

96454

CR-sent
4-15-85

STATE OF OHIO
Richard F. Celeste, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT
Alfred S. Dietzel, Director

Office of Criminal Justice Services
Statistical Analysis Center

96454

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

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

96454

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.

May, 1983

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
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION.....	22
COURT PROCEDURES.....	23
TRAFFIC ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION.....	24
TRAFFIC PATROL.....	25
PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES.....	26
OTHER SAC PUBLICATIONS.....	38

NCJRS
 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: SMALLEST MUNICIPALITIES 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: PATROL OFFICERS WITH PRIOR LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE.....	6
TABLE 8: TYPES OF PATROL BY TYPE OF JURISDICTION.....	7
TABLE 9: WORK SHIFT: MUNICIPAL PATROL OFFICERS.....	7
TABLE 10: "I AM CALLED UPON TO PERFORM THE TASKS OF A HIGHER RANK...".....	8
TABLE 11: PERCENT "SMALLEST MUNICIPALITY" POLICE 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 COMPLAINT/INCIDENTS.....	10
TABLE 15: FREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS (SMALLEST MUNICIPALITY POLICE).....	11
TABLE 16: INFREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS (SMALLEST MUNICIPALITY POLICE).....	12
TABLE 17: SUPERVISORS' RATING OF INFORMATION SOURCES MOST OFTEN USED (SMALLEST MUNICIPALITY POLICE).....	13
TABLE 18: INFORMATION SOURCES NEVER USED BY A MAJORITY OF OHIO PATROL OFFICERS IN SMALLEST MUNICIPALITIES.....	14
TABLE 19: FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS.....	15

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 20: SELDOM PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS.....	16
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 TASKS.....	20
TABLE 25: SELDOM PERFORMED PATROL TASKS.....	21
TABLE 26: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION TASKS.....	22
TABLE 27: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED COURT PROCEDURE TASKS.....	23
TABLE 28: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC ACCIDENT TASKS.....	24
TABLE 29: FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC PATROL TASKS.....	25
TABLE 30: PERFORMANCE FREQUENCY FOR SEVEN SELECTED PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES.....	26
TABLE 31: ACTIVITY STATUS FOR LAST FIVE WORK SHIFTS.....	27
TABLE 32: RUNNING.....	27
TABLE 33: OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE RUNNING.....	28
TABLE 34: CRAWLING.....	28
TABLE 35: JUMPING.....	29
TABLE 36: OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE JUMPING.....	29
TABLE 37: OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE CLIMBING.....	30
TABLE 38: OBSTACLES WITH HANDHOLDS AND Footholds.....	30
TABLE 39: CLIMBING (DISTANCES).....	31
TABLE 40: PUSHING (DISTANCES).....	31
TABLE 41: PUSHING (WEIGHTS).....	32
TABLE 42: PULLING (DISTANCES).....	33

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 43: PULLING (WEIGHTS).....	33
TABLE 44: LIFTING (HEIGHTS).....	34
TABLE 45: CARRYING (DISTANCES).....	34
TABLE 46: LIFTING (WEIGHTS).....	35
TABLE 47: CAUSES FOR INABILITY TO REASON WITH SUSPECTS.....	35
TABLE 48: TYPES OF RESISTANCE.....	36
TABLE 49: TYPES OF FORCE USED TO SUBDUE SUBJECTS.....	37

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

COUNTY	AGENCY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Allen	Manchester	1	0
	Spencerville	1	1
	Lafayette	1	0
Ashtabula	Geneva	3	0
	Andover	2	1
Athens	Trimble	1	0
	Glouster	1	0
	Amesville	1	0
	Chauncey	1	0
	Jacksonville	1	0
Auglaize	Buckland	1	1
	Cridersville	1	1
Brown	Fayetteville	1	0
	Mount Orab	1	0
Champaign	Mechanicsburg	1	1
	Saint Paris	1	0
Clark	South Charleston	1	0
Clermont	Batavia	1	0
	Bethal	2	0
Columbiana	Hañoverton	3	0
Crawford	New Washington	1	0
Cuyahoga	Brantenahl	3	2
	Hunting Valley	2	1
	Valley View	2	1
	Cuyahoga Heights	3	1
	North Randall	4	1
	Walton Hills	1	1
	Warrensville	1	0
Darke	Arcanum	1	0
	Union City	1	1
	Versailles	2	0
Erie	Berlin Heights	1	0
	Kelleys Island	5	0
	Milan	3	1
Franklin	New Albany	1	0
	Valley View	1	0

