96453

CR-Sent
4-15-85

96453

Law Enforcement In Ohio Cities
Serving 10,000-25,000 People:
A Task Analysis

STATE OF OHIO
Richard F. Celeste, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT
Alfred S. Dietzel, Director

Division of Criminal Justice Services
Statistical Analysis Center

March, 1983

LIST OF PARTICIPATING POLICE AGENCIES

AGENCY	COUNTY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
American Township	Allen	1	
Ashland	Ashland	8	3
Oxford	Butler	5	1
Lemon Township	Butler	2	1
Salem	Columbiana	5	2
Perry Township	Columbiana	2	1
East Liverpool	Columbiana	4	2
Bucyrus	Crawford	2	2
Richmond Heights	Cuyahoga	4	2
Broadview Heights	Cuyahoga	3	1
Bedford	Cuyahoga	7	2
Brecksville	Cuyahoga	4	1
Seven Hills	Cuyahoga	6	2
Warrensville Heights	Cuyahoga	15	5
Mayfield Heights	Cuyahoga	7	3
Greenville	Darke	8	1
Defiance	Defiance	9	2
Perkins Township	Erie	5	1
Gahanna	Franklin	10	2
Sharon Township	Franklin	2	1
Madison Township	Franklin	7	1
Westerville	Franklin	11	2
Chester Township	Geauga	3	1
Xenia	Greene	8	3
North College Hills	Hamilton	4	1
Mount Vernon	Knox	7	1
Willowick	Lake	8	1
Eastlake	Lake	6	3
Wickliffe	Lake	11	2
Willoughby	Lake	16	3
Bellefontaine	Logan	5	1
Naumee	Lucas	14	3
Oregon	Lucas	15	3
Piqua	Miami	15	2
Troy	Miami	11	2
Vandalia	Montgomery	4	2
West Carrolton	Montgomery	8	1
Circleville	Pickaway	5	1
Chillicothe	Ross	17	4
Fostoria	Seneca	9	4
Sidney	Shelby	8	2
Alliance	Stark	10	1
Dover	Tucarawas	6	1
Franklin	Warren	5	1
Perrysburg	Wood	6	1
TOTAL		328	82

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

This report has been prepared especially for chiefs and administrative officers in Ohio's forty-five medium-sized police departments, all of which serve urban populations of 10,000-25,000 people. It analyzes the responses of some four hundred officers from those forty-five departments of that size range who participated in the state-wide task analysis study conducted in 1981-82 by the Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Ohio Peace Officer Training Council. Because each of these officers responded to more than one-thousand questions about their backgrounds, sources of information, equipment, types of investigation, tasks, and physical activities, there now exists a rich data base which chief executive officers can use for decisions relating to hiring, training, planning--and especially in analyzing the propriety of departmental standards.

A total of 3,155 Ohio peace officers representing nearly 400 law enforcement agencies took part in this survey, the results of which are contained in a report issued in November, 1982. However, eight separate summaries (five for police jurisdictions, three for sheriffs' jurisdictions) like this one are also being published so that chief executive officers can see how their own departments compare with an aggregate profile of similarly-sized agencies throughout the State. It is hoped that this process will also allow mayors, city managers, county commissioners, and other local officials to see their law enforcement operations in better perspective.

Actually, the task analysis study is three studies in one. While the 328 "medium-sized city" patrol officers were responding to the survey in terms of frequency (of use or performance), 82 of their supervisors were responding to the same questions in terms of (1) the importance, and (2) the learning difficulty of those items. This, in effect, triples the amount of available information, and geometrically increases the ways in which that information can be studied. Not only can it be determined how frequently a task is performed, but that information can be further analyzed in light of its importance to the law enforcement function and the difficulty with which the task is learned.

Because of the tremendous amount of data generated by this study (some one-half million pieces of information in the "medium city" data base alone) no summary report can adequately capture all of the worthwhile data. This report, in fact, makes no attempt to do so. Rather, it is being published as a complement to the earlier state-wide report and as an indicator of the type and depth of the available data. To that end it is hoped that this brief report will arouse the interest of local law enforcement officials who will then make fuller use of the rich data base available through the Ohio Division of Criminal Justice Services.

OFFICER PROFILE

Of the 2,620 patrol officers who participated in the state-wide task analysis study, 328 were drawn from police departments in Ohio's forty-five medium-sized cities. These forty-five medium-sized city police departments represent approximately 10% of the over 400 participating agencies, and the 328 patrol officers represent 13% of the total survey sample. As Table 1 reflects, the larger jurisdictions, despite being fewer in number, represent larger percentages in the sample due to their concentration of manpower. For example, the seven largest urban areas, while constituting only 2% of the total agencies, account for 28% of the patrol population in the survey.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON:
ACTUAL LAW ENFORCEMENT POPULATION
V.
SURVEY (RESPONSE) POPULATION

