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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

DISSETATION CONCEPT

This study investigates the factors affecting the selection and screening decisions of police departments. It uses indicators that characterize the organizational environments of police departments to ask questions about whether these selection practices are affected by various contingencies such as a philosophical shift in police management, budget constraints, educational requirements, crime and clearance rates, citizen complaints, and the existence of a civilian review board. Unlike previous studies investigating the effects of using different selection techniques on selecting high-quality officers, this study tries to elicit information about the determinants of recruitment policies of police departments. In that sense, the study provides a new look to recruitment studies and contributes to the current literature an understanding of police departments’ concerns and priorities about recruitment.

The recruitment and selection of effective and competent employees and executive leaders are critical for public and nonprofit agencies because agencies depend on their staff to achieve their mission (Colarelli & Siegel, 1964, p. 287; Lipset et al., 1964; Tielsch & Whisenand, 1977, p. 1; Hogue & Black, 1994, p.113; Pynes, 2001, p. 219; Lavigna & Hays, 2004, p. 237, Slonaker, 2001, p. 289). Recruitment in law enforcement agencies is particularly important because police officers have the power to
enforce laws, a power not available to regular citizens. Exercise of this power, however, requires police officers to use a considerable amount of discretion. The cases and situations police officers encounter are highly risky, stressful, far from close supervision, and have the potential for officers to follow their impulses in an inappropriate manner that risks the lives of both officers and citizens. The critical aspect of police actions and possibility of making life-threatening decisions leaves officers and departments subject to “greater scrutiny of risks including civil liability” (Kelling et al., 1988, p.1-7). This liability risk requires that a police force be competent and appropriately trained; however, the outcome of training is bound to the quality of recruitment. If the people hired are not capable of succeeding on the job, then it is less likely that the training can compensate for the gap (Goulton & Field, 1995; Otu, 2005).

Police misconduct produces negative results, such as monetary judgments against the agency, and leads to increased costs for investigations and manpower. Manpower shortages result from suspensions, dismissals, and temporary reassignments (Goulton & Field, 1995). Police misconduct also diminishes morale and has the potential to generate other risks, such as the loss of trust in the community. Lynch (1995) suggests that recruiting the best possible people is one of the most fundamental ways for administrators to reduce liability risks. Considering the issues of power and the potential risks of civil liability and inefficiency, it is crucial that the selection of police officers be handled carefully. An effort must be made to find the best available methods and/or techniques for identifying and selecting high-quality officers. Planning for and selecting qualified and competent officers must be done with a strategic purpose because “it is people who deliver
the programs and services that public and nonprofit stakeholders expect” (Pynes, 2004, pp. 168-170, Bowman et al., 2006, p.1). In other words, if the initial selection decision is poorly made, then the department is faced with retaining an incompetent officer for 20 years or more. The Commission of Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies Inc. (CALEA, 1999), also requires law enforcement agencies to identify and employ the most suitable candidates for the job, not merely eliminate the least qualified.

In explaining this challenge, Tracy (2001) compares private- and public-sector recruitment policies. She suggests that if the organization is an industrial one, it may be easy to fire a manager if one does not believe that the person is capable of managing the company. But in governmental organizations, it is difficult to fire any person selected through certain processes unless there is convincing evidence that the person’s behavior is definitely criminal or strongly unethical. The wrong decision about the selection costs the organization greatly in terms of time, money, and energy spent for training, compensation, and other activities. But much worse than this is the diminished productivity that results in the loss of trust among stakeholders (p. 6-11).

Thus, selection decisions have vital and long-term implications for a department. Considering that recruitment and selection are ongoing processes that recur throughout the career of an officer, the importance of these actions become clearer because once selected for an entry-level position by a specific department, the officer is likely to be involved in selection procedures involving appointment to different assignments (e.g., detective, juvenile officer, crime technician, patrol officer), different ranks (e.g., promotional examinations), and different school/training programs (Goultan &
Field, 1995). No matter how well a department is organized or administered, if the officers who perform daily police responsibilities are not of the highest caliber, then the department will not reach its full potential in terms of maintaining order, reducing crime, and providing important services to the community (Gaines & Kappeler, 1992, pp. 107-123). In applying the theory of constraints developed by Taylor (2003) to public-safety hiring, it is possible to say that “output of multiple process system that is dependent upon the previous systems will be constrained by the least productive process” (Taylor et al., 2003, p. 367). A failure in selecting high-caliber officers will diminish the success rates in overall departmental performance.

