96448

CR-Sent
4-15-45

Law Enforcement In Ohio Municipalities
Serving 2,500-10,000 People:
A Task Analysis

STATE OF OHIO
Richard F. Celeste, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT
Alfred S. Dietzel, Director

Office of Criminal Justice Services
Statistical Analysis Center

April, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

COUNTY	AGENCY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Allen	Fort Shawnee	2	1
Ashland	Loudonville	2	0
Athens	Nelsonville	1	0
Auglaize	Minster	2	0
	Saint Marys	4	1
	Wapakoneta	3	1
Belmont	Martins Ferry	0	1
Butler	Monroe	5	1
	New Miami	2	0
Columbiana	Lisbon	3	1
	Wellsville	4	0
Crawford	Crestline	4	1
Cuyahoga	Beachwood	8	1
	Highland	3	2
	Moreland Hills	2	1
	Newburgh Heights	2	0
Erie	Huron	4	1
	Vermilion	5	1
Fairfield	Pickerington	3	0
Franklin	Dublin	4	1
	Perry Twp.	6	2
Fulton	Archbold	1	0
	Swanton	3	0
Gallia	Gallipolis	7	1
Geauga	Chardon	4	1
	Middlefield	2	1
	Thompson Twp.	2	0
Greene	Yellow Springs	2	1

COUNTY	AGENCY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Hamilton	Amberly Village	5	1
	Blue Ash	9	2
	Deer Park	3	1
	Golf Manor	2	1
	Lincoln Heights	2	1
	Lockland	5	1
	Loveland	2	1
	Madeira	4	1
	Woodlawn	2	1
	Wyoming	6	1
Hardin	Ada	3	0
	Kenton	4	1
Harrison	Cadiz	2	1
Henry	Napoleon	6	0
Highland	Hillsboro	4	1
Holmes	Millersburg	2	0
Huron	Bellevue	5	1
	Willard	3	1
Jackson	Wellston	3	1
Jefferson	Toronto	3	1
Lake	Fairport Harbor	1	0
	Willoughby Hills	0	1
Licking	Heath	2	0
Lorain	Oberlin	4	2
Lucas	Waterville	2	0
Madison	London	5	0
Mahoning	Sebring	7	1
Miami	Covington	2	1
	Tipp City	5	1
Montgomery	Brookville	4	1
	Jefferson Twp.	5	1
	Moraine	9	2
	Union	1	0

LIST OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

COUNTY	AGENCY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Ottawa	Oak Harbor	4	1
	Port Clinton	7	1
Paulding	Paulding	4	0
Pike	Waverly	4	1
Portage	Aurora	6	1
	Streetsboro	6	1
	Windham	1	1
Richland	Lexington	2	0
Sandusky	Clyde	4	1
Stark	Louisville	5	1
Summit	Bath Twp.	3	1
	Macedonia	1	1
	Mogadore	2	0
	Northfield	3	1
Trumbull	Cortland	3	1
	Champion Twp.	1	0
	Hubbard	6	0
	McDonald	2	1
	Newton Twp.	3	1
Tuscarawas	Dennison	4	0
	Urichsville	4	1
Union	Marysville	5	1
Warren	Lebanon	9	1
Wayne	Rittman	5	1
Williams	Bryan	5	1
TOTAL		311	67

PREFACE

This report has been prepared especially for chiefs and administrative officers in Ohio's 242 small municipal police departments, all of which serve municipal populations of 2,500 to 10,000 people. It analyzes the responses of some three hundred seventy officers from those eighty-six departments who participated in the state-wide task analysis study conducted in 1981-82 by the Office 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) including 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 311 "municipal" patrol officers were responding to the survey in terms of frequency (of use or performance), 67 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 (over one-half million pieces of information in the 2,500-10,000 jurisdiction 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 Office of Criminal Justice Services.

OFFICER PROFILE

Of the 2,620 patrol officers who participated in the state-wide task analysis study, 311 were drawn from police departments in 86 of Ohio's 242 small cities. As represented below these 311 officers constitute 13.1% of the survey sample and 11.7% of the law enforcement population in Ohio.

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.

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 small municipalities. Wherever possible, these 311 officers will be compared to their peers throughout the remainder of the State.

In comparing officers on the basis of sex and race, it is apparent that patrol officers in smaller jurisdictions differ markedly from those in major urban areas. For example, two-thirds of the 170 female patrol officers in the survey came from the large urban areas, as did seven out of 10 of the black officers. The results are contained in Table 2.

