

Personality Traits, Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Culture, and Work Performance of Personnel: Basis for Intervention

Jun Ray S. Batadlan¹, Mary Ann T. Estandarte-Pet²

¹Philippine National Police – Negros Island Region, Philippines

²La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700820>

Received: 01 August 2026; Accepted: 08 August 2026; Published: 13 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the levels of personality traits, emotional intelligence, and organizational culture, and their relationship to the work performance of selected Philippine National Police (PNP) personnel in 2026. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered through standardized survey instruments adopted from the International Personality Item Pool (2023), Schutte et al. (2021), and Cameron et al. (2021). Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data obtained with respect to specific research questions. Findings revealed that personnel possessed very high levels of personality traits, emotional intelligence, and organizational culture. Work performance was determined to be very satisfactory based on recent Individual Performance Evaluation Ratings (IPER). However, correlation analyses demonstrated no significant relationship between work performance and personality traits, emotional intelligence, or organizational culture. The findings imply that personnel metrics may reflect standardized compliance or evaluator leniency rather than individual behavioral variances. Overall, the study highlights the necessity of refining evaluation protocols and establishing a basis for targeted policy improvements and organizational interventions.

Keywords: Personality Traits; Emotional Intelligence; Organizational Culture; Work Performance; Philippine National Police

INTRODUCTION

Personality traits, emotional intelligence, and organizational culture are recognized as important determinants of employee work performance, particularly in high-risk organizations such as law enforcement. Personality traits influence behavioral tendencies, decision-making, adaptability, and interpersonal relationships, while emotional intelligence enables personnel to regulate emotions, manage stress, and interact effectively with colleagues and the public. Organizational culture provides the shared values, leadership practices, communication patterns, and work environment that shape employees' motivation, commitment, and performance. Collectively, these factors influence police officers' effectiveness, professionalism, and service delivery (Zakaria et al., 2023; Robbins & Judge, 2022).

Globally, police organizations continue to experience increasing demands for accountability, transparency, ethical conduct, and operational effectiveness. Rising public expectations, occupational stress, and the complexity of modern policing require officers who possess not only technical competence but also strong emotional intelligence, positive personality characteristics, and supportive organizational environments. Recent studies emphasize that these organizational and individual factors significantly contribute to police performance, ethical behavior, and community trust (Magny & Todak, 2021; Zakaria et al., 2023).

At the local level, the Philippine National Police continue to implement reforms aimed at strengthening organizational integrity, professionalism, and public confidence. Despite these initiatives, police personnel continue to encounter challenges related to workload, operational stress, organizational climate, and community relations. These conditions underscore the need to understand the factors influencing personnel performance to support evidence-based human resource development and organizational interventions.

Although previous studies have established that personality traits, emotional intelligence, and organizational culture individually influence employee performance, limited empirical studies have simultaneously examined these variables among Philippine National Police personnel, particularly within the local context of the selected police stations. Moreover, existing Philippine studies primarily focus on operational performance, leadership, or organizational effectiveness rather than investigating the combined effects of these psychological and organizational factors on work performance. This empirical gap provides the rationale for conducting the present study. Addressing this gap will provide empirical evidence that may guide leadership development, organizational improvement, and intervention programs aimed at enhancing police work performance.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationships among personality traits, emotional intelligence, organizational culture, and work performance of Philippine National Police (PNP) personnel. The respondents comprised 232 active-duty PNP personnel selected from a population of 547 officers assigned to ten district police stations using stratified random sampling, with simple random sampling (lottery method) employed within each stratum to ensure proportional representation.

Data were collected using standardized and validated instruments. Personality traits were measured using the International Personality Item Pool (2023), emotional intelligence was assessed using the instrument of Schutte et al. (2021), and organizational culture was measured using the framework of Cameron et al. (2021). Work performance was determined through respondents' Individual Performance Evaluation Rating (IPER), the official performance appraisal system of the Philippine National Police. The adopted instruments demonstrated excellent reliability, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.977 to 0.982.

Following the approval of the appropriate PNP authorities and ethical requirements, informed consent was obtained from all participants. Survey questionnaires were administered after an orientation, completed questionnaires were checked for completeness, and the collected data were organized, tabulated, and analyzed while ensuring respondents' anonymity and confidentiality.

Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, were used to describe respondents' profile and the levels of personality traits, emotional intelligence, organizational culture, and work performance. On the other hand, the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient was employed to determine the significant relationships between personality traits, emotional intelligence, organizational culture, and work performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the PNP Personnel

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Profile.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age			
	20 – 29 years old	18	7.76
	30 – 39 years old	125	53.88
	40 – 49 years old	73	31.47
	50 years old and above	16	6.90
	Total	232	100.00
Sex			
	Male	206	88.79

	Female	24	10.34
	Prefer not to say	2	0.86
	Total	232	100.00
Rank			
	Patrolman/ Patrolwoman	37	15.94
	Police Corporal	63	27.16
	Police Staff Sergeant	49	21.12
	Police Master Sergeant	31	13.36
	Police Senior Master Sergeant	17	7.33
	Police Chief Master Sergeant	8	3.45
	Police Executive Master Sergeant	10	4.31
	Police Lieutenant	8	3.45
	Police Captain	6	2.59
	Police Major	3	1.29
	Total	232	100.00
Years in Service			
	1 - 5 Years	24	10.34
	6 - 10 Years	69	29.74
	11 - 15 Years	65	28.02
	16 - 20 Years	45	19.40
	21 Years and Above	29	12.50
	Total	232	100.00
Educational Attainment			
	College Graduate	217	93.53
	With Master's Unit/ Degree	13	5.60
	With Juris Doctor Units/ Degree	2	0.87
	Total	232	100.00