COUNTY	AGENCY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Fulton	Fayette	3	1
	Metamora	1	0
Hamilton	Arlington Heights	1	1
	Cleves	2	1
	Glendale	2	1
	Newtown	2	1
	Terrace Park	2	1
Hancock	McComb	2	0
Holmes	Killbuck	1	0
Huron	Greenwich	2	0
	Monroeville	2	1
	New London	3	0
	Wakeman	3	1
Jefferson	Brilliant	2	1
	Smithfield	2	1
Knox	Fredericktown	3	1
Lake	Madison	3	1
	Grand River	1	0
	Lakeline	1	0
Licking	Alexandria	1	0
	Hebron	1	0
	Pataskala	2	0
	Utica	1	0
Logan	DeGraff	1	0
	Lakeview	1	0
	West Mansfield	1	0
	Russells Point	0	1
Lorain	Grafton	2	0
Mahoning	Lowellville	5	1
	New Middleton	3	1
Marion	Prospect	1	0
Medina	Seville	1	1
	Spencer	1	0
Miami	Bradford	1	1
Morgan	Malta	1	0
	McConnelville	3	0

COUNTY	AGENCY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Morrow	Cardington	1	0
Montgomery	Riverside	1	0
	South Clayton	1	0
Muskingum	Dresden	1	0
	New Concord	1	0
	Philo	1	0
	Roseville	2	0
Ottawa	Marblehead	1	0
	Put-In-Bay	3	0
Paulding	Antwerp	1	1
	Grove Hill	1	0
	Payne	1	0
Pickaway	Ashville	1	0
	Commercial Point	2	0
	Orient	1	0
	South Bloomfield	1	0
Pike	Piketon	4	1
Portage	Hiram	2	1
	Mantua	1	0
Preble	Camden	1	0
	Gratis	1	0
	Lewisburg	1	0
	New Paris	1	0
	West Alexandria	0	2
Putnam	Glandorf	1	0
	Continental	1	0
	Kalida	1	0
	Leipsic	1	0
Richland	Bellville	2	1
	Plymouth	1	1
	Butler	2	0
Sandusky	Gibsonburg	1	0
	Green Spring	1	0
	Woodville	1	1
Seneca	Bloomville	1	0
Shelby	Fort Loramie	1	0
	Jackson Center	0	2

COUNTY	AGENCY	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Stark	Beach City	1	0
	East Sparta	1	0
	Hartville	1	1
	Waynesburg	1	0
	Wilmington	1	0
Summit	Boston Heights	2	0
Tuscarawas	Strasburg	2	1
Union	Milford Center	1	0
	Richwood	4	1
Wayne	Doylestown	2	1
	Marshallville	1	0
	Smithville	1	1
Williams	West Unity	1	0
Wood	Rising Sun	1	0
TOTAL		188	46

PREFACE

This report has been prepared especially for chiefs and administrative officers in Ohio's 461 smallest municipal police departments, all of which serve municipal populations of under 2,500 people. It analyzes the responses of some two hundred officers from those 123 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) 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 188 "smallest municipality" patrol officers were responding to the survey in terms of frequency (of use or performance), 46 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 250,000 pieces of information in the "smallest municipality" 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, 188 were drawn from police departments in 123 of Ohio's 461 smallest municipalities. These 188 officers represent 8.4% of the total law enforcement population in Ohio and 7.3% of the survey population as tabled below.

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 smallest municipalities. Wherever possible these 188 officers will be compared to their peers throughout the remainder of the State.

Regarding sex and race characteristics, the smallest municipal police displayed a smaller percentage of blacks and females in their departments when compared to their "balance of state" counterparts. Table 2 below reflects these differences.