TABLE 2

OFFICERS' RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS

	Eighty-six Small Municipal Agencies	Balance of State
White	97%	88%
Black	2%	10%
Other	1%	2%
Male	98%	93%
Female	2%	7%

In terms of age, 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 experiential limitation placed upon officers who were otherwise randomly drawn for survey inclusion.

Among the officers' acquired characteristics educational achievement was notable for several reasons. Primary among these is the fact that many of the small municipality patrol officers have achieved more academically than the high school diploma required to become a peace officer in Ohio. One out of two of the "small municipality" officers surveyed have completed at least one year of post high school education.

TABLE 3

OFFICERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVELS PRIOR TO JOINING AND AT PRESENT: EIGHTY-SIX SMALL MUNICIPALITIES VS. BALANCE OF STATE

| | PRIOR TO JOINING | | PRESENT | |
	Eighty-Six Small Municipalities	Balance of State	Eighty-Six Small Municipalities	Balance of State
Less Than High School	2%	3%	1%	2%
High School	50%	44%	44%	37%
1-2 Years of College	32%	36%	32%	39%
3-4 Years of College	14%	16%	21%	20%
4 + Years of College	2%	1%	2%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3 reflects the emergence of better educated officers both state-wide and in the State's small municipalities. The tendency is slightly more pronounced in the former area, a fact that probably reflects the accessibility of colleges and universities within the larger jurisdictions. It is noteworthy, however, that since joining their departments the small municipal patrol officers have demonstrated roughly equal educational advancement in the "3-4 years of college" category when compared with their "balance of state" peers.

Three personal questions were asked relating to job attitudes. 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 311 municipal officers are contained in Tables 4-6.

TABLE 4

"MY JOB IS..."

	Number	Percent
Very Dull	0	0%
Dull	3	1%
So So	31	10%
Interesting	157	51%
Very Interesting	119	38%
	310	100%

TABLE 5

"MY JOB UTILIZES MY TALENT..."

	Number	Percent
Not at All	0	0.0%
Very Little	29	9.4%
Fairly Well	112	36.1%
Quite Well	116	37.4%
Very Well	53	17.1%
	310	100.0%

TABLE 6

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

	Number	Percent
Not at All	3	.1%
Somewhat	139	44.7%
Well	117	37.6%
Very Well	52	16.7%
	311	99.1%*

Based on these questions, the municipal 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 municipal 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. However, there do appear to be some differences between the municipal officers and their "balance of state" counterparts.

---

*   Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 7

PATROL OFFICERS WITH PRIOR
LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE

	Eighty-Six Small Municipalities	Balance of State
Security Guard	29%	30%
Military Police	18%	15%
Municipal Police	26%	20%
Police Reserve	41%	22%
Deputy Sheriff	17%	11%
Other	8%	2%

Particularly noticeable are the differences to be found in the "police reserve" and "deputy sheriff" positions, areas in which the officers exhibit more prior experience than their counterparts throughout the State. To at least some extent, this trend holds true for almost every job category.

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 notable example is the assignment of patrol officers to patrol vehicles. Table 8 reflects the overwhelming number of one-officer patrol vehicles in the eighty-six small municipalities, with the balance of state reflecting a much larger percentage of two-officer vehicles due to the influence of the large urban areas.

TABLE 8

TYPE OF PATROL
BY
TYPE OF JURISDICTION

	Eighty-Six Small Municipalities	Balance of State
1-Person Vehicle	87.4%	60.5%
2-Person Vehicle	1.3%	25.1%
Motorcycle	.0%	.3%
Foot	8.7%	.4%
Other	2.6%	7.4%
	100.0%	100.0%

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 311 officers did not differ markedly from their "balance of state" peers in terms of work shifts. The breakouts are as follows:

TABLE 9

WORK SHIFT: SMALL MUNICIPALITY PATROL OFFICERS

	Eighty-Six Small Municipalities	Balance of State
Day	26%	27%
Afternoon	29%	35%
Midnight	29%	25%
Split Shift	5%	3%
Odd Shift	6%	5%
Other	5%	4%
	100%	99%

There was, however, a rather noticeable difference between the two groups when responding to the question about the number of times patrol officers are called upon to perform tasks of a higher rank. The frequency of such occurrences among officers in the eighty-six small municipalities would seem to document less plentiful levels of manpower and, hence, less rigidly enforced lines of specialization of duties. In the larger departments, however, increased manpower allows for closer adherence to the defined lines of specialization.