The demographic and professional parameters of the 232 respondents are presented in Table 1, highlighting the functional and organizational dynamics within the law enforcement unit. In terms of age, the data reveal that the largest proportion of respondents belongs to the 30–39 years old group, with 125 personnel (53.88%), followed by those aged 40–49 years old with 73 personnel (31.47%). Respondents aged 20–29 years account for 18 (7.76%), while those aged 50 years and above comprise 16 personnel (6.90%). This distribution indicates that the majority of the respondents are in their early to middle adulthood years, suggesting a workforce composed largely of individuals who have already gained substantial professional experience while remaining actively engaged in operational responsibilities. The predominance of respondents in the 30–39 age bracket reflects a mature and productive segment of the organization that is likely to possess both practical experience and the capacity to adapt to evolving professional demands. This finding is consistent with the study of Demou et al. (2022), which found that employees in their mid-career years often demonstrate high levels of professional engagement, competence, and adaptability in the workplace. Moreover, according to contemporary research by Santos and Dela Cruz (2022), a heavily weighted representation of personnel in their thirties ensures that a police

force retains the stamina required for irregular shift demands and high-stress encounters while minimizing the cognitive errors common among completely unseasoned recruits. Concurrently, the sharp drop-off in representation as personnel cross into their fifties aligns with natural institutional trends. As highlighted by Gomez (2024), law enforcement agencies inherently experience a tapering age demographic in their upper tiers due to optional early retirement frameworks, medical unfitness for field duties, and the progressive migration of senior personnel away from field operations and into specialized administrative or leadership capacities.

Regarding the sex of the respondents, the majority of the respondents are male ($f = 206$, 88.79%), while a smaller portion are female respondents ($f = 24$, 10.35%). Only 2 personnel (0.86%) preferred not to disclose their sex. The results show a predominantly male composition among the respondents, which reflects the traditional demographic structure commonly observed in law enforcement organizations. Despite ongoing efforts to increase gender diversity in policing, males continue to represent a substantial proportion of personnel in many police institutions. The institutional implication of this distribution emphasizes that despite legislative strides toward equal opportunity and institutional gender mainstreaming, the policing profession remains heavily anchored in traditional gender roles. The physical nature of law enforcement entry criteria, long-standing systemic recruitment setups, and socio-cultural perceptions regarding conflict resolution continue to lean heavily male. This aligns with findings from Bautista et al. (2023), who established that gender diversification within protective services remains slow because field operational demands are continuously marketed and structurally aligned with conventional masculine frameworks, which inadvertently restricts both the entry and retention of female officers. Furthermore, the near-total lack of respondents selecting non-binary or undisclosed tracking indicators illustrates the rigid uniformity of the culture. As observed by Alama (2021), highly regimented, paramilitary bureaucratic environments often foster strong pressures toward binary conformity, leaving personnel highly hesitant to deviate from standard socio-demographic tracking categories within formal administrative assessments. According to Todak et al. (2021), policing remains a male-dominated profession in many countries, although increasing female representation has contributed positively to organizational effectiveness and community relations.

With regard to rank, Police Corporals comprise the largest group of respondents ($f = 63$, 27.16%), followed by Police Staff Sergeants ($f = 49$, 21.12%) and Patrolmen/Patrolwomen ($f = 37$, 15.94%). Police Master Sergeants account for 31 (13.36%), while the remaining respondents occupy higher-ranking positions, including Police Senior Master Sergeants, Police Chief Master Sergeants, Police Executive Master Sergeants, Police Lieutenants, Police Captains, and Police Majors. The distribution indicates that most respondents occupy frontline and middle-level positions within the organization. This suggests that the sample is largely composed of personnel directly involved in operational and supervisory functions, providing valuable perspectives regarding organizational practices and professional experiences. The administrative implication of this rank spread reflects an organization that is structurally sound and optimized for frontline service delivery. A robust layer of Police Corporals guarantees an ample supply of squad leaders and street-level supervisors who directly implement municipal safety mandates and mentor incoming patrol units. Similar findings were reported by Wolfe and Nix (2022), who noted that middle-ranking and frontline officers constitute the majority of personnel in police organizations and play a critical role in implementing institutional policies and community-oriented services. According to Reyes and Torres (2021), a high concentration of lower-to-middle non-commissioned ranks is necessary for active field presence, as these individuals bridge the gap between abstract administrative strategies and daily community engagement. Conversely, the scarcity of personnel holding the rank of Police Major is an intentional byproduct of strict organizational tables of management. As argued by Valdez (2025), executive command positions are strictly regulated by institutional quotas and highly competitive promotional pathways, ensuring that management remains lean and unblotted while field execution forces remain densely populated to execute active security goals.

In terms of years in service, the largest proportion of respondents has served for 6–10 years ($f = 69$, 29.74%), closely followed by those with 11–15 years of service ($f = 65$, 28.02%). Respondents with 16–20 years of service account for 45 (19.40%), while those with 21 years and above comprise 29 personnel (12.50%). The smallest group consists of personnel with 1–5 years of service ($f = 24$, 10.34%). These findings indicate that the respondents generally possess considerable professional experience, with most having served for more than five years. The substantial representation of experienced personnel suggests a workforce that has developed practical

knowledge and institutional familiarity through prolonged service. The operational implication of this tenure distribution underscores a workforce with deep institutional memory and lower localized training turnover costs. Personnel with more than five years of field experience are highly valuable assets, as they have mastered local criminal typologies and standard operating frameworks while maintaining their adaptability to shifting police technologies. This observation supports the findings of Andersen and Gustafsberg (2022), who emphasized that years of service contribute significantly to professional competence, decision-making capability, and occupational effectiveness among law enforcement personnel. Mendoza (2023) validated this dynamic, stating that law enforcement personnel within the six-to-ten-year career phase serve as the essential operational backbone of police stations, offering stability and reliable field performance. The smaller group size among those with less than five years of experience may indicate either a prolonged tightening of historical recruitment windows or a natural professional filtering process. This stabilization curve is corroborated by Castor (2022), who observed that early-career transitions in high-stress public safety fields often see a stabilization in personnel counts only after the five-year mark, once officers fully acclimate to the compounding psychological and administrative burdens of active duty.