TABLE 2
OFFICERS' RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS

	123 Smallest City Agencies	Balance of State
White	96%	89%
Black	1%	9%
Other	3%	2%
Male	96%	93%
Female	4%	7%

In terms of age, nearly seven out of ten small municipality officers were under the age of 35, whereas the "balance of state" reflected a slightly higher percentage (80%) of officers under the age of 35. 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 smallest municipality officers have achieved more academically than the high school diploma required to become a peace officer in Ohio. Thirty-one percent of the municipal officers surveyed in the smallest jurisdictions have completed at least one year of post high school education.

TABLE 3
OFFICERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVELS PRIOR TO
JOINING AND AT PRESENT:
SMALLEST MUNICIPALITIES
VS.
BALANCE OF STATE

	PRIOR TO JOINING		PRESENT	
	123 Smallest Municipalities	Balance of State	123 Smallest Municipalities	Balance of State
Less Than High School	13%	2%	11%	1%
High School	63%	43%	58%	36%
1-2 Years of College	18%	37%	23%	39%
3-4 Years of College	5%	17%	7%	22%
4 + Years of College	1%	1%	1%	2%

Table 3 reflects the emergence of better educated officers both state-wide and in the State's smallest municipalities. The tendency is much more pronounced in the former area, a fact that probably reflects the access to colleges and universities.

Three personal questions relating to job attitudes were also asked. Specifically, these addressed job interest, use of talents and training preparedness. While they are not exhaustive, these three areas are fundamentally important influences upon officer morale. The responses of the 188 officers from the 123 smallest municipalities are contained in Tables 4-6.

TABLE 4
"MY JOB IS..."

	Number	Percent
Very Dull	1	1%
Dull	2	1%
So So	12	6%
Interesting	92	49%
Very Interesting	81	43%
	188	100%

TABLE 5

"MY JOB UTILIZES MY TALENT..."

	Number	Percent
Not at All	0	0%
Very Little	13	7%
Fairly Well	71	38%
Quite Well	69	37%
Very Well	35	18%
	188	100%

TABLE 6

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

	Number	Percent
Not at all	1	1%
Somewhat	52	27%
Well	88	47%
Very Well	47	25%
	188	100%

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 comfortable with the degree to which their training prepared them for the actual duties they are called upon to perform. Regarding the utilization of talent, the municipal officer's responses closely paralleled the "balance of state" responses. However, in reference to the basic training question, the "balance of state" officers responded less positively than did their "smallest municipality" counterparts.

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 differences between the municipal officers and their "balance of state" counterparts.

TABLE 7

PATROL OFFICERS WITH PRIOR
LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE

	123 Small Municipalities	Balance of State
Security Guard	30%	28%
Military Police	13%	14%
Municipal Police	32%	19%
Police Reserve	43%	22%
Deputy Sheriff	21%	11%
Other	3%	6%

Particularly noticeable are the differences to be found in the "police reserve", "military police" and "deputy sheriff" positions, areas in which the "smallest municipality" officers exhibit substantially more prior experience than other officers throughout the State. For the most part the other job categories are virtually balanced.

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 123 smallest municipalities. Because of the large city influence, the "balance of state" reflects a smaller percentage of one-person vehicles and a substantially larger percentage of two-person vehicles.

TABLE 8
 TYPES OF PATROL
 BY
 TYPE OF JURISDICTION

	123 Smallest Municipalities	Balance of State
1-Person Vehicle	74%	63.0%
2-Person Vehicle	6%	23.0%
Motorcycle	0%	.5%
Foot	0%	.5%
Foot and Vehicle	18%	6.0%
Other	2%	7.0%
	100%	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 188 municipal officers did differ slightly from their "balance of state" peers in terms of work shifts, showing a greater percentage of officers working split, odd, and other shifts.

TABLE 9
 WORK SHIFT: MUNICIPAL PATROL OFFICERS

	Number	Percent
Day	33	18%
Afternoon	41	22%
Midnight	34	18%
Split Shift	23	12%
Odd Shift	40	21%
Other	17	9%
	188	100%

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 123 smallest municipalities would seem to document less plentiful levels of manpower and, hence, less rigidly enforced lines of specialization of duties. In larger departments, however, additional manpower and rigidly enforced lines of specialization reduce the frequency with which officers are called upon to perform tasks of a higher rank.

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

	123 Smallest Municipalities	Balance of State
Never	16%	20%
Seldom	22%	33%
Occasionally	34%	33%
Frequently	18%	9%
Very Frequently	10%	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 most frequent ways in which these incidents are handled. The scale below represents the categories officers could choose from when recording their responses.