	% of Law Enforcement Population in Ohio	% of Population in Survey Response
MUNICIPALITIES.....................77.0%		77.3%
Largest City Police (over 100,000)	26.6%	28.6%
Large City Police (25,000-100,000)	16.2%	15.6%
Medium City Police (10,000-25,000)	14.1%	12.7%
Small City Police (2,500-10,000)	11.7%	13.1%
Smallest City Police (under-2,500)	8.4%	7.3%
COUNTIES............................18.5%		17.2%
Large County Sheriffs (over 250,000)	9.2%	7.0%*
Medium County Sheriffs (100,000-250,000)	3.1%	3.8%
Small County Sheriffs (under 100,000)	6.2%	6.4%
SPECIAL AGENCIES......................4.5%		4.9%
Private Police		.4%
Railroad Police		.8%
Jr./Sr. High School Security		.2%
College/University Police		1.5%
Dept. of Taxation		.1%
Port Authority Police		.1%
Special Constables		.1%
Park Rangers		1.1%
Mental Health Police		.8%
MISSING................................		.4%
TOTALS............................100%....................99.8%		

* One large county sheriff's office, originally targeted for inclusion, was excluded after it was learned that those officers had only jail and civil processing duties.

2

While the task analysis study was aimed primarily at law enforcement duties, resources, physical activities, and other non-personal aspects of the job, a good deal of background information was also collected and is offered here as a basis for better understanding the people who perform the patrol function in Ohio's medium cities. Wherever possible these 328 officers will be compared to their peers throughout the remainder of the State.

At the level of hereditary traits it is apparent that patrol officers in medium-sized areas differ from those in the largest urban jurisdictions. For example, two-thirds of the 170 female patrol officers in the survey came from the large urban areas, as did 7 out of 10 of the black officers, which largely account for the differences between medium cities and the balance of state as reflected in Table 2.

TABLE 2

OFFICERS' RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS

	Forty-five Medium-Sized Cities Agencies	Balance of State
White	98%	88%
Black	1%	10%
Other	1%	2%
Male	98%	93%
Female	2%	7%

In terms of age, nearly nine out of ten officers were under the age of 35, but this was not significantly different from the other patrol officers in the State. To a large extent, the age variable was determined by the one-to-seven year limitation placed upon officers who were otherwise randomly drawn for survey inclusion.

Among the officers' acquired characteristics, educational achievement was noteable for several reasons. Primary among these is the fact that many of the medium city patrol officers have achieved more academically than the high school diploma required to become a peace officer in Ohio. Three out of five of the medium-sized city officers surveyed have completed at least one year of post high school education, with 12% possessing four years or more post high school education.

TABLE 3

OFFICERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVELS PRIOR TO
JOINING AND AT PRESENT:
FORTY-FIVE MEDIUM CITIES
VS.
BALANCE OF STATE

	PRIOR TO JOINING		PRESENT	
	45 Medium-Sized Cities	Balance of State	45 Medium-Sized Cities	Balance of State
Less Than High School	.7%	3%	0%	2%
High School	50%	44%	39%	38%
1-2 Years of College	35%	36%	43%	37%
3-4 Years of College	14%	16%	17%	21%
4 + Years of College	.3%	1%	1%	2%

Table 3 reflects the emergence of better educated officers both statewide and in the state's medium-sized cities. In comparison with the "balance of state" medium cities enjoyed a 6% advantage in officers with 1-2 years of college, but fell behind (17% vs. 21%) in the percentage of officers with three to four years of post high school education. The difference in the "3-4 years of college" group could be attributed, in part, to the commensurate public education levels, and accessibility of colleges and universities in the largest urban areas, hence raising the "balance of state" average. It is also possible that certain jurisdictions, within the "balance of state" category, impose stricter educational standards, again, positively influencing the state percentages. Medium city officers did, however, display greater educational advancement since joining their departments than did their aggregate counterparts in the state.

Three personal questions relating to job attitudes were also asked. Specifically, these addressed job interest, use of talents and training preparedness. While not an exhaustive list, these three areas are fundamentally important influences upon officer morale. The responses of the 328 medium-sized city officers are contained in Tables 4-6.

TABLE 4

"MY JOB IS..."

	Number	Percent
Very Dull	1	.3%
Dull	3	.9%
So So	33	10.0%
Interesting	156	47.6%
Very Interesting	135	41.2%
	328	100.0%

TABLE 5

"MY JOB UTILIZES MY TALENT..."

	Number	Percent
Not at All	2	1%
Very Little	24	7%
Fairly Well	132	40%
Quite Well	120	37%
Very Well	50	15%
	328	100%

TABLE 6

"MY (BASIC) TRAINING PREPARED ME..."

	Number	Percent
Not at All	6	2%
Somewhat	146	44%
Well	148	45%
Very Well	28	9%
	328	100%

Based on these questions, the medium city patrol officer can be portrayed as one who is quite interested in law enforcement work, satisfied that the job constructively utilizes his or her personal talents and, though to a lesser extent, comfortable with the degree to which their training prepared them for the actual duties they are called upon to perform. The responses of the medium city officers did not differ significantly from those of other patrol officer throughout Ohio in these areas.

Somewhat surprisingly, a large number of these relatively young patrol officers had already gained some law enforcement experience prior to taking their present assignments. Better than one-fourth indicated prior experience as security guards, while others had served as military police officers, police reservists, deputy sheriffs, and a variety of related jobs. Differences between medium city officers and the "balance of state" appear to be minimal.

