

96450

CR-Sent  
4-15-85

96450

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Ohio Governor's Office of  
Criminal Justice Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

STATE OF OHIO  
Richard F. Celeste, Governor  
  
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT  
Alfred S. Dietzel, Director

Office of Criminal Justice Services  
Statistical Analysis Center

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

June, 1983

96450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

	<u>PAGE</u>
PREFACE.....	1
OFFICER PROFILE.....	2
COMPLAINT/INCIDENT SECTION.....	9
EQUIPMENT.....	11
SOURCES OF INFORMATION.....	13
ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS.....	15
ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE.....	17
PATROL FUNCTIONS.....	19
PATROL CONTACT.....	20
CIVIL PROCESSES .....	22
DETENTION AND CUSTODY PROCEDURES.....	23
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION.....	24
COURT PROCEDURES.....	25
TRAFFIC ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION.....	26
TRAFFIC PATROL.....	27
PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES.....	28
OTHER SAC PUBLICATIONS.....	40

**NGJRE**

**JAN 16 1985**

**ACQUISITIONS**

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 1: COMPARISON: ACTUAL LAW ENFORCEMENT POPULATION V. SURVEY (RESPONSE) POPULATION.....	2
TABLE 2: OFFICERS' RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS.....	3
TABLE 3: OFFICERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVELS PRIOR TO JOINING AND AT PRESENT: THIRTEEN MEDIUM COUNTIES V. BALANCE OF STATE.....	4
TABLE 4: "MY JOB IS...".....	4
TABLE 5: "MY JOB UTILIZES MY TALENTS...".....	5
TABLE 6: "MY (BASIC) TRAINING PREPARED ME...".....	5
TABLE 7: PRIOR LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE.....	6
TABLE 8: TYPE OF PATROL BY TYPE OF JURISDICTION.....	7
TABLE 9: WORK SHIFT: "MEDIUM COUNTY" DEPUTIES.....	7
TABLE 10: "I AM CALLED UPON TO PERFORM THE TASKS OF A HIGHER RANK...".....	8
TABLE 11: PERCENT OF OFFICERS NEVER ENCOUNTERING... ..	9
TABLE 12: "LOG ONLY" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS..	10
TABLE 13: "PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS.....	10
TABLE 14: "COMPLETE INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS.....	10
TABLE 15: FREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS (MEDIUM COUNTY).....	11
TABLE 16: INFREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS (MEDIUM COUNTY).....	12
TABLE 17: FREQUENTLY USED INFORMATION SOURCES (MEDIUM COUNTY).....	13
TABLE 18: INFORMATION SOURCES NEVER USED BY A MAJORITY OF PATROL OFFICERS IN MEDIUM JURISDICTIONS.....	14
TABLE 19: FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS.....	15
TABLE 20: NEVER PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS.....	16

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 21: FIVE MOST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS.....	17
TABLE 22: FIVE LEAST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS.....	18
TABLE 23: FIVE MOST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED PATROL TASKS.....	19
TABLE 24: FREQUENTLY PERFORMED PATROL CONTACT TASKS.....	20
TABLE 25: SELDOM PERFORMED PATROL CONTACT TASKS.....	21
TABLE 26: SELECTED CIVIL PROCESS TASKS.....	22
TABLE 27: SELECTED DETENTION AND CUSTODY PROCEDURES.....	23
TABLE 28: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION TASKS.....	24
TABLE 29: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED COURT PROCEDURE TASKS.....	25
TABLE 30: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC ACCIDENT TASKS.....	26
TABLE 31: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC PATROL TASKS.....	27
TABLE 32: PERFORMANCE FREQUENCY FOR SEVEN SELECTED PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES.....	28
TABLE 33: ACTIVITY STATUS FOR LAST FIVE WORK SHIFTS.....	29
TABLE 34: RUNNING.....	29
TABLE 35: OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE RUNNING.....	30
TABLE 36: CRAWLING.....	30
TABLE 37: JUMPING.....	31
TABLE 38: OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE JUMPING.....	31
TABLE 39: OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE CLIMBING.....	32
TABLE 40: OBSTACLES WITH HANDHOLDS AND FOOTHOLDS.....	32
TABLE 41: CLIMBING (DISTANCES).....	33
TABLE 42: PUSHING (DISTANCES).....	33