COMPLAINT/INCIDENT SCALE				
When I Respond To This Type of Complaint/Incident I Usually:				
0	1	2	3	4
I have never responded to this type of complaint/incident.	Make log entry only.	Conduct preliminary investigation and write report.	Conduct complete investigation and write report.	Other response or some combination of previous 3.

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

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF "SMALLEST MUNICIPALITY" POLICE OFFICERS NEVER ENCOUNTERING...

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Never"
...Dead Body	33%
...Evictions	61%
...False Fire Alarms	32%
...Impersonating an Officer	73%
...Motor Vehicle Hijacking	93%

The following three tables illustrate the selected types of investigations conducted by the "smallest municipality" officers in response to a variety of complaint/incidents.

TABLE 12

"LOG ONLY" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINT/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Log Only"
Abandoned House	30%
Citizen Lockout	46%
Downed Wires	26%
Loud Party	23%
Perimeter Control at Fire	32%

TABLE 13

"PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Preliminary Investigation Only"
Arson	20%
Child Abuse	30%
Criminal Sexual Conduct	10%
Homicide	10%
Motor Vehicle Theft	15%

TABLE 14

"COMPLETE INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES FOR COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Officers Responding "Complete Investigation"
Concealed Weapons	49%
Disorderly Public Conduct	64%
Drunk in Public	56%
Traffic Accidents	75%
Traffic Offenses	68%

EQUIPMENT

Experience dictates that various equipment items play a prominent role in the effective performance of an officer's duties. As such, the tables below report equipment items frequently and seldom used by patrol officers in the course of their work. It is worth noting that some items (i.e. shotgun, first aid kit, fire extinguisher), although infrequently used, are rated by supervisors as very important to the patrol function. Additionally, while some responses would seem to 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
(SMALLEST 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%	96%
Body Armor	45%	76%	83%
Handcuffs	59%	96%	100%
Hand Held Radio	90%	100%	100%
LEADS Terminal	61%	87%	24%*
Radar Unit	90%	87%	83%
Spotlight	93%	98%	98%
Typewriter	76%	83%	48%

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

TABLE 16

INFREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS
(SMALLEST 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	9%	39%	78%
Breathalyzer	23%	59%	7%*
Drug/Narcotics Kit	11%	63%	52%
First Aid Kit	16%	87%	72%
Radio Car Computer	5%	13%*	7%**
Riot Baton	2%	48%	67%
Shotgun	12%	94%	83%

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

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

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

TABLE 17
SUPERVISORS' RATING OF INFORMATION SOURCES MOST OFTEN USED
(SMALLEST 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	48%	87%	52%
Department Manuals	67%	78%	83%
First Aid Manuals	41%	63%	78%
Interoffice Memos	59%	48%	76%
Local Ordinances	80%	89%	89%
Ohio Criminal Code and Procedures	73%	93%	65%
Ohio Vehicle Code	62%	93%	83%
Training Bulletins	49%	74%	89%
Wanted Bulletins	51%	74%	98%

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 SMALLEST MUNICIPALITIES

	NEVER USED
Airport Field Conditions Report	97%
FAA Bulletins	75%
Fish and Game Code	81%
Harbor Statutes	96%
Health Statutes	60%
Interstate Commerce Commission Rules	83%
Field Guides	43%
Weather Forecasts	40%

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 <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 Persons to Other Officer	72%	91%	91%
Exchange Information with Other Law Enforcement Officials	83%	96%	89%
Locate Documents and Information in Records System	50%	76%	87%
Receive and Evaluate Telephone Request for Police Service	54%	67%	83%
Request Equipment Repair	43%	89%	100%
Request Verification of Warrants Before Service	40%	89%	91%
Type Incident Reports	66%	70%	81%
Write Interoffice Memos	42%	37%	76%

TABLE 20

SELDOM PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE 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
Analyze Crime	14%	50%	41%
Attend Inservice Training	10%	81%	85%
Conduct Investigations	3%	39%	44%*
Fingerprint Persons	4%	17%	61%
Investigate and Report Background Information	3%	74%	54%
Issue Wanted Notices	12%	63%	74%
Participate in Firearms Training	17%	91%	83%
Participate in Planning	0%	24%*	20%**