TABLE 7

PATROL OFFICERS WITH PRIOR LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE

	Forty-five Medium-Cities	Balance of State
Security Guard	27%	30%
Military Police	12%	15%
Municipal Police	19%	21%
Police Reserve	27%	24%
Deputy Sheriff	12%	12%
Other	3%	6%

Several "agency" characteristics were also isolated in the survey data. Not surprisingly, the data revealed that the size of an agency's jurisdictional population will often dictate operational practices within those agencies. A noteable example is the assignment of patrol officers to patrol vehicles. Table 8 reflects the overwhelming number of one-officer patrol vehicles in the forty-five medium cities, and the relatively minute percentage of two-person patrol vehicles which are more commonly found in the larger jurisdictions. Jurisdictions of 100,000 or more, for example, had 63% of their patrol in the form of two-person vehicles.

TABLE 8

TYPE OF PATROL BY TYPE OF JURISDICTION

	Forty-five Medium-sized Cities	Balance of State
1-Person Vehicle	89%	60%
2-Person Vehicle	1%	25%
Motorcycle	1%	1%
Foot	0%	1%
Foot and Vehicle	6%	7%
Other	3%	6%
	100%	100%

The great differences noted in the types of patrol utilized by various agencies can probably be accounted for by the demands of geography (especially for sheriffs' patrol officers), increased danger to the officers in some urban areas and, in at least some circumstances, union demands.

The 328 urban officers did not differ markedly from their "balance of state" peers in terms of work shifts, the breakout of which was as follows:

TABLE 9

WORK SHIFT: MEDIUM CITY PATROL OFFICERS

	Number	Percent
Day	90	27%
Afternoon	113	35%
Midnight	99	30%
Split Shift	8	2%
Odd Shift	6	2%
Other	12	4%
	328	100%

In response to the question about the number of times patrol officers are called upon to perform tasks of a higher rank, medium city patrol responses closely paralleled the balance of state as reflected in Table 10. Unlike their larger city counterparts, medium city officers were asked more often to perform higher ranking tasks due largely to their smaller pool of manpower and less rigid lines of specialization.

TABLE 10

"I AM CALLED UPON TO PERFORM THE TASKS OF
A HIGHER RANK..."

	Forty-five Medium-sized Cities	Balance of State
Never	17%	21%
Seldom	33%	32%
Occasionally	37%	32%
Frequently	9%	9%
Very Frequently	4%	6%
	100%	100%

COMPLAINT/INCIDENT SECTION

The complaint/incident section of the task analysis survey queried Ohio's peace officers to determine which complaints and incidents officers typically encountered in the course of their daily activities. The questions also gleaned the most frequent ways in which these incidents are handled. The scale below represents the categories officers could choose from when recording their responses.

COMPLAINT/INCIDENT SCALE
When I Respond To This Type of Complaint/Incident I Usually:

0	1	2	3	4
I have never responded to this type of complaint/incident.	Make log entry only.	Conduct preliminary investigation and write report.	Conduct complete investigation and write report.	Other response or some combination of previous 3.

The majority of the questions yielding a response of "never" were aircraft, conservation, and victimless types of incidents. The questions listed in the following table are incidents that are less rare but which still drew a plurality of "never" respondents.

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF OFFICERS NEVER ENCOUNTERING...

Questions	Percent of Officers Responding "Never"
...Desertion or AWOL	42%
...Evictions	45%
...Impersonating an Officer	67%
...Embezzlement	61%
...Motor Vehicle Hijacking	90%

The following four tables illustrate the most frequent types of investigations conducted by the "medium city" officers in response to a variety of complaint/incidents.

TABLE 12

LOG ONLY RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Log Only"
Abandoned House	36%
Citizen Lockout	42%
Perimeter Control at Fire	39%
Loud Party	29%
Downed Wires	38%

TABLE 13

"PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Preliminary Investigation Only"
Motor Vehicle Theft	48%
Homicide	31%
Child Abuse	51%
Felony Assault	37%
Criminal Sexual Conduct	43%

TABLE 14

"COMPLETE INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Complete Investigation"
Traffic Accidents	87%
Traffic Offenses	78%
Disorderly Public Conduct	78%
Drunk in Public	74%
Concealed Weapons	68%

EQUIPMENT

Experience dictates that various equipment items play a prominent role in the effective performance of an officer's duties. As such, the tables below report equipment items frequently and seldom used by patrol officers in the course of their work. It is worth noting that some items (i.e. shotgun, first aid kit, fire extinguisher), although infrequently used, are rated by supervisors as very important to the patrol function. Additionally, while some items reflect low importance or involve little learning difficulty, this may not actually be the case. The inclusion of a "never used" category in the importance and learning difficulty scales may have precluded a majority of supervisors from rating certain equipment items due to their lack of use.

TABLE 15

FREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS (MEDIUM CITY POLICE)

	Percent of Patrol Officers Using This Equipment at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn to Operate
Automobile	99%	100%	85%
Body Armor	70%	90%	95%
Handcuffs	91%	100%	92%
Hand Held Radio	98%	99%	98%
LEADS Terminal	90%	98%	20%
Spotlight	96%	96%	99%
Typewriter	84%	88%	49%

TABLE 16

INFREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS
(MEDIUM CITY POLICE)

	Percent of Patrol Using This Equipment At Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn to Operate
Blackjack	9%	28%	71%
Canine	3%	20%	6%
Drug Narcotics Kit	17%	56%	66%
Evidence Processing Kit	27%	78%	38%
First Aid Kit	14%	59%	66%
Chemical Mace	3%	28%	88%
Shotgun	29%	94%	68%

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Patrol officers in the performance of their wide ranging and often complex duties must rely on a large magnitude of information flowing from a variety of sources. Presented below in Table 17 are the frequency, importance, and learning difficulty of some of the more frequently used sources of information. Additionally, Table 18 reflects the degree to which some sources are never utilized.