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 43: PUSHING (WEIGHTS).....	34
TABLE 44: PULLING (DISTANCES).....	35
TABLE 45: PULLING (WEIGHTS).....	35
TABLE 46: LIFTING (HEIGHTS).....	36
TABLE 47: CARRYING (DISTANCES).....	36
TABLE 48: LIFTING (WEIGHTS).....	37
TABLE 49: CAUSES OF INABILITY TO REASON WITH SUSPECTS.....	37
TABLE 50: TYPES OF RESISTANCE.....	38
TABLE 51: TYPES OF FORCE USED TO SUBDUE SUBJECTS.....	39

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

<u>COUNTY SHERIFFS' DEPARTMENTS</u>	<u>PATROL OFFICERS</u>	<u>SUPERVISORS</u>
ALLEN	9	2
ASHTABULA	7	2
CLARK	10	2
CLERMONT	9	2
COLUMBIANA	4	0
GREEN	8	1
LAKE	9	2
LICKING	6	2
MEDINA	10	2
PORTAGE	10	2
RICHLAND	9	2
TRUMBULL	9	3
WOOD	7	1
TOTAL	<u>107</u>	<u>23</u>

PREFACE

This report has been prepared especially for sheriffs and administrative officers in Ohio's thirteen medium sheriffs' departments, all of which serve county jurisdictions of 100,000 to 250,000 people. It analyzes the responses of some one hundred thirty officers from all thirteen 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 sheriffs 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 107 "medium county" deputies were responding to the survey in terms of frequency (of use or performance), 23 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 hundred fifty-two thousand pieces of information in the "medium county" 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, 107 were drawn from sheriff's departments in all thirteen of Ohio's thirteen medium counties.

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 medium counties. Wherever possible, these 107 officers will be compared to their peers throughout the remainder of the State.

When comparing officers' race and sex characteristics, deputies in medium counties differ slightly from patrol officers across the balance of the state. The results are contained in Table 2.

TABLE 2

OFFICERS' RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS

	Medium Sheriffs' Departments	Balance of State
White	94%	89%
Black	5%	9%
Other	1%	2%
Male	97%	93%
Female	3%	7%

In terms of age, 72% of the medium county deputies were under the age of 35 compared to 96% of the officers across the balance of the state.

Among the officers' acquired characteristics, educational achievement was notable for several reasons. Primary among these is the fact that most of the "medium county" patrol officers have achieved more academically than the high school diploma required to become a peace officer in Ohio. At present 59% of the "medium county" deputies surveyed have completed at least one year of post high school education.

TABLE 3  
OFFICERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVELS PRIOR TO  
JOINING AND AT PRESENT:  
THIRTEEN MEDIUM COUNTIES  
VS.  
BALANCE OF STATE

	PRIOR TO JOINING		PRESENT	
	Thirteen Medium Counties	Balance of State	Thirteen Medium Counties	Balance of State
Less Than High School	2%	3%	2%	2%
High School	49%	45%	39%	38%
1-2 Years of College	39%	35%	41%	37%
3-4 Years of College	8%	16%	14%	21%
4 + Years of College	2%	1%	4%	2%

Table 3 reflects better educated officers both in the medium counties and state-wide. The similarities between the two levels are evident.

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 107 "medium county" deputies are contained in Tables 4-6.

TABLE 4  
"MY JOB IS..."

	Number	Percent
Very Dull	0	0%
Dull	2	2%
So So	6	6%
Interesting	38	36%
Very Interesting	61	57%
	<u>107</u>	<u>101%*</u>

\* Percentage exceeds 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 5  
"MY JOB UTILIZES MY TALENTS..."

	Number	Percent
Not at All	0	0%
Very Little	7	6%
Fairly Well	33	31%
Quite Well	43	40%
Very Well	24	22%
	<u>107</u>	<u>99%*</u>

TABLE 6  
"MY (BASIC) TRAINING PREPARED ME..."

	Number	Percent
Not at All	5	5%
Somewhat Well	45	42%
Very Well	42	39%
	15	14%
	<u>107</u>	<u>100%</u>

Based on these questions, the "medium county" deputy 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 officers did not differ significantly from those of other peace officers throughout Ohio in these areas.

Somewhat surprisingly, a large number of these relatively young deputies had already gained some law enforcement experience prior to taking their present assignments. Close to one-third indicated prior experience as security guards, while others had served as military police officers, police reservists, and a variety of related jobs.