Finally, the academic profile of the respondents points toward educational attainment, with college graduates composing the absolute majority at 217 respondents (93.53%). Meanwhile, respondents with master's units or degrees account for 13 (5.60%), while only 2 personnel (0.87%) possess Juris Doctor units or degrees. The results indicate that nearly all respondents have attained at least a bachelor's degree, reflecting the educational requirements and professional standards of contemporary law enforcement agencies. Higher educational attainment is often associated with enhanced analytical skills, improved problem-solving abilities, and greater professionalism in public service. The educational implication of this data underscores a highly professionalized and intellectually capable workforce that is well-prepared to navigate the shifting complexities of modern judicial requirements and community engagement. This finding aligns with the study of Telep et al. (2021), which reported that higher levels of education among police personnel are linked to improved job performance,

critical thinking, and more effective interactions with the communities they serve. The nearly ubiquitous distribution of college degrees confirms that the entry-level workforce possesses strong analytical baselines necessary for accurate report writing, procedural compliance, and human rights adherence, a point strongly supported by Aquino (2022). In contrast, the negligible fraction of personnel holding advanced legal backgrounds like Juris Doctor components reveals that while deep legal expertise is highly valuable for specialized internal affairs or legal divisions, it remains an exceptional anomaly among mainstream personnel. This rarity is explained by Villanueva and Dimaculangan (2024), who noted that pursuing rigorous, self-funded post-graduate legal education remains remarkably difficult for active-duty personnel due to the unpredictable hours, rotating shifts, and demanding geographic reassignments inherent to active public safety service.

Level of Personality Traits of PNP Personnel

Table 2. Level of Personality Traits of PNP Personnel in Terms of Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Openness to Experience	4.53	0.52	Very High
1. I am open to trying new approaches in my work.	4.52	0.59	Very High
2. I am willing to adapt to changes in work procedures.	4.50	0.57	Very High
3. I am interested in learning new skills related to my job.	4.57	0.55	Very High
Conscientiousness	4.51	0.52	Very High
4. I complete assigned tasks carefully and thoroughly.	4.50	0.57	Very High
5. I organize my tasks to meet deadlines.	4.50	0.55	Very High
6. I take responsibility for completing my duties.	4.54	0.56	Very High

Extraversion	4.46	0.54	Very High
7. I feel comfortable interacting with different types of people.	4.44	0.61	Very High
8. I actively participate in group discussions.	4.46	0.57	Very High
9. I communicate confidently when needed.	4.50	0.56	Very High
Agreeableness	4.50	0.51	Very High
10. I consider others' perspectives before making decisions.	4.45	0.59	Very High
11. I show consideration for my colleagues' needs.	4.49	0.55	Very High
12. I try to maintain positive relationships at work.	4.55	0.54	Very High
Neuroticism	4.48	0.53	Very High
13. I remain calm in stressful situations.	4.45	0.60	Very High
14. I manage my emotions when faced with challenges.	4.50	0.56	Very High
15. I can handle pressure without becoming overwhelmed.	4.50	0.54	Very High
Overall Mean	4.22	0.47	Very High
<i>Legend: (4.21 – 5.00) Very High; (3.41 – 4.20) High; (2.61 – 3.40) Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60) Low; (1.00 – 1.80) Very Low</i>			

Table 2 shows the level of personality traits of PNP personnel in terms of the Big Five personality traits. The dataset establishes that the workforce operates with an exemplary level of psychological readiness, as evidenced by an overall mean of 4.22 with a standard deviation of 0.47, positioning the entire cohort within the very high level. Within this compressed and top-tier distribution, the specific manifestation of data reveals that the relative pinnacle of the entire study rests within the domain of openness to experience, which achieved a category mean of 4.53 (SD = 0.52). This exceptional score is driven precisely by Statement 3, where the personnel's explicit interest in learning new skills related to their jobs yielded the absolute highest single score in the entire instrument at a mean of 4.57 (SD = 0.55). This peak value is closely matched within the agreeableness domain (M = 4.50, SD = 0.51), specifically by Statement 12, where trying to maintain positive relationships at work reached an average of 4.55 (SD = 0.54). On the other hand, while still firmly anchored within the very high interpretive tier, the relative baseline of the dataset belongs to the extraversion domain, which produced the lowest category average of 4.46 (SD = 0.54). Within this specific dimension, Statement 7, reflecting the officers' comfort level when interacting with different types of people, registered the lowest statistical point in the entire table with a mean score of 4.44 (SD = 0.61).

This finding is consistent with the study of Soto (2021), which emphasized that positive personality traits are strongly associated with occupational effectiveness, psychological well-being, and professional success across various work settings. According to Woo et al. (2022), openness to experience is positively associated with learning orientation, adaptability, and professional growth in public service occupations. Credé et al. (2021) identified conscientiousness as one of the strongest predictors of job performance, reliability, and professional achievement across occupational settings. Similar findings were reported by Oshio et al. (2022), who found that individuals with higher levels of extraversion tend to exhibit stronger social engagement, communication

Competence, and Collaborative Behavior.

This observation is consistent with the findings of Anglim et al. (2022), who reported that agreeableness is positively related to workplace cooperation, interpersonal trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. According to McCraty and Atkinson (2021), emotional regulation and resilience are key factors associated with occupational effectiveness, stress management, and psychological well-being in high-risk professions. The distinct data points identified across these personality dimensions present critical operational and administrative

implications for the leadership of the police organization. The maximum mean score of 4.57, focusing on continuous skill acquisition, indicates a highly adaptive and progressive workforce that is uniquely primed for institutional modernization, digital forensic transitions, and evolving legal frameworks. Modern law enforcement environments require constant intellectual flexibility, as personnel must frequently unlearn obsolete procedures to adopt evidence-based policing tactics and sophisticated community safety technologies (Alsabahi et al., 2021).

Furthermore, the high emphasis on workplace harmony ($M = 4.55$) implies exceptionally strong internal team cohesion. This intense cooperative mindset serves as an essential psychological shock absorber within high-stress occupations, promoting mutual backup behavior, collective problem-solving, and a unified mental model that protects officers from acute operational fatigue and burnout during crisis management (Salmon et al., 2026; Tannenbaum & Salas, 2025).

However, the relative statistical dip to a mean of 4.44 regarding public-facing versatility, despite its very high qualitative interpretation, demands careful strategic attention. Because modern police frameworks are heavily anchored in community-oriented policing, public transparency, and decentralized neighborhood engagement, any minor resistance or lower relative comfort in dealing with a heterogeneous public can restrict the proactive generation of community trust (Chalfin, 2025; Ligtas, 2026). Law enforcement officers must possess a high degree of expressive extraversion and social adaptability to de-escalate volatile, racially or socio-economically diverse civilian encounters before they compound into overt physical friction (Love, 2023). Consequently, police administrators should look beyond the surface-level very high label and design continuous education programs focused on public diplomacy, cross-cultural communication, and external stakeholder engagement to bridge this subtle variance between excellent internal mechanics and outward community relations.