Taylor (1972) focuses on the concept of consumer protection as it relates to comments that different publics have been raising about the effectiveness of merit systems: First, public administrators ask for more control of personnel functions to make them more responsive to their employee’s needs because the employees’ success or failure largely depends on their workforce. The public who pays taxes and receives government services question the competency of some civil servants. The applicant group questions the fairness and validity of the selection tools. Taylor goes on to say that the Civil Rights Act and the Guidelines of Employee Selection Procedures from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission are in part responses to this problem. Governmental organizations, however, are expected to apply more scrutiny and effort in these selection procedures (Taylor, 1972, p. 1). Such procedures seem more challenging in light of what Pynes (2001, p. 219) suggests: “Police selection is important to public administrators because approximately 61% of a local government’s budget is spent on
law enforcement operations.”

**DISSERTATION PLAN**

This study includes a literature review together with a theoretical background to review the previous research, a methodology, a research-design section based on the analysis of three merged relevant data sets (i.e., LEMAS, UCR, and Census), and a conclusion section. Limitations and potential future research also will be discussed in the conclusion chapter. In that chapter, the findings of the research will be discussed in the frame of theoretical background and current literature as well. The objective of this study is to draw conclusions about the determinants of the diverse selection and screening techniques used in police departments in the United States. One expected result is the relationship between the organizational change from traditional to community policing, which highlights a strong collaboration between the police and the community in solving problems and with the recruitment process. Budgetary concerns also are expected to be highly correlated with selection practices because practices need certain tests or devices that require the allocation of money. Another expectation from the study is the relationship between recruitment and crime clearances and citizen complaints.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

OVERVIEW

The literature review on recruitment and selection comprises two segments that are relevant and complementary to each other. The first section reviews the concept of recruitment and selection in human resource management followed by a historical background of American personnel management aiming to reveal the background of law enforcement recruitment and selection. The second part reviews the relevant theories for recruitment in law enforcement.

Recent trends in management and administration tend to put an emphasis on human capital, recognizing that “employees are an agency’s most important organizational asset” (Pynes, 2005). It is workers who define the organization’s character, affect its performance, and represent its knowledge base (Kiyonaga, 2004). Economic issues such as globalization, worker productivity, and outsourcing require a “ready, willing and able” workforce (Kiyonaga, 2004; Lavigna & Hays, 2004). A study on human resource trends conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management suggested that respondents considered “finding and keeping qualified candidates to be the greatest employment challenge” (cited from Pynes, 2005, p.XVII). The same concern was shared by a large group of police chiefs. The Major Cities Chiefs
Association’s Critical Issues Study Group that was created to study the most imperative issues of its members issued a report titled *Meeting Law Enforcement’s Responsibilities, Solving the Serious Issues of Today*, which contained a chapter on recruiting and retention problems. Within that chapter, Deputy Chief David Beam of the Marietta, Georgia, Police Department said, “Recruiting and retaining professionals compatible for law enforcement duty is quite possibly the most difficult task facing law enforcement today” (Bowman et al., 2006, pp. 122-123).

Today’s changing environment and increasing demands for quality and fairness force human resource managers to focus on increasing the human quality within their organizations. They must demonstrate new sensitivity to the full range of human capabilities (including emotional intelligence), align human resource efforts with strategic objectives, and integrate various human resource activities so that people are consistently encouraged to achieve desired results (Rothwell, 2002; Beamount, 1974, p. 427).

Pynes (2005) highlights the changes in human resource management today and asserts that public and nonprofit sector jobs are “increasingly professional in nature, requiring a higher level of education. At the same time, there has been a decrease in jobs that are physically demanding.” She argues that employers must ask themselves how to meet the public’s objectives and satisfy the organization’s stakeholders simply because employees in public and nonprofit agencies often deal with a variety of people, many of whom have a stake in the agency. Taxpayers, clients, customers, elected officials, donors,
contractors, board members, and special interest groups are just some of the stakeholders concerned about agency performance (Pynes, 2005, Preface, p xv).

Reichenberg (2002) also emphasizes the changes and new dilemmas in human resource management. To him, rapid change in technology and economic conditions requires a highly versatile workforce, but current civil service system is far from eliminating the threat of high turnover and poses a lack of competent and skilled replacements. He argues that the widespread understanding of career as the loyalty to the organization no longer works and is of little value. Budget limitations, he argues, place government at a disadvantage in a time when the private sector competes with government to capture the best and the brightest employees. Reichenberg argues that through the widespread perception about harsh government policies, government is no longer seen an employer of choice.

Dubois and Rothwell (2004) similarly highlight the difficulties and challenges in making the recruitment process positive and productive. He does so by discussing the traditional ways employee recruitment and selection are handled:

- Decision makers are unwilling to make the substantial investments in time, money, and effort that are necessary for researching and validating competencies for any of the organization’s jobs.

- The organization’s resources are limited and cannot be committed to establishing a competency-based approach.