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

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

ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE

Of the 24 "arrest, search and seizure" tasks identified in the survey, five of the more frequently performed tasks are reflected in Table 21 below along with importance and learning difficulty ratings provided by the supervisors from the smallest 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
Conduct Frisk	32%	94%	94%
Handcuff Suspect	26%	96%	89%
Arrest Persons Without a Warrant	31%	76%	63%
Conduct Field Search	24%	91%	85%
Issue Citations for Non-Traffic Offenses	24%	76%	85%

Most of the above tasks were rated highly by supervisors regarding importance and ease in learning with the exception of "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.

Also presented in Table 22 are those "arrest, search, and seizure" tasks which were never performed by a plurality of the municipal patrol officers.

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	81%	30%*	24%*
Request Bystanders to Assist in an Apprehension	73%	9%*	35%*
Secure Search Warrant	54%	83%	39%
Take Into Custody Person Detained by Citizen	56%	48%	59%
Participate in Raid	42%	52%	46%

* "Never encountered" category was higher than 50% 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 <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 Homes While on Vacation	76%	94%	100%
Check Parking Lots	92%	74%	91%
Check Parks	92%	83%	96%
Inform Dispatcher of Status	96%	100%	98%
Make Entries In Log	90%	91%	98%

The "patrol functions" listing also contained several tasks which were maintenance in nature (e.g., clean weapons, inspect cruiser, etc.). Because these are supplemental to, but not indicative of, patrol operations their ratings were not included in the calculating of the 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 diffusing most 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 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 Nature of Complaint	59%	78%	91%
Give Street Directions	81%	61%	98%
Interview Suspicious Persons	58%	87%	72%
Investigate Suspicious Vehicles	72%	91%	89%
Stop Vehicle to Cite	70%	87%	78%
Talk to Establish Rapport	82%	91%	83%
Warn Offenders in Lieu of Arrest	75%	67%	91%

TABLE 25

SELDOM PERFORMED 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
Accept Bond	5%	9%*	13%*
Evacuate Persons	1%	67%	65%
Fight Structural Fires	2%	13%*	7%*
Fight Vehicle Fires	2%	33%	33%**
Place Children in Protective Custody	0%	61%	43%
Search for Bombs	1%	50%	15%
Watch for Illegal Activity	1%	17%**	20%**

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

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

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 <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
Determine Whether Incidents Are Criminal or Civil Matters	45%	93%	72%
Interview Complainants, Witnesses, etc.	61%	91%	67%
Locate Witnesses to Crime	30%	89%	59%
Tag Evidence and Confiscated Properties	27%	91%	96%
Take Statements of Witnesses	54%	91%	89%
Cast Impressions At Crime Scene	2%	54%	30%
Organize and Conduct Station House Line-ups	1%	35%*	24%*
Prepare Paperwork To File Extradition Warrants	2%	26%*	13%*
Serve as Deputy Medical Examiner	0%	0%**	0%**
Witness Autopies	1%	22%*	24%*

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

** Over ninety 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 27

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
Appear in Court (other than as a witness)	26%	67%	65%
Confer with Prosecutor Prior to Testimony In Case	29%	83%	85%
Discuss Cases with Prosecutors Following Legal Proceedings	20%	72%	87%
Review Reports and Notes For Court Testimony	29%	83%	74%
Testify in Criminal Cases	25%	87%	57%
Assemble Potential Juror List	0%	9%*	9%*
Mail Jury Duty Notices	1%	4%*	7%*
Testify in Liquor Board Hearings	0%	26%**	28%**
Testify in Parole or Probation Hearings	1%	24%**	37%**
Testify in Secretary of State Implied Consent Hearings	0%	17%*	15%*

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

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

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 <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 The Standard Traffic Accident Report Form	57%	96%	91%
Determine Violations in a Traffic Accident	53%	96%	72%
Diagram Accident Scenes	54%	96%	74%
Interview Persons Involved in Traffic Accidents	53%	94%	94%
Identify Persons Involved in Accident	53%	96%	91%
Calculate Vehicle Speed Using Mathematical Formulas	3%	33%*	13%*
Interview Tow Truck Operators for Relevant Information	14%	30%	70%
Review Accidents with Accident Investigators	10%	52%	72%
Take Coordinate Measures of Accident Scenes	28%	76%	65%
Test Operating Condition of Accident Vehicle Equipment	22%	52%	65%

* Over forty-five 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.