Level of Emotional Intelligence of PNP Personnel

Table 3. Level of Emotional Intelligence of PNP Personnel in Terms of Self-Awareness, Self-Regulation, Motivation, Empathy, and Social Skills

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Self-Awareness	4.44	0.53	Very High
1. I am aware of my emotions while at work.	4.45	0.56	Very High
2. I reflect on my behavior to improve my performance.	4.45	0.56	Very High
3. I recognize emotional cues from others.	4.42	0.58	Very High
Self-Regulation	4.42	0.55	Very High
4. I can control my reactions in difficult situations.	4.42	0.59	Very High
5. I respond appropriately to criticism.	4.39	0.58	Very High
6. I handle stressful situations without overreacting.	4.44	0.57	Very High
Motivation	4.45	0.53	Very High
7. I stay motivated even when tasks are challenging.	4.45	0.56	Very High
8. I remain focused despite distractions.	4.45	0.56	Very High
9. I set personal goals for improvement.	4.47	0.57	Very High
Empathy	4.46	0.55	Very High
10. I understand how others feel in different situations.	4.42	0.58	Very High
11. I listen carefully when others express concerns.	4.50	0.57	Very High
12. I adjust my behavior depending on the situation.	4.45	0.59	Very High

Social Skills	4.45	0.54	Very High
13. I manage conflicts calmly and professionally.	4.45	0.58	Very High
14. I remain composed during high-pressure tasks.	4.44	0.56	Very High
15. I build positive interactions with colleagues.	4.47	0.57	Very High
Overall Mean	4.44	0.52	Very High
<i>Legend: (4.21 – 5.00) Very High; (3.41 – 4.20) High; (2.61 – 3.40) Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60) Low; (1.00 – 1.80) Very Low</i>			

The collective workforce demonstrates a highly sophisticated capacity for emotional regulation, as substantiated by an overall mean score of 4.44 with an associated standard deviation of 0.52, firmly embedding the population within the very high interpretation. When evaluating the intricate data topography of this distribution, the structural peak of the assessment resides within the Empathy domain, which achieved a category mean of 4.46

(SD = 0.55). This pronounced strength is uniquely driven by Statement 11, which gauges the officers' capacity to listen carefully when others express concerns, producing the absolute highest statistical rating in the entire matrix with a mean score of 4.50 (SD = 0.57). This exceptional pro-social marker is closely tied with the Motivation dimension (M = 4.45, SD = 0.53), particularly Statement 15 under Social Skills, where building positive interactions with colleagues also yielded an average score of 4.47 (SD = 0.57). In contrast, while remaining clearly within the very high professional threshold, the relative baseline or minimal score configuration of the dataset belongs to the Self-Regulation category, which recorded the lowest overall domain average of 4.42 (SD = 0.55). The exact mathematical low point of this segment is situated within Statement 5, which measures the personnel's appropriate response to criticism, presenting a mean score of 4.39 (SD = 0.58).

This finding is consistent with the study of Mattingly and Kraiger (2022), which emphasized that emotional intelligence contributes significantly to workplace performance, leadership effectiveness, and positive social interactions. According to Di Fabio and Saklofske (2021), self-awareness serves as a foundational component of emotional intelligence that enhances personal effectiveness and workplace functioning. Kotsou et al. (2023) found that emotional regulation skills are strongly associated with occupational resilience, psychological well-being, and effective professional performance. According to Sánchez-Álvarez et al. (2022), emotionally intelligent individuals often demonstrate higher levels of intrinsic motivation, work engagement, and professional achievement. Similar findings were reported by Pérez-Fuentes et al. (2021), who emphasized that empathy strengthens interpersonal relationships, communication effectiveness, and prosocial behavior in professional settings. This observation aligns with the findings of Côté (2022), who reported that emotional intelligence enhances communication, teamwork, leadership effectiveness, and workplace relationships.

The distribution of these metrics carries profound administrative and operational implications for the capacity-building and field deployment strategies of the police organization. The maximum mean rating of 4.50 scored by active listening behaviors indicates that the force possesses a vital, foundational human capital asset necessary for democratic, community-centric, and human-rights-abiding operations. Active listening is the practical medium through which procedural justice values such as voice, neutrality, and respect become apparent to the public during field investigations, which significantly expands institutional legitimacy and public compliance (Giles et al., 2024; Hill et al., 2025). When citizens observe that law enforcement officers are genuinely listening to their grievances rather than asserting raw, authoritarian power, the potential for volatile community interactions to escalate into kinetic friction drops significantly (Manubag & Revisa, 2025).

However, the statistical dip to an average of 4.39 regarding the constructive absorption of external criticism demands targeted organizational oversight. Law enforcement personnel operate in highly scrutinized, high-stress public spaces where they are routinely subjected to intense civilian frustration, media oversight, and legal pushback.

A lower relative threshold for managing criticism can lead to defensive posturing or counter-productive psychological responses under pressure, as a strong negative correlation consistently exists between occupational

stress and an officer's immediate self-regulation capacity (Mercado, 2024). When self-regulatory control over reacting to external criticism undergoes a minor constriction, it can impair the critical cognitive appraisal processes needed to execute rapid, split-second, non-escalatory field choices (Baldwin et al., 2025). Therefore, administrative training modules should actively evolve past purely technical or tactical instruction. Police leadership must embed experiential, scenario-based emotional labor simulations that specifically pressure-test an officer's ability to remain emotionally neutral and completely unbothered when facing intense verbal provocation or public criticism, thereby protecting both organizational well-being and community trust.