TABLE 17

SUPERVISORS' RATING OF INFORMATION SOURCES MOST OFTEN USED
(MEDIUM CITY POLICE)

	Percent of Patrol Officers Required To Read These Materials	Percent of Supervisors Rating These Manuals As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating These Manuals As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Criminal Law and Procedures Manual	37%	96%	53%
Department Manuals	84%	85%	78%
First Aid Manuals	23%	38%	79%
Interoffice Memos	70%	64%	98%
Local Ordinances	81%	94%	77%
Ohio Criminal Code and Procedures	69%	99%	61%
Ohio Vehicle Code	57%	90%	74%
Training Bulletins	45%	71%	94%
Wanted Bulletins	37%	55%	99%

As seen in Table 16, most of the required reading for the majority of patrol officers is rated by supervisors as rather easy to learn.

TABLE 18

INFORMATION SOURCES NEVER USED BY A MAJORITY OF OHIO PATROL OFFICERS IN MEDIUM JURISDICTIONS

	NEVER USED
Airport Field Conditions Report	99%
FAA Bulletins	78%
Fish and Game Code	83%
Harbor Statutes	98%
Health Statutes	58%
Interstate Commerce Commission Rules	83%
Legal Transcripts	53%
Weather Forecasts	38%

(Number of respondents equals 328, percentages adjusted for missing cases; missing cases range from 1 to 6.)

13

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

As one might expect, administrative tasks were performed less frequently by patrol officers. Tabled below are both some of the more often and seldom performed administrative tasks including their corresponding importance and learning difficulty ratings. As previously mentioned, some supervisors could not rank the importance and learning difficulty of certain tasks because they responded "never used" in some areas.

TABLE 19

FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS IN MEDIUM CITY POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Describe Person to Other Officer	85%	94%	85%
Estimate Property Value	46%	27%	54%
Exchange Information	67%	94%	96%
Notify Public Agencies	42%	60%	98%
Operate LEADS To Check Persons and Property	70%	78%	35%
Request Equipment Repair	68%	85%	96%
Request Verification Of Warrants Before Service	62%	87%	96%
Type Incident Reports	66%	67%	75%

14

TABLE 20

SELDOM PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Analyze Crime	5%	35%	31%
Attend Inservice Training	15%	77%	93%
Conduct Investigation	0%	27%	32%
Issue Wanted Notices	7%	56%	77%
Fingerprint Persons	9%	56%	55%
Investigate and Report Background	0%	55%	32%
Participate in Planning	0%	23%	31%
Plan Training	2%	32%	40%
Represent Department	6%	45%	68%

ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE

Of the 24 "arrest, search and seizure" tasks identified in the survey, five were performed at least weekly or even daily by the majority of medium city officers. When compared to their largest city counterparts, medium city officers performed the five tasks below with 20-30% less frequency with the exception of "arresting persons with a warrant" which reflected a substantial reduction from the 70% frequency found in the largest cities jurisdiction. Table 21 reflects these frequency ratings as well as the importance and learning difficulty ratings provided by the medium city supervisors.

TABLE 21

FIVE FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Week	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Conduct Frisk	58%	94%	85%
Handcuff Suspect	52%	96%	90%
Arrest Persons Without a Warrant	57%	89%	61%
Conduct Field Search	53%	96%	83%
Arrest Persons With A Warrant	26%	92%	85%

In most cases the importance and learning difficulty ratings correlated with the frequency ratings, with supervisors generally convinced of both the task importance and the relative ease with which it can be learned. The exception to this rule is found in the learning difficulty ratings for "arrest persons without a warrant," a task which involves police officers in the sensitive and controversial areas of defendant rights. For this task the patrol supervisors displayed misgivings about the ease with which the tasks could be learned.

At the other end of the spectrum, the five infrequently performed arrest/search and seizure tasks drew a decidedly mixed response from the supervisors. For example, "discharge firearm at person" had never been performed by five-out-of-six of the officers, yet elicited high importance and difficulty ratings from the supervisors. And, while three-fourths of the patrol officers had never requested bystanders to assist in an apprehension, less than one supervisor in ten saw that task as having any real importance.

TABLE 22

FIVE INFREQUENTLY PERFORMED
ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Who Have Never Performed This Task	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Discharge Firearm at Person	87%	55%	30%
Request Bystanders to Assist in an Apprehension	77%	7%	42%*
Secure Search Warrant	55%	78%	22%
Plan Strategy for Searches	58%	72%	42%
Participate in Raid	33%	66%	57%

* "Never encountered" category was higher than forty percent of total responses.

PATROL FUNCTIONS

Seventy-one patrol function tasks were identified in the survey. Because some of these were quite obscure (e.g., clean fire fighting equipment, flush fuel spills, etc.) only the six most frequently performed patrol functions are summarized here.