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%	93%	72%
Follow Suspect Vehicle to Observe Traffic Violations	67%	78%	87%
Inspect Operator's License	83%	100%	89%
Issue Traffic Citations	87%	94%	94%
Issue Verbal Warnings to Traffic Violators	85%	70%	96%
Complete Operator's License Re-Examination Form	3%	31%	52%
Count Traffic Flow Using Automatic Devices	2%	9%*	15%*
Issue Traffic Citations to Bicycle Riders	2%	22%**	37%
Move Disabled Vehicles with Patrol Car	1%	7%*	22%
Operate Video Tape Equipment	3%	9%*	11%*

* Over seventy-five 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 chiefs, but also to prospective recruits. Listed below are seven selected routine physical activities performed monthly or more frequently by patrol officers in Ohio's 123 smallest municipalities.

TABLE 30
PERFORMANCE FREQUENCY FOR SEVEN SELECTED
PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

	Monthly or More Often	Never
Climb Obstacles	12%	16%
Jump Over Obstacles	12%	24%
Lift Heavy Objects or Persons	14%	24%
Physically Push Movable Object	15%	13%
Run After Suspects	10%	8%
Run Up Stairs	10%	17%
Subdue Persons Resisting Arrest	16%	9%

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 91 of the "smallest municipality" patrol officers. The remaining 97 officers indicated no such activity for that time frame. As will become evident the task analysis study went to tedious lengths to measure these activities in feet, inches, pounds, etc. This was done because most departmental standards, especially physical standards, are measured in those same units.

TABLE 31
ACTIVITY STATUS FOR LAST FIVE WORK SHIFTS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Activity	96	51%
Activity Without Resistance	63	34%
Activity With Resistance	28	15%
TOTAL	187	100%

It is interesting to note that in analyzing all the city police department categories, a trend toward inactivity becomes evident with a decrease in jurisdiction size. That is, a smaller percentage of big city officers are inactive as compared to small city officers. Conversely, the small municipality police officers are less likely than their big city counterparts to engage in activities 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 "smallest municipality" patrol officers during what they described as the "most strenuous physical activity of their last five work shifts." (Note: All of the remaining tables reflect descriptions of that same activity.)

TABLE 32
RUNNING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 24 yards	30	57%
25 to 49 yards	10	19%
50 to 74 yards	5	9%
75 to 99 yards	2	4%
100 yards and over	6	11%
TOTAL	53	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

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ditch	3	8%
Fence or Wall	2	5%
Shrubs	3	8%
Stairs	5	13%
Vehicle	5	13%
2 of the above	7	18%
3 of the above	4	10%
Other	10	25%
TOTAL	39	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 "smallest municipality" police officers crawled during their last five work shifts.

TABLE 34
CRAWLING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 3 feet	7	70%
4 to 6 feet	1	10%
7 to 9 feet	2	20%
10 to 12 feet	0	0%
13 feet and over	0	0%
TOTAL	10	100%

The typical police officer in Ohio does not engage in the stunts that characterize law enforcement work as depicted on television. Still, some of the officers from the smallest 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

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 3 feet	9	41%
4 to 6 feet	13	59%
7 to 9 feet	0	0%
10 to 12 feet	0	0%
TOTAL	<u>22</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE JUMPING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ditch	5	19%
Fence	3	11%
Shrubs	1	4%
Stairs	2	7%
Vehicle	2	7%
2 of the above	4	15%
3 of the above	4	15%
Other	6	22%
TOTAL	<u>27</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE CLIMBING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ditch	0	0%
Embankment	4	15%
Fence	5	19%
Ladder	4	15%
Stairs	12	44%
Other	2	7%
TOTAL	<u>27</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

TABLE 38

OBSTACLES WITH HANDHOLDS AND FOOTHOLDS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Foothold	3	25%
Handhold	5	42%
Solid	4	33%
TOTAL	<u>12</u>	<u>100%</u>

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 "smallest municipality police" respondents.