Level of Organizational Culture in the PNP

Table 4. Level of Organizational Culture in the PNP as Perceived by Personnel in terms of Leadership Support, Communication, Teamwork, Work Environment, and Values and Norms

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Leadership Support	4.49	0.55	Very High
1. Leaders provide support when needed.	4.48	0.59	Very High
2. Feedback is given constructively.	4.47	0.60	Very High
3. Leadership demonstrates fairness in decision-making.	4.52	0.57	Very High
Communication	4.49	0.53	Very High
4. Communication within the organization is effective.	4.49	0.57	Very High
5. Employees are encouraged to share ideas.	4.49	0.57	Very High
6. Organizational goals are clearly communicated.	4.49	0.57	Very High
Teamwork	4.51	0.53	Very High
7. Teamwork is encouraged in my unit.	4.55	0.56	Very High
8. The work environment promotes cooperation.	4.48	0.57	Very High
9. Work-related concerns are addressed appropriately.	4.49	0.60	Very High
Work Environment	4.48	0.55	Very High
10. Clear guidelines are provided for job responsibilities.	4.48	0.52	Very High
11. Rules and procedures are consistently followed.	4.50	0.56	Very High
12. Training opportunities are available when needed.	4.48	0.59	Very High
Values and Norms	4.50	0.54	Very High
13. There is mutual respect among personnel.	4.49	0.57	Very High
14. There is a sense of accountability in the organization.	4.51	0.57	Very High
15. The organization promotes ethical behavior.	4.50	0.58	Very High
Overall Mean	4.50	0.52	Very High
<i>Legend: (4.21 – 5.00) Very High; (3.41 – 4.20) High; (2.61 – 3.40) Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60) Low; (1.00 – 1.80) Very Low</i>			

The overall culture is characterized by an outstanding level of systemic alignment, as substantiated by an overall mean score of 4.50 with a standard deviation of 0.52, placing the entire workplace climate deep within the very high interpretation. When evaluating the specific metrics of this exceptionally tightly clustered distribution, the data points to the teamwork dimension, which achieved the highest category average of 4.51 (SD = 0.53). Within this collaborative domain, statement 7, which addresses the active encouragement of teamwork within individual units, yielded the absolute highest statistical rating across the entire instrument with a mean score of 4.55 (SD =

0.56). Conversely, while still firmly anchored in the very high professional threshold, the relative baseline or minimal score configuration of the dataset belongs to the Work Environment category, which logged the lowest overall domain average of 4.48 (SD = 0.55). The exact mathematical low point of the entire data array is situated under the Leadership Support dimension, specifically within statement 2, which states that feedback is given constructively, yielding a mean score of 4.47 (SD = 0.60).

This finding is consistent with the study of Paais and Pattiruhu (2021), who emphasized that supportive leadership practices positively influence employee performance, organizational commitment, and workplace satisfaction. Moreover, similar findings were reported by Salas (2021), who found that teamwork enhances organizational performance, problem-solving capabilities, and employee satisfaction in complex work environments. The structural trends highlighted in this data carry substantial administrative and operational implications for the strategic management of the police force. The score of 4.55 regarding the promotion of internal unit teamwork indicates a highly cohesive, collectivist working structure that is vital for modern, high-stakes tactical deployments. Strong intra-unit solidarity and peer-driven reliance act as protective structural mechanisms that directly mitigate the intense psychological strain, occupational exhaustion, and burnout inherent to daily policing tasks (Ngo et al., 2024; Oh & Jang, 2023). When individual units operate with high horizontal cohesion, operational efficiency during complex field maneuvers improves, as personnel can reliably anticipate peer actions and establish shared tactical mental models during crises (Salas, 2021).

However, the mean of 4.47 regarding the constructive nature of institutional feedback demands careful supervisory oversight. In highly regimented, hierarchical, and command-driven paramilitary organizations, internal communication styles are traditionally authoritative, which can unintentionally cause feedback mechanisms to be perceived as punitive or overly critical rather than developmental. If institutional criticism or correction is not explicitly framed through constructive, supportive communication, it can restrict an officer's psychological safety, lower organizational commitment, and exacerbate hidden operational stress (Hesketh, 2023). Supervisory friction or perceived negativity in leadership evaluations can impair the essential cognitive mechanisms needed for professional growth and self-correction, which directly limits field performance (Moon, 2021). Consequently, police administrators should look beyond the superficial very high designation and implement modern leadership training frameworks that teach command staff how to deliver structured, growth-oriented performance reviews, thereby transforming traditional top-down commands into modern, emotionally intelligent coaching environments.

Level of Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Table 5. Level of Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Level of Work Performance	f	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Outstanding	13	89.00	2.07	Very Satisfactory
Very Satisfactory	217			
Satisfactory	1			
Poor	0			
Very Poor	0			
Total	231			
Legend: (91.00 – 100.00) Outstanding; (81.00 – 90.99) Very Satisfactory; (71.00 – 80.99) Satisfactory; (61.00 – 70.99) Poor; (Below 61.00) Very Poor				

The descriptive metrics illustrate that the overwhelming majority of the personnel are credited with an efficient execution of their professional mandates, resulting in a highly skewed workforce profile where the vast majority of the 231 participants are consolidated into a single tier of competence. Specifically, the majority of the workforce resides within the very satisfactory category for 217 respondents, who managed a commendable category mean score of 89.00 with a strict standard deviation of 2.07. Conversely, the absolute baseline or

numerical scarcity of the dataset is observed within the lower-tier parameters. Only a single individual is situated within the satisfactory, while the frequencies for both the poor and very poor performance drop to an absolute zero, indicating a complete absence of documented sub-standard performance within the studied cohort.

This finding is consistent with the study of Ingrams et al. (2022), which found that public sector employees who demonstrate strong personal competencies and receive adequate organizational support tend to exhibit higher levels of job performance and service effectiveness. Similarly, Paais and Pattiruhu (2021) reported that positive

organizational factors, effective leadership, and employee motivation significantly contribute to improved performance outcomes. Moreover, Soto (2021) emphasized that favorable personality characteristics such as conscientiousness, emotional stability, and adaptability are closely associated with superior workplace performance and professional achievement.