TABLE 10

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

	Eighty-Six Small Municipalities	Balance of State
Never	8%	22%
Seldom	21%	34%
Occasionally	42%	31%
Frequently	16%	8%
Very Frequently	13%	5%
	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 ways in which these incidents are most frequently 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 majority of "never" respondents.

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF OFFICERS NEVER ENCOUNTERING...

Incidents	Percent of Officers Responding "Never"
...Accidents Involving Chemicals	66%
...Bombing	90%
...Evictions	51%
...Impersonating an Officer	68%
...Motor Vehicle Hijacking	88%

The following four tables illustrate the types of investigations conducted most frequently by the officers in response to a variety of complaints/incidents.

TABLE 12

"LOG ONLY" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Log Only"
Abandoned House	41%
Citizen Lockout	50%
Downed Wires	37%
Loud Party	27%
Perimeter Control at Fire	41%

TABLE 13

"PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Preliminary Investigation Only"
Bomb Threat	33%
Child Abuse	37%
Criminal Sexual Conduct	25%
Homicide	19%
Motor Vehicle Theft	30%

TABLE 14

"COMPLETE INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Complete Investigation"
Concealed Weapons	72%
Disorderly Public Conduct	75%
Drunk in Public	68%
Felony Assault	63%
Traffic Accident	84%

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 because they are never used.

TABLE 15

FREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS (SMALL MUNICIPALITY 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	100%	100%	84%
Body Armor	68%	87%	91%
Car Door Lock Opening Devise	75%	66%	73%
Handcuffs	82%	99%	99%
Hand Held Radio	99%	100%	99%
LEADS Terminal	81%	99%	24%
Radar Unit	86%	84%	84%
Spotlight	95%	95%	100%
Typewriter	78%	94%	57%

TABLE 16

INFREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS
(SMALL MUNICIPALITY 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	8%	21%	73%
Canine	3%	19%*	6%**
Chemical Mace	5%	43%	93%
Drug Narcotics Kit	13%	61%	75%
Fire Extinguisher	12%	78%	81%
First Aid Kit	23%	87%	76%
Motorcycle	2%	8%*	14%
Shotgun	22%	94%	82%

---

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

** Over eighty percent responded to the "never encountered" category.

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 the nine most frequently used sources of information. Additionally, Table 18 reflects the degree to which some sources are never utilized.

TABLE 17

FREQUENTLY USED INFORMATION SOURCES
(SMALL MUNICIPALITY 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%	99%	60%
Department Manuals	77%	93%	90%
Interoffice Memos	72%	69%	94%
Local Ordinances	81%	94%	79%
Ohio Criminal Code and Procedures	65%	100%	64%
Ohio Vehicle Code	55%	98%	81%
Training Bulletins	45%	81%	93%
Teletype Messages	51%	90%	93%
Wanted Bulletins	40%	75%	96%

As seen in Table 17, 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 SMALL MUNICIPALITIES

	NEVER USED
Airport Field Conditions Report	98%
FAA Bulletins	81%
Fish and Game Code	79%
Harbor Statutes	96%
Health Statutes	58%
Interstate Commerce Rules	81%
In-depth Narrative Reports	52%

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

	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	81%	93%	84%
Estimate Property Value	46%	42%	49%
Exchange Information	79%	99%	94%
Operate LEADS to Check Persons and Property	50%	69%	22%
Request Equipment Repair	61%	84%	98%
Request Verification	56%	93%	97%
Type Incident Reports	61%	60%	78%

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	11%	58%	42%
Attend In-service Training	12%	90%	94%
Conduct Investigation	1%	34%	27%*
Issue Wanted Notices	9%	55%	82%
Fingerprint Persons	11%	21%	70%
Investigate and Report Background	1%	67%	43%
Participate in Planning	1%	28%	30%**
Participate in Firearms Training	26%	88%	67%

---

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

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

16

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 many of the officers. Table 21 reflects these frequency ratings as well as the importance and learning difficulty ratings provided by the 67 supervisors from small municipalities.