TABLE 39

CLIMBING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
5 feet or less	2	8%
6 to 10 feet	10	42%
11 to 20 feet	9	38%
21 feet and over	<u>3</u>	<u>12%</u>
TOTAL	<u>24</u>	<u>100%</u>

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)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	16	62%
20 to 39 feet	5	19%
40 to 59 feet	4	15%
60 to 79 feet	0	0%
80 feet and over	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>
TOTAL	<u>26</u>	<u>100%</u>

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 smallest municipal departments.

TABLE 41

PUSHING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	0	0%
50 to 99 pounds	1	4%
100 to 149 pounds	3	11%
150 to 199 pounds	1	4%
200 pounds and over	<u>21</u>	<u>81%</u>
TOTAL	<u>26</u>	<u>100%</u>

It is evident from the table above that a majority of officers pushed extremely heavy objects. Some of this can be explained by the fact that 18 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; over half, 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)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	14	64%
20 to 39 feet	7	32%
40 to 59 feet	1	4%
60 to 79 feet	0	0%
80 feet and over	0	0%
TOTAL	<u>22</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 43

PULLING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	1	4%
50 to 99 pounds	1	4%
100 to 149 pounds	2	8%
150 to 199 pounds	13	52%
200 pounds and over	8	32%
TOTAL	<u>25</u>	<u>100%</u>

Since over 90% of the officers pulled objects weighing in excess of 100 pounds it might suggest that persons were the objects pulled. In fact, eight-out-of-ten of the officers pulled persons, but 40 percent of these officers received assistance in their pulling encounter. Additionally, 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, three-fourths of those officers engaging in lifting did so to heights under five feet.

TABLE 44

LIFTING (HEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 foot	5	21%
2 feet	3	13%
3 feet	8	33%
4 feet	2	8%
5 feet and over	6	25%
TOTAL	<u>24</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

TABLE 45

CARRYING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	12	48%
20 to 39 feet	7	28%
40 to 59 feet	1	4%
60 to 79 feet	1	4%
80 feet and over	4	16%
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 46
LIFTING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	6	21%
50 to 99 pounds	2	7%
100 to 149 pounds	4	14%
150 to 199 pounds	10	36%
200 pounds and over	<u>6</u>	<u>21%</u>
TOTAL	28	99%*

Slightly more than 60 percent of these patrol officers carried people; and over one-third of them got some assistance.

As could be expected, a number of the officers engaging in physical activities met resistance (15%). The majority (61%) of these officers had to contend with only one suspect, with another 12% being forced to grapple with two. Eighty-seven percent of the resisters were males.

One conclusion pointed out by the data is that reasoning with resistive suspects is difficult in most cases. Less than 30% 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

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Drug or alcohol influence	23	70%
Emotionally or mentally upset	5	15%
Mental State Unknown	2	6%
No Opportunity to Reason	<u>3</u>	<u>9%</u>
TOTAL	33	100%

* Percent does not total to 100% due to rounding.

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

TABLE 48
TYPES OF RESISTANCE

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Barricade	3	(10%)	27	(90%)
Hit/Kick	20	(65%)	11	(35%)
Passive Resistance	7	(23%)	24	(77%)
Pulled Away	24	(80%)	6	(20%)
Special Tactics	4	(13%)	26	(87%)
Ran Away	8	(27%)	22	(73%)
Threw Object	10	(33%)	20	(67%)
Weapon	8	(28%)	21	(72%)
Wrestled	25	(81%)	6	(19%)

By far the vast majority (97%) of officers encountering resistance issued verbal orders to their suspects. Less than one-third (30%) 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

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Chemical Agent	1	(3%)	30	(97%)
Discharge Firearm	2	(7%)	29	(93%)
Display Firearm	3	(9%)	29	(91%)
Handcuffs with Assistance	18	(58%)	13	(42%)
Handcuffs without Assistance	13	(42%)	18	(58%)
Hit/Kick	12	(39%)	19	(61%)
Nightstick/Blackjack	6	(19%)	25	(81%)
Restraining Holds	27	(87%)	4	(13%)
Wrestled	23	(74%)	8	(26%)
Other Force	2	(10%)	17	(90%)

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. (forthcoming)

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