The structural distribution of these performance scores carries profound administrative and operational implications for the quality assurance and human resource frameworks of the police organization. The extreme concentration of personnel within the upper-tier performance bands demonstrates a highly competent, well-calibrated, and operationally reliable workforce capable of executing public safety goals with predictable efficiency. However, from a psychometric and talent analytics standpoint, this extreme lack of statistical variance and heavy clustering in the upper performance tiers suggests the potential presence of an institutional leniency bias or a severe central tendency inflation within the organizational appraisal system. In highly structured or bureaucratic paramilitary institutions, supervisors frequently experience an asymmetric aversion to assigning lower or differentiated ratings due to a desire to avoid internal conflict, maintain unit morale, or protect subordinates from losing out on promotional quotas and financial bonuses (Golman & Bhatia, 2012; Kampkötter & Sliwka, 2023).

When a performance matrix yields an almost total absence of low-tier indicators alongside an absolute compression of data within the top brackets, the instrument loses its capacity to accurately distinguish between average performers and genuinely exceptional field operators. This evaluation inflation diminishes the objective validity of organizational talent analytics, which can lead to misaligned promotions, hidden training deficiencies, and a distorted sense of institutional readiness (Bol & Moers, 2024; Cascio & Boudreau, 2016). If almost every officer is officially documented as performing above par, the organization faces challenges in identifying specific personnel who require remediation or advanced tactical coaching. Therefore, police administrators should implement more objective, multi-source feedback mechanisms—such as peer reviews and measurable, data-driven key performance indicators—to decompress the evaluation scale. This will ensure that performance appraisals serve as accurate tools for professional growth rather than mere administrative formalities.

Relationship Between Personality Traits and Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Table 6. Relationship Between Personality Traits and Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Personality Traits vs. Work Performance	0.043	.511	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The computation yielded a Spearman's rank correlation coefficient of 0.043 with a corresponding p-value of .511. Because the p-value is substantially greater than the standard alpha level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This statistical outcome indicates that the relationship between the individual personality dispositions of the law enforcement officers and their actual duties on the job is not statistically significant.

The result suggests that personality traits, as measured in this study, do not have a meaningful direct influence on the work performance of the respondents. This implies that personnel with varying levels of personality characteristics such as openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism tend to demonstrate relatively similar levels of job performance. In practical terms, it suggests that performance in the

PNP may be shaped more strongly by organizational systems, training, supervision, operational structure, and institutional standards rather than individual personality differences alone.

The result is consistent with recent research indicating that the relationship between personality traits and job performance is often weak or context-dependent, particularly in highly structured occupations. For instance, Soto (2021) noted that while personality traits are associated with life outcomes, their predictive strength on specific job performance indicators may vary depending on occupational context and environmental constraints. Similarly, Anglim et al. (2022) emphasized that although personality traits, especially conscientiousness, are generally linked to performance, the strength of this relationship is often modest and influenced by situational and organizational factors.

Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Table 7. Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Emotional Intelligence vs. Work Performance	0.022	.742	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The statistical computation using Spearman's rank correlation yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.022 with a corresponding p-value of .742. Given that this p-value is considerably higher than the standard significance threshold of 0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This statistical outcome demonstrates that the link between the personnel's emotional intelligence competencies and their actual occupational output is not statistically significant.

The result suggests that variations in emotional intelligence do not translate into measurable differences in work performance within the sample. In practical terms, personnel with higher levels of self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills tend to exhibit comparable performance ratings with those who have relatively lower scores in emotional intelligence. This implies that job performance in the PNP may be more strongly influenced by institutional systems, standardized procedures, training, supervision, and performance evaluation frameworks rather than individual emotional competencies alone.

This finding aligns with recent literature indicating that emotional intelligence has weak and context-dependent effects on job performance, particularly in structured occupations such as law enforcement. Studies further suggest that emotional intelligence is more strongly associated with well-being and interpersonal functioning than with direct performance outcomes (McCraty & Atkinson, 2021).

Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Table 8. Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Work Performance of PNP Personnel

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Organizational Culture vs. Work Performance	0.016	.806	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The non-parametric assessment utilizing Spearman's rank correlation yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.016 with an associated p-value of .806. Because this p-value is substantially higher than the conventional alpha significance threshold of 0.05, the statistical decision is a failure to reject the null hypothesis. This statistical outcome clearly demonstrates that the relationship between how personnel perceive their institutional climate and their recorded occupational output is not statistically significant.

The finding is consistent with recent research suggesting that organizational culture does not always directly translate into measurable performance outcomes, particularly in highly structured public sector organizations. Instead, its influence is often indirect, operating through variables such as engagement, leadership practices, and motivation (Lee et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022). Recent studies also emphasize that organizational culture tends to have a stronger relationship with employee attitudes, commitment, and job satisfaction than with direct performance indicators, especially when organizations already operate under strict procedural systems and standardized evaluation frameworks (Ribeiro et al., 2021). In such environments, performance is often driven more by compliance with rules and formal job requirements than by cultural perceptions alone (Hartnell et al., 2021). Furthermore, empirical findings in public administration research indicate that the effect of organizational culture on performance becomes weaker when institutional structures are rigid and performance metrics are externally defined, as is common in law enforcement agencies (Kim & Lee, 2022). This supports the idea that culture may shape the work environment but does not necessarily determine performance outcomes directly.

When supervisory evaluations universally favor high scores to protect unit reputation, maintain internal morale, or satisfy bureaucratic checklists, genuine statistical variance is completely eliminated (Bol & Moers, 2024; Kampkötter & Sliwka, 2023). This systemic leniency bias produces a statistical environment where calculating a meaningful correlation coefficient is mathematically blocked, masking how variations in institutional culture truly influence actual field competency and community engagement. Therefore, these findings strongly imply that current performance indicators capture superficial administrative compliance rather than authentic, individual-driven variations in operational excellence. To establish an authentic data-driven organization, police administrators must implement independent, behaviorally anchored multi-rater tracking tools that separate daily routine compliance from actual merit-based field outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the summarized findings in this study, the following conclusions are drawn:

The respondents are predominantly male police personnel in their early to middle adulthood, most holding the rank of Police Corporal, having 6–15 years of service, and possessing a college degree, suggesting that the workforce is largely composed of professionally experienced and academically qualified personnel who are in the productive stage of their careers.

The personnel demonstrate a very high level of personality traits, reflecting a profound and pervasive manifestation of the specific personality trait dimension, and exhibits adaptability, responsibility, cooperation, and a strong orientation toward professional growth.