\* Differences due to rounding.

TABLE 7  
PRIOR LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE

	Thirteen Medium Counties	Balance of State
Deputy Sheriff	20%	28%
Military Police	18%	14%
Municipal Police	48%	18%
Police Reserve	37%	23%
Security Guard	29%	11%
Other	9%	6%

Several "agency" characteristics also were 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 differences that exist in vehicle patrol between the thirteen medium counties and the balance of state.

TABLE 8  
TYPE OF PATROL  
BY  
TYPE OF JURISDICTION

	Thirteen Medium Counties	Balance of State
1-Person Vehicle	96%	62.3%
2-Person Vehicle	0%	23.0%
Motorcycle	0%	.3%
Foot	0%	.4%
Foot and Vehicle	2%	6.9%
Other	2%	7.1%

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 107 "medium county" officers did not differ markedly from their "balance of state" peers in terms of work shifts, as is displayed in Table 9 below.

TABLE 9  
WORK SHIFT: "MEDIUM COUNTY" DEPUTIES

	Thirteen Medium Counties	Balance of State
Day	33%	26%
Afternoon	30%	35%
Midnight	26%	25%
Split Shift	8%	4%
Odd Shift	1%	5%
Other	2%	5%

There was, however, a 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, as illustrated in Table 10.

TABLE 10  
 "I AM CALLED UPON TO PERFORM THE TASKS OF  
 A HIGHER RANK..."

	Medium Counties	Balance of State
Never	11%	21%
Seldom	32%	32%
Occasionally	40%	32%
Frequently	14%	9%
Very Frequently	3%	6%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

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 questions yielding a response of "never" include those related to aircraft, conservation, and victimless types of incidents. The questions listed in the following table describe incidents that are not as rare but which still drew many "never" responses.

TABLE 11  
 PERCENT OF OFFICERS NEVER ENCOUNTERING...

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Never"
Curfew Violations	35%
Evictions	30%
Impersonating an Officer	47%
Kidnapping	51%
Motor Vehicle Hijacking	71%

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

TABLE 12

## "LOG ONLY" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Log Only"
Abandoned House	49%
Citizen Lockout	44%
Downed Wires	34%
Loud Party	27%
Perimeter Control at Fire	41%
Ruptured Water or Gas Line	32%

TABLE 13

"PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES  
FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Preliminary Investigation Only"
Bad Check	47%
Credit Card Theft	43%
Motor Vehicle Theft	31%
Obscene Phone Call	42%
Robbery	47%

TABLE 14

"COMPLETE INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES  
FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Complete Investigation"
Concealed Weapons	79%
Disorderly Public Conduct	82%
Drunk in Public	78%
Traffic Accident	74%
Traffic Offense	70%

## 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 deputies 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  
(MEDIUM COUNTY)

	Percent of Deputies Using This Equipment Monthly Or More Often	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Rather Easy" or "Very Easy" to Learn to Operate
Automobile	99%	100%	75%
Body Armor	64%	88%	96%
Handcuffs	95%	96%	96%
Hand-Held Radio	94%	96%	92%
LEADS Terminal	84%	100%	25%
Spotlight	89%	96%	100%
Typewriter	83%	74%	62%

TABLE 16  
INFREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS  
(MEDIUM COUNTY)

	Percent of Deputies Using This Equipment Monthly or More Often	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	6%	21%	79%
Drug/Narcotics Kit	7%	46%	62%
Fire Extinguishing Agents	6%	58%	67%
First Aid Kit	20%	83%	71%
Shotgun	30%	92%	71%

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

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

TABLE 17  
FREQUENTLY USED INFORMATION SOURCES  
(MEDIUM COUNTY)

	Percent of Deputies Required to Read These Manuals	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Information As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Information As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn to Learn
Criminal Law & Procedures Manual	40%	92%	46%
Department Manuals	84%	92%	71%
First Aid Manuals	28%	38%	71%
Interoffice Memos	66%	83%	96%
Ohio Criminal Code and Procedures	63%	96%	54%
Ohio Vehicle Code	51%	92%	62%
Teletyped Messages	52%	88%	100%
Training Bulletins	50%	75%	92%

As seen in Table 17, most of the required reading for the majority of patrol officers is rated by supervisors as easy to learn.