TABLE 21

FIVE MOST 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
Arrest Persons Without a Warrant	40%	88%	57%
Conduct Field Search	39%	97%	84%
Conduct Frisk	46%	98%	88%
Handcuff Suspect	41%	98%	84%
Issue Citation for Non-Traffic Offenses	34%	73%	88%

In most cases the importance and learning difficulty ratings correlated positively with the frequency ratings, with supervisors generally convinced of the both 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 area of defendant rights. For this task the patrol supervisors displayed misgivings about the ease with which the task could be learned.

At the other end of the spectrum, the five least often 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 four-out-of-five of the officers, yet elicited high difficulty ratings from the supervisors. And, with three-fourths of the patrol officers having never requested bystanders to assist in an apprehension, only three out of ten supervisors saw this task as having real importance.

17

TABLE 22

FIVE LEAST FREQUENTLY 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	88%	39%*	18%
Participate in Raid	30%	57%	63%
Plan Strategy for Searches	46%	73%	36%
Request Bystanders to Assist in an Apprehension	74%	31%	40%*
Secure Search Warrant	46%	81%	22%

---

* "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 five most frequently performed patrol functions are summarized here.

TABLE 23

FIVE 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
Check for Wants Via LEADS	77%	91%	75%
Check Parks	93%	78%	99%
Check Parking Lots	98%	64%	100%
Follow Suspicious Vehicles	78%	92%	85%
Inform Dispatcher of Status	99%	97%	97%

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 calculation of the five 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 indispensable service to the community by dissolving some volatile situations, they also tend to flavor 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 in the following two tables 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 CONTACT 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
Advise Victims	81%	81%	73%
Give Street Directions	88%	60%	95%
Interview Suspicious Persons	77%	92%	57%
Investigate Suspicious Vehicles	88%	92%	75%
Mediate Family Disputes	70%	92%	18%
Stop Vehicle to Cite	90%	87%	75%
Talk to Establish Rapport	86%	94%	85%

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	41%	2%**	5%**
Evacuate Persons	2%	70%	61%
Fight Structural Fires	2%	11%*	5%*
Fight Vehicle Fires	4%	31%	46%
Place Children in Protective Custody	3%	76%	46%
Search for Bombs	1%	57%	19%
Watch for Illegal Activity	3%	33%	42%

*   Over seventy percent responded to the "never encountered" category.

** Over ninety percent responded to the "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	72%	91%	66%
Interview Complainants, Witnesses, etc.	78%	94%	46%
Locate Witnesses to Crime	51%	92%	57%
Tag Evidence and Confiscated Properties	59%	94%	87%
Take Statements of Witnesses	76%	96%	75%
Instruct and Direct Civilians in Undercover Operations	2%	36%	14%*
Prepare Paperwork to File Extradition Warrants	1%	42%*	11%*
Photograph Line-up	2%	50%	37%
Serve as Deputy Medical Examiner	0%	3%**	0%**
Witness Autopsies	0%	24%*	19%*

---

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

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

22

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
Confer with Prosecutor Prior to Testimony in Case	48%	95%	84%
Discuss Cases with Prosecutors Following Legal Proceedings	33%	83%	77%
Present Evidence In Legal Proceedings	27%	94%	47%
Review Reports and Notes For Court Testimony	44%	92%	69%
Testify in Criminal Cases	41%	99%	50%
Assemble Potential Juror List	0%	5%*	3%*
Testify in Secretary of State Implied Consent Hearings	0%	31%**	26%**
Mail Jury Duty Notices	0%	2%*	2%*
Testify in Liquor Board Hearings	0%	42%	43%
Testify in Parole or Probation Hearings	0%	38%**	35%**

---

* Over ninety percent responded "never encountered" to this task.

** Over forty percent responded "never encountered" to this task.

23

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	85%	95%	78%
Determine Violations in a Traffic Accident	84%	97%	61%
Diagram Accident Scenes	82%	97%	54%
Identify Persons Involved in Accidents	78%	97%	98%
Interview Persons Involved in Traffic Accidents	82%	98%	87%
Calculate Vehicle Speed Using Mathematical Formulas	2%	29%	15%
Interview Tow Truck Operators	23%	27%	81%
Photograph Accident Scenes	39%	83%	49%
Review Accidents with Accident Investigators	13%	58%	79%
Test Operating Conditions of Accident Vehicle Equipment	34%	77%	76%

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
Clock Vehicles Using Radar	85%	91%	69%
Follow Suspect Vehicle to Observe Traffic Violations	81%	71%	91%
Inspect Operator's License	92%	92%	97%
Issue Traffic Citations	93%	83%	90%
Issue Verbal Warnings to Traffic Violators	95%	59%	93%
Count Traffic Flow Using Automatic Devices	1%	5%	30%
Issue Moving Citations to Bicycle Riders	1%	14%	49%
Issue Traffic Citations to Pedestrians	3%	12%	67%
Move Disabled Vehicles With Patrol Car	4%	5%	23%
Record Pedestrian Flow	3%	8%	43%

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 by patrol officers in Ohio's eighty-six small municipalities monthly or more frequently.