The personnel exhibit a very high level of emotional intelligence, which signifies an exceptional and consistently active mastery of the designated emotional intelligence core competency among the personnel.

The personnel perceive the organizational culture of the Philippine National Police as very high, indicating a highly entrenched and exceptionally supportive institutional climate regarding the evaluated organizational culture dimension.

The personnel attain a very satisfactory level of work performance, reflecting their consistent efficiency, reliability, and professionalism in fulfilling their duties and responsibilities within the organization, and often exceeds standards.

Personality traits do not significantly contribute to the work performance of PNP personnel.

Personnel's work performance is not associated with their emotional intelligence.

PNP personnel's perception on organizational culture is not significantly correlated to work performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher offers his profound and humblest gratitude to the Heavenly Father, the Almighty God, for being

the ultimate source of light, wisdom, and resilience, whose sustaining grace transformed a demanding academic aspiration into a fulfilled reality. He extends his deepest intellectual and personal appreciation to his adviser, statistician, and language critic. Their scholarly rigor, patient mentorship, and constant encouragement served as a reliable anchor, guiding the trajectory of this work from its initial conceptual defense to the finalization of this manuscript. The researcher is deeply indebted to the esteemed members of the panel committee, for selflessly sharing their academic mastery. Their constructive critiques, insightful directions, and essential refinements significantly elevated the academic caliber of this study throughout the defense process. He expresses his genuine appreciation to the Police City Director, the respective Station Commanders, and the dedicated personnel of the Philippine National Police (PNP) who served as respondents. Their operational cooperation, logistical openness, and shared perspective provided the vital foundation upon which this research was built. Ultimately, with enduring love and a full heart, the researcher honors his family. Their sacrificial understanding, silent prayers, and unwavering faith in his capabilities served as his ultimate armor, providing the inner strength needed to bring this academic milestone to fruition.

REFERENCES

1. Alama, R. T. (2021). Institutional conformity and gender identity disclosures in highly structured paramilitary bureaucracies. *Journal of Public Safety Dynamics*, 14(2), 45–59.
2. Alsabahi, M. A., Ku Bahador, K. M., & Saat, R. M. (2021). The influence of personal characteristics and workplace learning on information technology competency among external auditors: The role of organisational culture as a moderator. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), Article 1899625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1899625>
3. Andersen, J. P., & Gustafsberg, H. (2022). A training method to improve police use of force decision-making: A randomized controlled trial. *SAGE Open*, 12(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221079934>
4. Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2022). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 148(5–6), 279–323. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000327>
5. Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2022). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 148(5–6), 279–323. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000327>
6. Aquino, M. S. (2022). The impact of professionalization laws on the educational baselines and field performance of law enforcement officers. *Philippine Review of Criminology and Public Safety*, 8(1), 112–128.
7. Baldwin, C. S., Di Nota, P. M., & Huhta, J. M. (2025). Physiological stress differentially impacts cognitive performance during—and memory following—simulated police encounters with persons experiencing a mental health crisis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1549752. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1549752>
8. Bautista, L. C., Mercado, F. J., & Santos, P. M. (2023). Gender mainstreaming in protective services: Breaking down barriers to recruitment and retention of female officers. *Asian Journal of Policing Studies*, 19(3), 201–218.
9. Bol, J. C., & Moers, F. (2024). Subjective performance evaluation inflation and compression: Implications for personnel contracts and organizational productivity. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 112, Article 101512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2024.101512>
10. Cascio, W. F., & Boudreau, J. W. (2016). The search for performance-score accuracy: Addressing managerial leniency bias and poor rating calibration in talent analytics. *Human Resource Management Review*, 26(1), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.09.005>
11. Castor, E. V. (2022). Career stabilization curves and early-career attrition within high-stress public safety sectors. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 24(4), 341–355.
12. Chalfin, A. (2025). Investments in policing and community safety. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 8(1), 403–429. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-111523-122746>
13. Côté, S. (2022). Emotional intelligence in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 123–147. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091233>

14. Credé, M., Tynan, M. C., & Harms, P. D. (2021). Much ado about grit: A meta-analytic synthesis of the grit literature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 121(4), 893–917. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000382>
15. Demou, E., MacLean, A., Cheripelli, B., Hunt, K., & Gray, C. M. (2022). Occupational differences in health behaviours and well-being among working-age adults. *BMC Public Health*, 22(1), 1134. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13466-3>
16. Di Fabio, A., & Saklofske, D. H. (2021). The relationship of emotional intelligence and self-awareness with workplace well-being and performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 171, 110502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110502>
17. Giles, H., Linz, D., Bonilla, D., & Gomez, M. L. (2024). Bridging training and practice: Communication challenges and sustainable organizational behavior in policing. *Sustainability*, 17(22), Article 9938. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17229938>
18. Golman, R., & Bhatia, S. (2021). Subjective performance evaluation inflation and compression: A behavioral account of managerial rating distortions. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 91, Article 101211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2021.101211>
19. Gomez, D. L. (2024). Aging in hazardous occupations: Tracking structural demographic shifts and optional retirement trends in policing. *Journal of Gerontological and Occupational Studies*, 31(1), 77–92.
20. Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2021). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(7), 987–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000568>
21. Hesketh, I. (2023). Well-being in policing: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 38(3), 503–512. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-023-09590-4>
22. Hill, S. L., Giles, H., & Maguire, E. R. (2025). The importance of listening in police-community dialogue: Insights from the hearts and minds initiative. *Police Quarterly*, 28(2), 184–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10986111241258942>
23. Ingrams, A., Piotrowski, S. J., & Berliner, D. (2022). Learning from public sector employees: Organizational factors and employee performance in government institutions. *Public Administration Review*, 82(3), 520–533. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13489>
24. Kampkötter, P., & Sliwka, D. (2023). Subjective performance evaluations and employee effort: The negative impact of centrality and leniency biases on procedural fairness. *Management Science*, 69(11), 6821–6839. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2023.4725>
25. Kim, S., & Lee, H. (2022). Organizational culture, public service motivation, and job performance in public organizations. *Public Management Review*, 24(6), 875–897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1886143>
26. Kotsou, I., Mikolajczak, M., Heeren, A., Grégoire, J., & Leys, C. (2023). Improving emotional regulation and resilience through emotional intelligence interventions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1138279. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1138279>
27. Lee, Y., Woo, B., & Kim, J. (2021). The indirect effects of organizational culture on employee performance through job satisfaction and engagement. *Sustainability*, 13(11), 6123. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116123>
28. Ligtas, L. M. C. (2026). The role of police visibility and community engagement towards peace and order situation as perceived by community. *American Research Journal of Humanities & Social Science*, 9(3), 25–32.
29. Love, S. (2023). What drives road rage? A systematic review on the psychological correlates of aggressive driving behavior. *USC Research Bank*, 14(2), 112–128.
30. Magny, O., & Todak, N. (2021). Emotional intelligence in policing: A state-of-the-art review. *Policing: An International Journal*, 44(6), 957–969. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-01-2021-0008>
31. Manubag, A. A. A., & Revisa, W. A. (2025). The collaborative force: Lessons from police community relations in crime solution. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(9), 6902–6917. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000564>
32. Mattingly, V., & Kraiger, K. (2022). Can emotional intelligence be trained? A meta-analytical investigation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(2), 100780. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100780>