TABLE 18  
 INFORMATION SOURCES NEVER USED BY A MAJORITY OF PATROL OFFICERS  
 IN MEDIUM JURISDICTIONS

	<u>NEVER USED</u>
FAA Bulletins	68%
Fish and Game Code	38%
Harbor Statutes	89%
Health Statutes	64%
Interstate Commerce Rules	77%
Legal Transcripts	47%

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 also never 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 Deputy Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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	80%	96%	88%
Estimate Property Values	55%	71%	71%
Exchange Information with Law Enforcement Officials	79%	96%	88%
Operate LEADS to Check Persons and Property	61%	67%	38%
Operate Switchboard	49%	71%	71%
Request Equipment Repair	66%	79%	92%
Request Verification	71%	88%	92%
Type Incident Reports	61%	67%	79%

TABLE 20

## NEVER PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

Task	Percent of Patrol Officers Never Performing 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
Conduct Investigations on License Applicants	91%	33%*	17%**
Interview Police Officer Applicants	89%	33%*	29%*
Investigate and Report Background of Police Applicants	84%	33%*	33%*
Make Vehicle Repairs	84%	21%*	21%**
Train Police Dogs	90%	12%**	4%**
Update Spot Maps	83%	21%*	50%*
Write Contract Specifications	94%	29%**	12%**
Write Policy Materials	83%	42%*	21%*

\* Over forty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

\*\* Over seventy percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

## ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE

There were 24 "arrest, search and seizure" tasks identified in the survey; Table 21 reflects these frequency ratings as well as the importance and learning difficulty ratings provided by the 23 medium county supervisors.

TABLE 21

## FIVE MOST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS

Task	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 with a Warrant	46%	92%	83%
Arrest Persons without a Warrant	50%	83%	58%
Conduct Field Search	50%	96%	75%
Conduct Frisk	64%	96%	88%
Handcuff Suspect	74%	96%	88%

At the other end of the spectrum, the five least often performed arrest/search and seizure tasks drew a mixed response from the supervisors. For example, "discharge firearm at person" had never been performed by three-fourths of the officers, yet almost 30% of the supervisors gave this task a high importance rating. In another direction, while three-fourths of the patrol officers had never requested bystanders to assist in an apprehension, less than one in ten of the supervisors saw this task as having any real importance.

TABLE 22

FIVE LEAST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED  
ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Who Have <u>Never Performed This Task</u>	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	79%	29%	25%
Plan Strategy for Arrests	22%	79%	50%
Plan Strategy for Searches	44%	75%	33%
Request Bystanders to Assist in an Apprehension	68%	8%	38%
Secure Search Warrant	44%	67%	29%

## PATROL FUNCTIONS

Sixty-nine 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 <u>Once a Week</u>	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	82%	83%	67%
Check Parks	83%	50%	96%
Check Parking Lots	83%	38%	100%
Check Homes While on Vacation	75%	67%	96%
Inform Dispatcher of Status	92%	96%	96%

The patrol functions list 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 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 counseling 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 many 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 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 <u>Once a Month</u>	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	94%	83%	54%
Explain Nature of Complaint	92%	79%	75%
Give Street Directions	91%	38%	96%
Interview Suspicious Persons	91%	83%	54%
Investigate Suspicious Vehicles	94%	83%	71%
Stop Vehicle to Cite	78%	71%	58%
Talk with People to Establish Rapport	91%	83%	71%
Warn Offenders	90%	46%	75%

TABLE 25

SELDOM PERFORMED PATROL CONTACT TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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%	0%*	4%*
Explain Demonstration Permits	0%	29%**	33%**
Fight Structural Fires	0%	4%*	8%*
Fight Vehicle Fires	1%	25%**	38%**
Watch for Illegal Activity	2%	42%	33%**

\* Over ninety percent responded "never encountered" for this task.  
 \*\* Over thirty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

CIVIL PROCESSES

Eighteen questions were posed to the responding officers regarding their involvement in civil process duties. Overall, peace officers in Ohio seldom engage in civil process matters. In fact, a significant number of the questions prompted an overwhelmingly large number of responses of "never having performed" that particular task.

However, when the responses of sheriffs and police officers were compared, the former group was found to be more involved than the latter. This is logical because of the many civil functions assigned to the sheriff's officers by law.