TABLE 23

SIX MOST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED PATROL TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Week	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Inform Dispatcher of Status	96%	96%	100%
Check for Wants via LEADS	81%	88%	78%
Check Parking Lots	95%	63%	95%
Check Parks	95%	73%	96%
Write Narrative Report	87%	95%	47%
Follow Suspicious Vehicles	75%	95%	73%

The "patrol functions" listing also contained several tasks which were maintenance in nature (e.g., clean weapons, inspect cruiser, etc.). Because these are supplemental to, but not indicative of, patrol operations their ratings were not included in the calculating of the six most frequently performed tasks.

PATROL CONTACT

Although a patrol officer's primary function is law enforcement in a reactive sense, each day sees the average patrol officer in contact with the public outside of the strict law enforcement context. These contacts range from counselling juveniles to cultivating informants to establishing rapport with local citizens. And while these contacts provide a vital and indispensible service to the community by dissolving most reactive situations, they also tend to add flavor to the often routine role of the patrol officer. For example, past findings indicate a direct relationship between the frequency with which patrol officers talk with people in the community and the level of interest in their jobs. Presented below are a few of the patrol contact functions dichotomized into high and low frequency categories with corresponding importance and learning difficulty ratings.

TABLE 24

FREQUENTLY PERFORMED PATROL TASKS IN MEDIUM CITIES

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Advise Victims	91%	90%	68%
Give Street Directions	90%	43%	95%
Interview Suspicious Persons	88%	88%	53%
Mediate Family Disputes	87%	81%	21%
Stop Vehicle to Cite	92%	89%	62%
Talk to Establish Rapport	84%	82%	80%
Investigate Suspicious Vehicles	94%	90%	74%
Warn Offenders	93%	60%	88%

TABLE 25

SELDOM PERFORMED PATROL TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Accept Bond	2%	5%	5%*
Evacuate Persons	4%	74%	69%
Fight Structual Fires	0%	6%	9%
Fight Vehicle Fires	1%	16%	37%**
Place Children in Protective Custody	3%	70%	46%
Search for Bombs	1%	49%	36%
Watch for Illegal Activity	4%	38%	43%
Communicate with Management and Labor Over Strike Disturbances	0%	33%	20%

* Over eighty-five percent responded to "never encountered" category.

** Over forty percent responded to "never encountered" category.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION

In the course of routine patrol work law enforcement officers have the opportunity to engage in criminal investigation. Below are ten of the criminal investigation activities most and least frequently engaged in by Ohio peace officers.

TABLE 26

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST
OFTEN PERFORMED CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Determine Whether Incidents Are Criminal Or Civil Matters	82%	91%	62%
Interview Complainants, Witnesses, etc.	87%	96%	47%
Summarize Statements of Witnesses and Complainants	63%	75%	56%
Tag Evidence And Confiscated Properties	75%	93%	89%
Take Statements of Witnesses	83%	93%	73%
Cast Impressions At Crime Scene	1%	36%	26%
Prepare Paperwork To File Extradition Warrants	2%	28%*	20%
Use Polygraph Results to Interrogate Suspect or Witnesses	2%	38%	10%*
Serve As Deputy Medical Examiner	0%	4%**	4%**
Instruct and Direct Civilians in Undercover Operations	1%	30%	15%

---

* Over fifty percent responded to "never encountered" category.

** Over ninety percent responded to "never encountered" category.

COURT PROCEDURES

Either as a result of their patrol duties or in addition to them, patrol officers sometimes find themselves engaging in court-related procedures. Listed below are those court activities in which officers are most and least likely to engage.

TABLE 27

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST
OFTEN PERFORMED COURT PROCEDURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Appear in court (other than as a witness)	34%	38%	62%
Confer With Prosecutor Prior To Testimony In Case	58%	93%	84%
Discuss Cases With Prosecutors Following Legal Proceedings	43%	79%	85%
Review Reports And Notes For Court Testimony	52%	91%	73%
Testify In Criminal Cases	50%	98%	45%
Act As Court Bailiff	3%	14%*	34%*
Assemble Potential Juror List	1%	4%**	6%**
Testify in Secretary of State Implied Consent Hearings	0%	30%*	28%*
Mail Jury Duty Notices	0%	0%**	4%**
Testify In Liquor Board Hearings	0%	47%	40%

---

* Over fifty percent responded to "never encountered" category.

** Over ninety percent responded to "never encountered" category.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

Law enforcement officers in Ohio, as elsewhere, are called upon to investigate traffic accidents. The following is a list of accident-related activities which do and do not consume the patrol officer's time.

TABLE 28

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST
OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC ACCIDENT TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Complete The Standard Traffic Accident Report Form	94%	93%	83%
Determine Violations In A Traffic Accident	94%	94%	54%
Diagram Accident Scenes	93%	93%	57%
Interview Persons Involved In Traffic Accidents	92%	91%	73%
Identify Persons Involved in Traffic Accidents	92%	94%	90%
Calculate Vehicle Speed Using Mathematical Formulas	4%	29%	10%
Interview Tow Truck Operator	25%	38%	77%
Review Accidents With Accident Investigators	20%	46%	56%
Photograph Accident Scenes	26%	66%	51%
Test Operating Condition Of Accident Vehicle Equipment	38%	70%	71%

TRAFFIC PATROL

Much of an officer's time on the job is spent on traffic patrol looking for violators and ensuring that traffic is flowing safely and smoothly.