TABLE 30

PERFORMANCE FREQUENCY FOR SEVEN SELECTED PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

	Monthly or More Often	Never
Climb Obstacles	19%	5%
Jump Over Obstacles	14%	11%
Lift Heavy Objects or Persons	17%	13%
Physically Push Movable Object	24%	5%
Run After Suspects	7%	6%
Run Up Stairs	14%	11%
Subdue Persons Resisting Arrest	15%	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 174 of the "small municipality" patrol officers. The remaining 137 officers indicated no such activity for that time frame. As will become evident the task analysis study went to unusual 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	134	43%
Activity Without Resistance	116	38%
Activity With Resistance	58	19%
TOTAL	308	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 larger precentage of small municipality officers are inactive as compared to large city officers. Conversely, the large city police officers are more likely than their small municipality 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 "small municipality" patrol officers during what they described as the "most strenuous physical activity of their last five work shifts." (Note: All the remaining tables reflect descriptions of that same activity.)

TABLE 32

RUNNING

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 24 yards	45	59%
25 to 49 yards	16	21%
50 to 74 yards	6	8%
75 to 99 yards	1	1%
100 yards and over	8	11%
TOTAL	76	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	7	10%
Shrubs	8	11%
Vehicle	12	17%
Stairs	8	11%
Ditch	1	1%
2 of the above	16	23%
3 of the above	6	9%
Other	13	18%
TOTAL	71	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 "small municipality" police officers crawled during their last five work shifts.

TABLE 34

CRAWLING

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 3 feet	6	46%
4 to 6 feet	6	46%
7 to 9 feet	0	0%
10 to 12 feet	0	0%
13 feet and over	1	8%
TOTAL	13	100%

28

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 small municipal 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	23	59%
4 to 6 feet	15	38%
7 to 9 feet	1	3%
10 to 12 feet	0	0%
TOTAL	39	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	7	13%
Shrubs	5	10%
Vehicle	8	15%
Stairs	8	15%
Ditch	6	11%
2 of the above	7	13%
3 of the above	6	11%
Other	6	11%
TOTAL	53	99%*

* Percentages may total to less than 100% due to rounding.

29

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	6	16%
Embankment	9	24%
Ditch	1	3%
Ladder	5	13%
Stairs	8	22%
Other	8	22%
TOTAL	37	100%

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

TABLE 38

OBSTACLES WITH HANDHOLDS AND FOOTHOLDS

	Number of Officers	Percent
Handhold	6	33%
Foothold	5	28%
Solid	7	39%
TOTAL	18	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 "small municipality police" respondents.

TABLE 39

CLIMBING (DISTANCES)

	Number of Officers	Percent
5 feet or less	8	22%
6 to 10 feet	17	47%
11 to 20 feet	6	17%
21 feet and over	5	14%
TOTAL	36	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	21	55%
20 to 39 feet	6	16%
40 to 59 feet	8	21%
60 to 79 feet	1	3%
80 feet and over	2	5%
TOTAL	38	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 small municipal departments.

TABLE 41

PUSHING (WEIGHTS)

	Number of Officers	Percent
25 to 49 pounds	2	5%
50 to 99 pounds	2	5%
100 to 149 pounds	2	5%
150 to 199 pounds	8	21%
200 pounds and over	25	64%
TOTAL	39	100%

It is evident from the table above that the majority of officers pushed extremely heavy objects. Some of this can be explained by the fact that 28 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; sixty percent, 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	27	68%
20 to 39 feet	9	23%
40 to 59 feet	1	2%
60 to 79 feet	1	2%
80 feet and over	2	5%
TOTAL	40	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	3	7%
50 to 99 pounds	2	5%
100 to 149 pounds	8	18%
150 to 199 pounds	24	56%
200 pounds and over	6	14%
TOTAL	43	100%