Below are some of the most and least frequently performed civil process duties engaged in by officers from Ohio's medium county sheriff departments.

TABLE 26  
SELECTED CIVIL PROCESS TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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
Evictions	8%	33%	33%*
Pick Up Children as Directed by Court	3%	46%	50%
Record Disposition of Civil Papers	21%	42%	50%*
Serve Civil Process Papers	65%	58%	71%
Serve Probate Orders	42%	58%	67%
Collect Fees for Civil Process	1%	17%**	8%**
Collect Money for Sales of Levied Property	1%	17%**	13%**
Determine Exempt & Non-Exempt Property for Levy Purposes	0%	12%**	8%**
Prepare Advertisements for Sale of Property	1%	8%**	12%**
Update Index and Description for Civil Cases	2%	12%**	17%**

\* Over thirty-five percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

\*\* Over seventy percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

DETENTION AND CUSTODY PROCEDURES

Sixty-six questions were included in the survey concerning detention and custody procedures. However, the vast majority were not relevant to the duties of most patrol officers with a substantial portion falling within the realm of administrative functions. Collecting bonds, responding to court orders, placing holds on prisoners, and reviewing arrest and bond documents are examples of these tasks.

Many of the tasks included duties that a jailer would perform, but jailers were not included in the survey sample. Some sheriffs' departments rotate their officers between patrol and jail duties. Therefore, a small percentage of officers do perform some of these tasks occasionally, as illustrated in Table 27.

TABLE 27  
SELECTED DETENTION AND CUSTODY PROCEDURES

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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
Answer Inquiries Concerning Prisoners	38%	38%	79%
Book Prisoners	37%	54%	58%
Escort Prisoners	32%	63%	67%
Guard Prisoners	23%	62%	67%
Shakedown Prisoners	19%	67%	58%

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 sheriffs' officers in the thirteen medium counties.

TABLE 28  
FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST  
OFTEN PERFORMED CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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
Collect Evidence and Personal Property From Crime Scenes	67%	83%	38%
Determine Whether Incidents Are Criminal Or Civil Matters	87%	88%	62%
Interview Complainants, Witnesses, etc.	89%	96%	42%
Locate Witnesses to Crime	70%	96%	42%
Take Statements of Witnesses	84%	92%	63%
Cast Impressions at Crime Scene	2%	50%	12%
Instruct and Direct Civilians in Undercover Operations	0%	46%*	17%*
Organize and Conduct Station House Line-Ups	3%	38%*	29%
Prepare Paperwork to File Extradition Warrants	3%	42%*	12%*
Serve As Deputy Medical Examiner	0%	0%*	12%**

\* Over thirty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

\*\* Over seventy-five percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

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 29  
FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST  
OFTEN PERFORMED COURT PROCEDURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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	58%	79%	79%
Discuss Cases with Prosecutors Following Legal Proceedings	41%	67%	79%
Review Reports and Notes for Court Testimony	50%	88%	58%
Serve Subpoenas	73%	79%	83%
Testify in Criminal Cases	50%	88%	54%
Assemble Potential Juror List	1%	8%*	8%*
Collect Fines	2%	4%*	25%*
Mail Jury Duty Notices	1%	8%*	21%*
Testify in Liquor Board Hearings	1%	42%**	25%**
Testify in Secretary of State Implied Consent Hearings	0%	21%*	25%*

\* Over sixty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

\*\* Over thirty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

Law enforcement officers in Ohio's medium counties, 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 30

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC ACCIDENT TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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 Standard Accident Form	64%	75%	75%
Determine Factors Contributing to an Accident	57%	79%	42%
Determine Violations in a Traffic Accident	58%	75%	54%
Interview Persons Involved in Traffic Accidents	55%	83%	71%
Investigate Off-Road Vehicle Accidents	51%	67%	67%
Calculate Vehicle Speed Using Mathematical Formulas	2%	29%*	17%*
Determine Status of Auto Insurance	31%	17%	67%
Interview Tow Truck Operators for Relevant Accident Information	21%	17%	79%
Review Accidents with Accident Investigators	8%	54%	75%
Test Operating Condition of Accident Vehicle Equipment	29%	67%	75%

\* Over thirty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

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. Examples of these tasks are listed below in Table 31.