TABLE 29

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST
OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC PATROL TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Follow Suspect Vehicle To Observe Traffic Violations	88%	73%	85%
Clock Vehicle Using Radar	84%	81%	63%
Inspect Operator's License	96%	85%	94%
Issue Traffic Citations	96%	83%	88%
Issue Verbal Warnings To Traffic Violators	95%	56%	96%
Count Traffic Flow Using Automatic Devices	1%	5%*	27%*
Operate Videotape Equipment	9%	23%**	24%**
Plan Traffic Detours	2%	33%	57%
Complete Operator's License Re-Examination Form	2%	29%	72%
Move Disabled Vehicles With Patrol Car	7%	5%*	22%*

*   Over sixty-five percent responded to "never encountered" category.

**   Over forty percent responded to "never encountered" category.

PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

Because of its implications for the validation of entry-level strength and agility requirements, this section perhaps will be of greatest interest not only to chiefs, but also to prospective recruits. Listed below are seven selected routine physical activities performed monthly or more frequently by patrol officers in Ohio's forty-five medium cities.

TABLE 30

PERFORMANCE FREQUENCY FOR SEVEN SELECTED PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

	Monthly or More Often	Never
Climb Obstacles	35%	2%
Run After Suspects	14%	3%
Run Up Stairs	24%	7%
Jump Over Obstacles	22%	7%
Lift Heavy Objects or Persons	26%	7%
Subdue Persons Resisting Arrest	23%	1%
Physically Push Movable Object	39%	2%

The remaining 19 tables of this report, and their corresponding narratives, describe in minute detail the most strenuous physical activity of the previous five work shifts undertaken by 205 of the "medium city" patrol officers. The remaining 117 officers indicated no such activity for that time frame. As will become evident the task analysis study went to tedious lengths to measure these activities in feet, inches, pounds, etc. This was done because most departmental standards, especially physical standards, are measured in those same units.

TABLE 31

ACTIVITY STATUS FOR LAST FIVE WORK SHIFTS

	Number of Officers	Percent
No Activity	117	36%
Activity Without Resistance	112	35%
Activity With Resistance	93	29%
TOTAL	322	100%

It is interesting to note that in analyzing all the city police department categories, a trend toward inactivity becomes evident with a decrease in jurisdiction size. That is, a smaller precentage of big city officers are inactive as compared to small city officers. Conversely, the small city police officers are less likely than their big city counterparts to engage in activity in which resistance plays a part.

During the course of police patrol work, officers periodically have to run, either in pursuit of suspects or to assist in other emergency situations. Below are the distances run by "medium city" patrol officers during what they described as the "most strenuous physical activity of their last five work shifts." (Note: All of the remaining tables reflect descriptions of that same activity.)

TABLE 32

RUNNING

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 24 yards	73	59%
25 to 49 yards	15	12%
50 to 74 yards	12	10%
75 to 99 yards	3	3%
100 yards and over	20	16%
TOTAL	123	100%

In running, police officers can expect to encounter a number of obstacles which make their job more difficult. Officers responding to the task analysis survey reported encountering the following obstacles:

TABLE 33

OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE RUNNING

	Number of Officers	Percent
Fence or Wall	12	13%
Shrubs	8	9%
Vehicle	13	14%
Stairs	9	10%
Ditch	2	2%
2 of the above	18	20%
3 of the above	8	9%
Other	21	23%
TOTAL	91	100%

Not often do officers find themselves crawling. One seasoned police veteran suggested this is because officers do not want to ruin their uniforms. Below are the distances Ohio's "medium city" police officers crawled during their last five work shifts.

TABLE 34

CRAWLING

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 3 feet	10	62%
4 to 6 feet	1	6%
7 to 9 feet	1	6%
10 to 12 feet	2	13%
13 feet and over	2	13%
TOTAL	16	100%

The typical police officer in Ohio does not engage in the stunts that characterize law enforcement work as depicted on television. Still, some of the officers from the medium city police forces did jump in the course of performing their duties. Following are the distances jumped by the task analysis respondents.

TABLE 35

JUMPING

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 3 feet	22	50%
4 to 6 feet	20	46%
7 to 9 feet	1	2%
10 to 12 feet	1	2%
TOTAL	44	100%

As with the officers who ran, the ones who jumped also encountered obstacles. The table below reflects the numbers of patrol officers having to cope with each type of obstacle.

TABLE 36

JUMPING OBSTACLES

	Number of Officers	Percent
Fence	15	23%
Shrubs	8	12%
Vehicle	6	9%
Stairs	4	6%
Ditch	3	5%
2 of the above	11	17%
3 of the above	8	12%
Other	10	15%
TOTAL	65	100%

Climbing is yet another activity which, while not consuming much of an officer's time, can make the job more difficult when it is necessary. The kinds of obstacles officers encounter can have important training implications. For example, if most of the obstacles did not have handholds or footholds, then training sessions would have to emphasize climbing techniques designed to help officers surmount these barriers. Below are some of the objects the officers were forced to climb.