- The organization’s need is for unskilled or semiskilled workers with whom the competency-based approach is not especially useful.
• Candidates’ competencies already have been documented or verified through a comprehensive and systematic process, as is the case with medical doctors, and only minimal additional competency assessment must be completed in order to select a capable job candidate.

• Recruitment and selection activities must be completed within a very limited period of time (p. 110).

Selection, like other human resource functions, is strictly tied to the organization’s strategic management. Strategic management refers to the process through which the organization addresses the competitive challenges it faces. The goals of strategic human resource management are “to acquire, deploy, and allocate human resources in ways that provide the organization a competitive advantage.” Many of the competitive challenges facing organizations today are related to changes in technology, communications, and the way work is organized and performed (Schmitt & Chan, 1998). Klehe (2004) emphasizes the same concept, commenting that an organization’s decision regarding a specific selection procedure depends on such diverse aspects as perceived short- and long-term financial impact of the procedure, shareholder interests, size, legal regulations that vary from nation to nation and proximity to governmental agencies, anticipated applicant and recruiter reactions, the organization’s history of legal charges against its personnel selection procedures, the number of applicants per vacancy, and the organization’s need to fill the vacant posts (pp. 328-329).

Certain preconditions must be met in order to make the selection procedure a success. Lavingna & Hays (2004) argue that “without legitimate and transparent political
institutions, for example, the public personnel system is likely to be controlled by
privileged groups and castes” (also in Anderson, 1987). Namely, in the absence of an
objective bipartisan civil service, some other factors such as political affiliation, familial
relationships, and other contacts will influence recruitment policies and procedures.

The professionalization of police service requires competent and qualified
employees as well. Hogue et al. (1994) discuss this need, suggesting that “law
enforcement officers routinely exercise a great deal of power, have substantial discretion
in the application of the law to specific offenders, experience situations that include
exposure to potential for inappropriate personal enrichment, and generally receive
marginal salaries” (p. 114). Given these factors, the selection of candidates with high
moral values and strong personal strength is necessary. However, the researchers admit
that selection on the basis of moral characteristics that does not have the appearance of
being arbitrary is difficult because the measurement of morality is difficult at best (Hogue
et al., 1994, p. 113). Because public safety officers are often the most visible employees
of local governments, “unqualified officers, officers inappropriately trained, and officers
subject to lax supervision” place a local government at risk (Pynes, 2001, p. 219). The
need for high ethical standards springs from the nature of police work; it involves
“dealing with many persons who are ethically deficient” and frequently presents unusual
opportunities and temptations that require more than an average moral stamina to
withstand” (Wilson, 1953, p. 842).

The International Association of Chiefs of Police also states:

No matter how perfect the organization of a force is, how progressive its
policies are, or how advanced its methods and techniques are, it is not likely to
provide a good quality of service unless suitable attention is given to personnel administration and the quality of the people selected (Wilson, 1953, p.840).

Poor recruiting and selection procedures result in the hiring and promotion of personnel who cannot or will not communicate effectively with diverse populations, exercise discretion properly, or perform the multitude of functions required of the police. Miller and Braswell (2002) argue that the American public attitude against police generally fosters criticism and cynicism reinforced by the American culture of individual freedom (p. 1). The researchers also emphasize the media effect and go on to say that the media are also quick to publicize criticism of law enforcement and slow to offer praise. They suggest that on occasions where officers risk their lives to stop a criminal, the public tend not to praise it but see the issue as merely the police simply performing their job. However, the wrongful and/or illegal acts of a few officers have the potential to affect the image of all law enforcement officers (pp. 2-3).

Klockars and his colleagues (2006) approach the discussion from a different but relevant point. They argue that in developing an environment of integrity within a department, two key issues are recruitment and training. They warn that even the most sophisticated and inclusive training program will fail if standards for recruitment and selection are compromised by a lack of resources or trained personnel of high integrity, inadequate hiring standards or their application, and/or a lack of qualified candidates for police officer positions (Klockars et al., 2006, p. 165). A direct linkage to law enforcement is in Trautman’s research. Trautman, executive director of the Florida-based National Institute of Ethics, (2002) in his study of all 50 states over five years found that
making false statements was the top reason officers were decertified. The most frequent type of falsification was cheating on overtime, and it accounted for 32% of all charges against law enforcement officers. Klockars et al. (2006) also argue that it is imperative to focus more on the selection process to find applicants of diverse socioeconomic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds (p. 165).

For their part, Kelling and Moore (1988) review the evolution of policing strategies. They talk about three eras in the evolutionary process: the early history of selection and the political era; the professional era, where standardization and formalization were underscored; and the community policing era. The community policing era however, lacks information about recruitment and selection. One of the important focuses of this dissertation therefore will be analyses of recruitment and selection in a community policing environment and the revelation. Discussed will be the relationship between community policing and law enforcement recruitment and which selection practices are used and valued.