TABLE 31

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC PATROL TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Month</u>	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
Explain Legal Procedures to Traffic Violators	66%	62%	62%
Follow Suspect Vehicle to Observe Traffic Violations	75%	62%	79%
Inspect Operator's License	86%	79%	92%
Issue Traffic Citations	78%	75%	83%
Issue Verbal Warnings to Traffic Violators	82%	50%	96%
Count Traffic Flow Using Automatic Devices	0%	4%*	12%*
Issue Moving Traffic Citations to Bicycle Riders	2%	12%**	29%**
Move Disabled Vehicles with Patrol Car	0%	4%*	17%*
Operate Traffic Signals	0%	17%*	42%**
Record Pedestrian Flow	2%	4%**	42%**

\* Over eighty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

\*\* Over fifty percent responded "never encountered" for this task.

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 sheriffs, but also to prospective recruits. Listed below are seven selected routine physical activities performed monthly or more frequently by patrol officers in thirteen medium county agencies.

TABLE 32  
PERFORMANCE FREQUENCY FOR SEVEN SELECTED  
PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

	<u>Monthly or More Often</u>	<u>Never</u>
Climb Obstacles	26%	4%
Jump Over Obstacles	21%	5%
Lift Heavy Objects or Persons	19%	6%
Physically Push Movable Object	28%	6%
Run After Suspects	11%	4%
Run Up Stairs	17%	5%
Subdue Persons Resisting Arrest	21%	3%

The remaining 19 tables of this report, and their corresponding narratives, describe in minute detail the most strenuous physical activity undertaken by 66 of the "medium county" patrol officers during the previous five work shifts. The remaining 40 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 33  
ACTIVITY STATUS FOR LAST FIVE WORK SHIFTS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Activity	40	38%
Activity Without Resistance	44	42%
Activity With Resistance	22	21%
TOTAL	<u>106</u>	<u>101%*</u>

During the course of 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 county" patrol officers during what they described as the "most strenuous physical activity of their last five work shifts."

TABLE 34  
RUNNING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 24 yards	21	52%
25 to 49 yards	4	10%
50 to 74 yards	4	10%
75 to 99 yards	0	0%
100 yards and over	11	28%
TOTAL	<u>40</u>	<u>100%</u>

\* Percentage exceeds 100% due to rounding.

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

TABLE 35  
OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE RUNNING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ditch	3	9%
Fence or Wall	2	6%
Shrubs	4	12%
Stairs	4	12%
Vehicle	3	9%
2 of the above	12	35%
3 of the above	3	9%
Other	3	9%
TOTAL	34	101%*

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 county" deputies crawled during their last five work shifts.

TABLE 36  
CRAWLING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 3 feet	6	75%
4 to 6 feet	0	0%
7 to 9 feet	1	12%
10 to 12 feet	1	12%
13 feet and over	0	0%
TOTAL	8	99%*

\* Differences due to rounding.

The typical deputy 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 county forces did jump in the course of performing their duties. Following are the distances jumped by the task analysis respondents.

TABLE 37  
JUMPING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 3 feet	9	50%
4 to 6 feet	8	44%
7 to 9 feet	0	0%
10 to 12 feet	1	6%
Over 13 feet	0	0%
TOTAL	18	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 38  
OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE JUMPING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ditch	4	14%
Fence	4	14%
Shrubs	4	14%
Stairs	4	14%
Vehicle	0	0%
2 of the above	7	25%
3 of the above	2	7%
Other	3	11%
TOTAL	28	99%*

\* Differences due to rounding.

TABLE 43  
PUSHING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	0	0%
50 to 99 pounds	1	5%
100 to 149 pounds	1	5%
150 to 199 pounds	3	15%
200 pounds and over	<u>15</u>	<u>75%</u>
TOTAL	<u>20</u>	<u>100%</u>

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 15 of the officers indicated they had pushed a vehicle. Many of the rest may have pushed people, trash dumpsters, or other heavy objects. Over 54% 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 44  
PULLING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	14	70%
20 to 39 feet	4	20%
40 to 59 feet	0	0%
60 to 79 feet	0	0%
80 feet and over	<u>2</u>	<u>10%</u>
TOTAL	<u>20</u>	<u>100%</u>

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 45  
PULLING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	2	10%
50 to 99 pounds	2	10%
100 to 149 pounds	4	20%
150 to 199 pounds	8	40%
200 pounds and over	<u>4</u>	<u>20%</u>
TOTAL	<u>20</u>	<u>100%</u>

Since 80% of the officers pulled objects weighing in excess of 100 pounds it might suggest that persons were the objects pulled. In fact, almost 50% of the officers pulled persons. And 40% of these officers received assistance in their pulling encounter. However, less than one-third 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, almost two-thirds of those officers engaging in lifting did so to heights of under five feet.