TABLE 37

CLIMBING OBSTACLES

	Number of Officers	Percent
Fence	16	28%
Embankment	11	19%
Ditch	3	5%
Ladder	1	2%
Stairs	17	30%
Other	9	15%
TOTAL	57	100%

As mentioned earlier, handholds and footholds can be an important consideration for training purposes. The obstacles encountered by the "medium city" respondents are analyzed below.

TABLE 38

OBSTACLES WITH HANDHOLDS AND FOOTHOLDS

	Number of Officers	Percent
Handhold	16	52%
Foothold	4	13%
Solid	11	35%
TOTAL	31	100%

Those readers concerned with officers who climb may be interested in knowing how far the latter were forced to climb. Below is a list of the distances for the "medium city police" respondents.

TABLE 39

CLIMBING DISTANCES

	Number of Officers	Percent
5 feet or less	11	20%
6 to 10 feet	24	44%
11 to 20 feet	9	16%
21 feet and over	11	20%
TOTAL	55	100%

Pushing is another activity which most lay persons probably do not see officers do. Yet some of the task analysis respondents did, in fact, have to push objects during their last five work shifts.

TABLE 40

PUSHING (DISTANCES)

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 19 feet	37	44%
20 to 39 feet	25	30%
40 to 59 feet	14	17%
60 to 79 feet	3	3%
80 feet and over	5	6%
TOTAL	84	100%

The weight of an object to be pushed certainly influences the ease or difficulty with which the task is completed. Here are the weight ranges for objects pushed by police officers from the medium-sized city departments.

TABLE 41

PUSHING (WEIGHTS)

	Number of Officers	Percent
25 to 49 pounds	1	1%
50 to 99 pounds	3	4%
100 to 149 pounds	6	7%
150 to 199 pounds	11	13%
200 pounds and over	64	75%
TOTAL	85	100%

It is evident from the table above that a plurality of officers pushed extremely heavy objects. Some of this can be explained by the fact that 66 of the officers indicated they had pushed a vehicle. Many of the rest may have pushed people, trash dumpsters, or other heavy objects. The majority of those pushing admitted receiving some assistance; most, however, revealed that speed was not required, suggesting that most situations were not of an emergency nature.

Some of the officers also found themselves pulling objects while performing their patrol duties. A breakdown of the distances the officers pulled objects is provided in the following table.

TABLE 42

PULLING (DISTANCES)

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 19 feet	36	59%
20 to 39 feet	9	15%
40 to 59 feet	4	6%
60 to 79 feet	3	5%
80 feet and over	9	15%
TOTAL	61	100%

It is evident that the vast majority of officers claiming to have pulled objects did so for relatively short distances. Even more important might be the weight of the objects pulled.

TABLE 43

PULLING (WEIGHTS)

	Number of Officers	Percent
25 to 49 pounds	2	3%
50 to 99 pounds	7	11%
100 to 149 pounds	16	25%
150 to 199 pounds	26	41%
200 pounds and over	13	20%
TOTAL	64	100%

Since over 80% of the officers pulled objects weighing in excess of 100 pounds it might suggest that persons were the objects pulled. In fact, over three fourths of the officers pulled persons. And almost two-thirds of these officers received assistance in their pulling encounter. However, less than half of those pulling claimed that speed was required, perhaps suggesting that the officers may have been pulling intoxicated persons.

The last standard physical activity to be considered is lifting.
Again, the layman often does not see officers doing this. As can be
seen in the following table, over three-fourths of those officers engaging
in lifting did so to heights under five feet.

TABLE 44

LIFTING (HEIGHTS)

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 foot	4	7%
2 feet	9	15%
3 feet	28	48%
4 feet	6	10%
5 feet and over	12	20%
TOTAL	59	100%

Objects lifted often have to be carried certain distances. The
table below reveals that over half of the officers carried their
objects fewer than 20 feet.

TABLE 45

CARRYING (DISTANCES)

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 19 feet	29	55%
20 to 39 feet	9	17%
40 to 59 feet	8	15%
60 to 79 feet	0	0%
80 feet and over	7	13%
TOTAL	53	100%

Lifting and carrying can, of course, be made more or less
difficult by the weight of the object carried.

TABLE 46

LIFTING (WEIGHTS)

	Number of Officers	Percent
25 to 49 pounds	10	17%
50 to 99 pounds	8	14%
100 to 149 pounds	10	17%
150 to 199 pounds	21	36%
200 pounds and over	9	16%
TOTAL	58	100%

Just over one-half of the above patrol officers carried people,
with slightly more than one-half of them receiving some type of
assistance.

As could be expected, a number of the officers engaging in
physical activities met resistance (28%). The majority (74%) of these
officers had to contend with only one suspect, with another 16% being
forced to grapple with two. Eighty-six percent of the resisters were
males.

One frustrating conclusion pointed out by the data is that
reasoning with resistive suspects is difficult in most cases. Less
than 25% of the officers were able to reason with their suspects. The
task analysis respondents were given the opportunity to describe why
they were unable to reason with their suspects.

TABLE 47

REASONS FOR INABILITY TO REASON WITH SUSPECTS

	Number of Officers	Percent
Drug or alcohol influence	57	62%
Emotionally or mentally upset	21	23%
Mental State Unknown	9	10%
No Opportunity to Reason	5	5%
TOTAL	92	100%

Resistance by suspects can take a variety of forms. For example, a drunk poses a problem different from the armed robber.

