – extremely dissatisfied, 5 – extremely satisfied
Source: Survey, 2012; calculations by the authors

Table 5: CAF Enablers: Arithmetic Means, Standard Deviations

CAF Enablers	M	SD	No. of sub-criteria	Cronbach alpha
CAF-Leadership	2.95	0.97	4	0.87
CAF-Strategy and Planning	2.75	0.93	4	0.91
CAF-People	2.54	1.03	3	0.90
CAF-Partnerships and Resources	2.76	0.90	6	0.91
CAF-Processes	2.77	0.93	3	0.85
CAF-Enablers Total	**2.77**	**0.85**	**20**	**0.97**

Source: Survey, 2012; calculations by the authors

Table 6: Correlation Coefficients

CAF Enablers	Facets of Satisfaction			
	Relationships and leadership	Salary and security	Tasks and working conditions	Job Satisfaction – Total
CAF-Leadership	0.625**	0.436**	0.461**	0.589**
CAF-Strategy and Planning	0.525**	0.433**	0.428**	0.536**
CAF-People	0.483**	0.411**	0.400**	0.500**
CAF-Partnerships and Resources	0.433**	0.430**	0.422**	0.496**
CAF-Processes	0.451**	0.428**	0.448**	0.513**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.0005 level (2-tailed)
Source: Survey, 2012; calculations by the authors

Table 7: Standardized Coefficients – Beta, Adjusted r^2 and Degrees of Significance for Facets of Job Satisfaction

CAF Enablers	Facets of Satisfaction Standardized Coefficients – Beta			
	Relationships and leadership	Salary and security	Tasks and working conditions	Job satisfaction - Total
Constant)	1.566**	1.197**	1.939**	1.547**
CAF-Leadership	0.574**	0.216**	0.326*	0.434*
CAF-Strategy and Planning	0.048	0.066	0.005	0.047
CAF-People	0.060	0.001	-0.028	0.013
CAF-Partnerships and Resources	-0.140**	0.113*	0.030	-0.001
CAF-Processes	0.122**	0.166**	0.235*	0.201*
Adjusted r^2	0.416**	0.248**	0.256**	0.398**

Note. *p<0.05; **p<0.01
Source: Questionnaire Survey, 2012; calculations by the authors