TABLE 46  
LIFTING (HEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 foot	2	8%
2 feet	0	0%
3 feet	11	46%
4 feet	2	8%
5 feet and over	9	38%
TOTAL	<u>24</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

TABLE 47  
CARRYING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	9	36%
20 to 39 feet	5	20%
40 to 59 feet	3	12%
60 to 79 feet	1	4%
80 feet and over	7	28%
TOTAL	<u>25</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

TABLE 48  
LIFTING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	3	12%
50 to 99 pounds	5	20%
100 to 149 pounds	4	16%
150 to 199 pounds	9	36%
200 pounds and over	4	16%
TOTAL	<u>25</u>	<u>100%</u>

Over one-half of these patrol officers carried people. And, over one-half of them got some assistance.

As could be expected, a number of the officers engaging in physical activities met resistance (21%). The majority (83%) of these officers had to contend with only one suspect, with another 12% being forced to grapple with two. Seventy-nine 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. Thirteen percent 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 49  
CAUSES OF INABILITY TO REASON WITH SUSPECTS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Drug or alcohol influence	22	92%
Emotionally or mentally upset	1	4%
Mental State Unknown	1	4%
No Opportunity to Reason	0	0%
TOTAL	<u>24</u>	<u>100%</u>

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, almost two-thirds of those officers engaging in lifting did so to heights of under five feet.

TABLE 46  
LIFTING (HEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 foot	2	8%
2 feet	0	0%
3 feet	11	46%
4 feet	2	8%
5 feet and over	9	38%
TOTAL	<u>24</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

TABLE 47  
CARRYING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	9	36%
20 to 39 feet	5	20%
40 to 59 feet	3	12%
60 to 79 feet	1	4%
80 feet and over	7	28%
TOTAL	<u>25</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

TABLE 48  
LIFTING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	3	12%
50 to 99 pounds	5	20%
100 to 149 pounds	4	16%
150 to 199 pounds	9	36%
200 pounds and over	4	16%
TOTAL	<u>25</u>	<u>100%</u>

Over one-half of these patrol officers carried people. And, over one-half of them got some assistance.

As could be expected, a number of the officers engaging in physical activities met resistance (21%). The majority (83%) of these officers had to contend with only one suspect, with another 12% being forced to grapple with two. Seventy-nine 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. Thirteen percent 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 49  
CAUSES OF INABILITY TO REASON WITH SUSPECTS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Drug or alcohol influence	22	92%
Emotionally or mentally upset	1	4%
Mental State Unknown	1	4%
No Opportunity to Reason	0	0%
TOTAL	<u>24</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

TABLE 50  
TYPES OF RESISTANCE

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Barricade	1	( 4%)	21	(96%)
Hit/Kick	13	(56%)	10	(44%)
Passive Resistance	7	(30%)	16	(70%)
Pulled Away	19	(86%)	3	(14%)
Ran Away	8	(36%)	14	(64%)
Special Tactics	2	( 9%)	20	(91%)
Threw Object	1	( 4%)	21	(96%)
Weapon	3	(14%)	19	(86%)
Wrestled	19	(83%)	4	(17%)

All of the 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 50 lists the various degrees of force used by deputies in subduing resisting arrestees.

TABLE 51  
TYPES OF FORCE USED TO SUBDUE SUBJECTS

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Chemical Agent	1	( 4%)	21	(96%)
Discharge Firearm	0	( 0%)	22	(100%)
Display Firearm	1	( 4%)	21	(96%)
Handcuffs with Assistance	16	(70%)	7	(30%)
Handcuffs without Assistance	5	(22%)	18	(78%)
Hit/Kick	3	(14%)	19	(86%)
Restraining Holds	22	(96%)	1	( 4%)
Wrestled	16	(67%)	8	(33%)
Nightstick/Blackjack	3	(13%)	20	(87%)
Other Force	1	( 6%)	17	(94%)

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. (forthcoming)

- 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 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**