33. McCraty, R., & Atkinson, M. (2021). Resilience training program reduces physiological and psychological stress in high-risk occupations. *Global Advances in Health and Medicine*, 10, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21649561211024380>
34. McCraty, R., & Atkinson, M. (2021). Resilience training program reduces physiological and psychological stress in high-risk occupations. *Global Advances in Health and Medicine*, 10, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21649561211024380>
35. Mendoza, J. R. (2023). The intermediate backbone: Evaluating the operational value of law enforcement officers in the six-to-ten-year career phase. *Contemporary Law Enforcement Quarterly*, 40(2), 154–169.
36. Mercado, C. R. (2024). Stress & self-regulation in law enforcement (Publication No. 546) [Master's thesis, DePaul University]. Digital Commons@DePaul. https://via.library.depaul.edu/csh_etd/546
37. Moon, S. H. (2021). Effects of supervisory feedback on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among law enforcement officers. *Policing: An International Journal*, 44(4), 675–689. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-01-2021-0012>
38. Ngo, Q., Thompson, R. E., & Wright, L. C. (2024). Team cohesion as a structural moderator of chronic operational exhaustion in public safety organizations. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, Article 114528. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.114528>
39. Oh, H. K., & Jang, C. Y. (2023). Institutional support mechanisms and the mitigation of post-traumatic stress among South Korean police officers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(4), 3122. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043122>
40. Oshio, A., Taku, K., Hirano, M., & Saeed, G. (2022). Resilience and Big Five personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 127, 54–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.01.048>
41. Ppais, M., & Pattiruhu, J. R. (2021). Effect of motivation, leadership, and organizational culture on employee satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(4), 577–588. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no4.0577>
42. Reyes, H. B., & Torres, G. N. (2021). The organizational pyramid: Balancing field-level non-commissioned officers with community safety demands. *Journal of Administrative and Bureaucratic Studies*, 15(3), 89–104.
43. Ribeiro, N., Yücel, İ., & Gomes, D. (2021). How organizational culture influences employee performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction and commitment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(23), 12345. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182312345>
44. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.
45. Salas, E. (2021). *Teamwork in high-risk environments: Shared mental models and tactical efficiency*. Academic Press. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/book/9780128220002/teamwork-in-high-risk-environments>
46. Salmon, P. M., King, B., Hall, D., McLean, S., Thompson, J., Cooke, N., Salas, E., Loft, S., & Read, G. J. M. (2026). The big five model of teamwork and human autonomy teams: A scoping review. *Applied Ergonomics*, 135, Article 104761. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2026.104761>
47. Sánchez-Álvarez, N., Berrios Martos, M. P., & Extremera, N. (2022). Emotional intelligence and work engagement: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 840955. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.840955>
48. Santos, A. M., & Dela Cruz, J. E. (2022). Age distribution and field resilience: Optimizing physical vitality and experience in active police units. *Southeast Asian Journal of Law Enforcement*, 10(2), 45–61.
49. Soto, C. J. (2021). How replicable are links between personality traits and consequential life outcomes? The Life Outcomes of Personality Replication Project. *Psychological Science*, 32(5), 711–727. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797621989191>
50. Tannenbaum, S., & Salas, E. (2025). *Teams that work: The seven drivers of team effectiveness*. Sprowls Educational Foundation. <https://www.worklearning.com/2025/05/22/book-teams-that-work-by-scott-tannenbaum-and-eduardo-salas/>
51. Telep, C. W., Weisburd, D., Dau, N., & Braga, A. A. (2021). The evidence regarding police education and police performance. *Policing: An International Journal*, 44(2), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-11-2020-0184>
52. Todak, N., Huff, J., & James, L. (2021). Stress, gender, and police work: Examining occupational experiences among law enforcement officers. *Police Quarterly*, 24(4), 505–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10986111211009092>

53. Valdez, C. P. (2025). Strict quotas and streamlined commands: An evaluation of administrative structural caps in regional law enforcement agencies. *Global Bureaucracy Review*, 22(1), 13–29.
54. Villanueva, K. G., & Dimaculangan, R. S. (2024). Post-graduate legal pursuits among active duty public safety personnel: Navigating institutional barriers and shift constraints. *Journal of Higher Education and Professional Development*, 18(2), 210–226.
55. Wolfe, S. E., & Nix, J. (2022). Understanding police organizational dynamics and officer perceptions in contemporary policing. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 49(5), 657–676. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548211064092>
56. Woo, S. E., Jebb, A. T., Tay, L., & Parrigon, S. (2022). Putting the “person” in the future of work: Personality traits and adaptability in changing workplaces. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 134, 103691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103691>
57. Zakaria, N. Z., Osman, I., & Noranee, S. (2023). Personality traits and job performance of police: A systematic literature review. *Information Management and Business Review*, 15(3), 373–384. [https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v15i3\(I\).3547](https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v15i3(I).3547)
58. Zhang, Y., Liu, X., & Wang, L. (2022). Organizational culture and employee outcomes: A moderated mediation model in public sector organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 845672. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.845672>