Since over 85% of the officers pulled objects weighing in excess of 100 pounds it might suggest that persons were the objects pulled. In fact, over 85% of the officers pulled persons, with over three fourths of these officers receiving 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	2	4%
2 feet	9	18%
3 feet	20	41%
4 feet	12	25%
5 feet and over	6	12%
TOTAL	49	100%

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

TABLE 45

CARRYING (DISTANCES)

	Number of Officers	Percent
1 to 19 feet	29	62%
20 to 39 feet	8	17%
40 to 59 feet	3	6%
60 to 79 feet	2	4%
80 feet and over	5	11%
TOTAL	47	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	3	6%
50 to 99 pounds	5	10%
100 to 149 pounds	10	19%
150 to 199 pounds	26	50%
200 pounds and over	8	15%
TOTAL	52	100%

Slightly less than three-fourths of these patrol officers carried people; and again, nearly two-thirds of them got some assistance.

As could be expected, a number of the officers engaging in physical activities met resistance (17%). The majority (85%) of these officers had to contend with only one suspect, with another 6% being forced to grapple with two. In 83% of the cases the suspects 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

CAUSES FOR INABILITY TO REASON WITH SUSPECTS

	Number of Officers	Percent
Drug or Alcohol Influence	37	69%
Emotionally or Mentally Upset	9	17%
Mental State Unknown	4	7%
No Opportunity to Reason	4	7%
TOTAL	59	100%

Resistance by suspects can take a variety of forms. For example, a drunk poses a problem far different from the armed robber. Table 48 reflects the types of resistance encountered by fifty-four (54) patrol officers reporting resistance incidents.

TABLE 48

TYPES OF RESISTANCE

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Barricade	2	(4%)	52	(96%)
Hit/Kick	27	(50%)	27	(50%)
Passive Resistance	14	(26%)	40	(74%)
Pulled Away	40	(74%)	14	(26%)
Ran Away	21	(38%)	34	(62%)
Special Tactics	5	(10%)	47	(90%)
Threw Object	4	(7%)	50	(93%)
Weapon	6	(11%)	47	(89%)
Wrestled	40	(74%)	14	(26%)

By far the vast majority (89%) of officers encountering resistance issued verbal orders to their suspects. Only one-fifth 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 49 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	3	(6%)	50	(94%)
Discharge Firearm	2	(4%)	51	(96%)
Display Firearm	9	(17%)	44	(83%)
Handcuffs with Assistance	28	(53%)	25	(47%)
Handcuffs without Assistance	19	(35%)	35	(65%)
Hit/Kick	13	(25%)	39	(75%)
Nightstick/Blackjack	8	(15%)	44	(85%)
Other Force	4	(10%)	38	(90%)
Restraining Holds	30	(57%)	23	(43%)
Wrestled	42	(79%)	11	(21%)

OTHER SAC PUBLICATIONS

March 1983   Use of Force By Ohio Peace Officers. An analysis of the use of force by Ohio law enforcers during the performance of routine patrol work. Examined are personal defense tactics as well as non-lethal and lethal force.

March 1983   The Ohio Statistical Analysis Center: A User's Profile. This administrative report highlights SAC's setting and function in Ohio government, the federal SAC network, and the field of criminal justice. It profiles SAC's structure, research priorities, information users, and similarities to other state and territorial SACs.

March 1983   OCJS Research Requests and Responses: An Analysis. An analysis of 346 research data requests received and responded to by SAC in 1982, as well as the nearly 1,000 requests received to date, by type and source of request.

Spring, 1983   The following series of eight reports are modular summaries, each about 40 pages in length, profiling the results from each of the jurisdiction levels (based on populations) represented in 1981-82 Ohio Law Enforcement Task Analysis Survey. These reports highlight 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.

Law Enforcement In Ohio Cities Serving Over 100,000 People: A Task Analysis.

Law Enforcement In Ohio Cities Serving 25,000-100,000 People: A Task Analysis.

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

Law Enforcement In Ohio Municipalities Serving 2,500-10,000 People: A Task Analysis.

Law Enforcement In Ohio Municipalities Serving Under 2,500 People: A Task Analysis

Law Enforcement In Ohio Counties Serving Over 250,000 People: A Task Analysis.

Law Enforcement In Ohio Counties Serving 100,000-250,000 People: A Task Analysis.

Law Enforcement In Ohio Counties Serving Under 100,000 People: A Task Analysis.

November 1982   Survey of Ohio Citizen Attitudes Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice. The third annual report of a 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 sheriffs' 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