TABLE 48

TYPES OF RESISTANCE

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Passive Resistance	27	(30%)	63	(70%)
Barricade	5	(6%)	84	(94%)
Pulled Away	75	(83%)	15	(17%)
Ran Away	37	(42%)	52	(58%)
Threw Object	8	(9%)	81	(91%)
Wrestled	75	(82%)	17	(18%)
Hit/Kick	42	(47%)	47	(53%)
Special Tactics	2	(2%)	87	(98%)
Weapon	7	(8%)	80	(92%)

By far the vast majority (97%) of officers encountering resistance issued verbal orders to their suspects. Only one-sixth of the officers saw their suspects submit to these orders.

In some cases, it was necessary for officers to use force to subdue the suspects. Table 48 lists the various degrees of force used by police in subduing resisting arrestees.

TABLE 49

TYPES OF FORCE USED TO SUBDUE SUBJECTS

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Chemical Agent	2	(2%)	89	(98%)
Restraining Holds	68	(74%)	24	(26%)
Handcuffs with Assistance	66	(72%)	26	(28%)
Handcuffs without Assistance	24	(26%)	67	(74%)
Wrestled	72	(77%)	21	(23%)
Hit/Kick	25	(27%)	66	(73%)
Nightstick/Blackjack	13	(14%)	77	(86%)
Display Firearm	9	(10%)	83	(90%)
Discharge Firearm	1	(1%)	90	(99%)
Other Force	5	(8%)	61	(92%)

OTHER SAC PUBLICATIONS

January 1983 — Law Enforcement In Ohio Cities Serving Over 100,000 People: A Task Analysis: Focusing on Ohio police departments serving metropolitan populations in excess of 100,000, this report highlights the frequency of task performance, equipment usage, physical activities, as well as other facets of the peace officer's job. Also included are supervisors' assessments of importance and learning difficulty.

November 1982 — Survey of Ohio Citizen Attitudes Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice: the third annual report of this series, this study focusing on attitudes toward law enforcement officers, public crime-fear levels, handgun ownership, and the informational resources which mold public opinion in this area.

October 1982 — Peace Officers Task Analysis Study: The Ohio Report: a two-and-one-half year study involving a survey of 3,155 Ohio peace officers in some 400 law enforcement agencies concerning the types of investigation, equipment, informational resources, tasks and physical activities associated with law enforcement in Ohio.

May 1982 — OCJS Research Requests and Responses: An Analysis: An analysis of 308 research data requests received and responded to by SAC in 1981, as well as the 625 total requests received to date, by type and source of request.

April 1982 — Fact and Fiction Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice in Ohio (1979-1982 data). A look at twenty-five popularly believed myths about crime and criminal justice in the State, accompanied by appropriate factual data.

July 1981 — Ohio Citizen Attitudes: Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice (Report #2, 1980 data). The second in a series of reports concerning Ohioans' attitudes and opinions about contemporary issues affecting law enforcement, courts, corrections, juvenile justice, crime prevention, and criminal law.

June 1981 — A Stability Profile of Ohio Law Enforcement Trainees: 1974-1979 (1981 records). A brief analysis of some 125 Ohio Law Enforcement Officers who completed mandated training between 1974 and 1979. The randomly selected group was analyzed in terms of turnover, advancement, and moves to other law enforcement agencies.

May 1981 — A Directory of Ohio Criminal Justice Agencies (1981 data). An inventory of several thousand criminal justice (and related) agencies in Ohio, by type and county.

April 1981 — Property Crime Victimization: The Ohio Experience (1978 data). A profile of property crime in Ohio highlighting the characteristics of victims, offenders, and the crimes themselves; based on results of the annual National Crime Survey victimization studies in Ohio.

March 1981 — Profiles in Ohio Law Enforcement: Technical Assistance, Budgets, and Benefits (1979 data). The second report emanating from the 1979 SAC survey of 82 sheriff's departments and 182 police departments in Ohio; discusses technical assistance needs and capabilities among these agencies, as well as budgets and fringe benefits.

December 1980 — The Need for Criminal Justice Research: OCJS Requests and Responses (1978-1980). An analysis of some 300 research requests received and responded to by the OCJS SAC Unit between 1978 and 1980, by type, request source and time of response.

September 1980 — State of the States Report: Statistical Analysis Centers (Emphasis Ohio) (1980 data). An analysis of the criminal justice statistical analysis centers located in virtually every state and several territories.

September 1980 — Survey of Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys: Report (1979 data). An operational overview of 46 county prosecutors' offices.

September 1980 — In Support of Criminal Justice: Money and Manpower (1977 data). Analysis of employment and expenditures within Ohio's criminal justice system, by type of component (police, courts, corrections, etc.) and type of jurisdiction (county, city, township and state).

June 1980 — Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice: Attitudes Among Ohio's Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police (1979 data). Opinions and attitudes of 82 Ohio sheriffs and 182 chiefs of police, analyzed by jurisdictional size.

May 1980 — Ohio Citizen Attitudes: A Survey of Public Opinion on Crime and Criminal Justice (1979 data). An analysis of public opinion and attitudes on a wide range of issues concerning law enforcement, courts, corrections, juvenile justice, crime prevention and other areas of crime and criminal justice.

END