In spite of the difficulties in drawing clear lines among these three eras, Kelling & Moore argue that the logic behind such a classification is the policing style by which each era is marked. They state that the political era refers to the close ties between the police and politicians, which dates back to the introduction of police organizations into the municipalities around the 1840s and ending in the early 1900s. They continue to say that the reform era was a reaction to this close relationship between the politicians and the police. It had an influence on police organizations and began to erode in 1970s. The time since 1970s emphasizes a focus on the community policing approach.
EARLY HISTORY AND THE POLICITAL ERA

Personnel selection has a long past but a short history (Salgado, 2000, p. 191). Beginning from ancient history, including texts from the Bible, there are many examples about creating standards and assessing talents for different professions. A famous story about Gideon’s selection of his army speaks of how the Lord provided Gideon with a means of choosing the best among his soldiers: “Bring them down unto the water and I will try them for thee there . . . . Separate everyone that lappeth of the water with his tongue, as a dog lappeth, him shalt thou set by himself; likewise everyone that boweth down upon his knees to drink.” (quoted in Tielsch & Whisenand, 1977, p. 9). Similar criteria and assessment views and tools can be found in Plato’s and Cicero’s books as well. Plato, for example, in *The Republic* (380 BCE) discusses the ideal state and suggests that “no two persons are born exactly alike, but each differs from the other in natural endowments, one being suited for one occupation and another for another.” Plato proposes a series of “actions to perform” as tests of military aptitude and gives the first systematic description of aptitude testing on record. He suggests that the guardians of his ideal city should be “keen of perception, strong enough to subdue opponents, and high-spirited in temper.” He goes on to say that at the same time, the guardians of the city should “love wisdom and learning so that they could treat their own people gently” (Harrison, 1999, p. 1).

In American personnel management history, the merit concept was promulgated as the Civil Service Act, also known as the Pendleton Act, in 1883. Before then, there were different periods in the public-career system.
After the U.S. Constitution was announced, President George Washington, in the absence of formalized procedures and selection tools, decided to use “fitness of character” and “qualifications for the post to be filled” as the only criteria for appointing officials to certain posts. His standards of fitness was not similar of today’s standards and included honor, family background, educational attainment, and reputation. This classification led public offices to be dominated by a selected group of landed gentry, professionals, and merchants. It was perhaps an elitist means of employee selection, but the context in which such criteria was overvalued was understandable because President Washington took office during an unstable period. The Constitution was ratified by a narrow margin in several states and the new administration was eager to fight with Federalists, prompting President Washington’s attempt to establish a moral and impartial civil service where “integrity” and “competence” were the required attributes. As historians tell it, the criteria of “fitness of character” produced a highly visible government far from corruption (Hays & Reeves, 1984, pp. 5-6). However, President Washington also took into consideration the political orientation and party affiliation of the people considered for appointments in order to ensure that the posts to be held by his opponents. He was also concerned with establishing a representative government and insisted that local offices be staffed primarily by local residents (p. 7).

President Washington’s principles and criteria for selection were maintained by his successor presidents Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, and John Quincy Adams with few differences; they all resisted the temptation to replace members of the civil service. They also believed that positions were permanent, as they wanted to
avoid pressure for patronage appointments. Presidents Monroe and Adams therefore
delegated their appointing power to the heads of departments, which actually expedited
patronage appointments because department heads had close alliances with party factions
in the Congress and state legislatures.

By the time that Andrew Jackson became president, the career system was
changed to be accessible to segments of the population that had been previously
excluded. Also known as the spoils system, Jackson opened government offices to all
citizens by establishing unity of command and emphasizing both loyalty and competence.
Although seemingly contentious, this effort was intended to remedy the corruption caused
by long tenure in the office, democratize the civil service, and establish a more
representative government. In the end it became another source of corruption because it
guaranteed a job for the party workers (Hays & Reeves, 1984, p. 10; Tielsch &
this era, the only criteria for employee selection were political orthodoxy and investing
time and money for the political campaigns. But this created an atmosphere where there
were many unnecessary jobs, unskilled employees, and continual pressure for a position
by office seekers.

In critiquing Kelling and Moore’s (1988) article on the evolution of policing
strategies, Williams and Murphy (1990) also evaluated three eras with a minority view
arguing that Kelling & Moore neglected to discuss it. They state that “police history was
conditioned by broad social forces and attitudes—including a long history of racism” (p.
2). They contend that segregation and discrimination have not been fully eliminated
through the history of the country and even were supported and/or sustained by rules and laws. This pattern also influenced the police behavior and police work on the side of dealing with minority communities in that it involved keeping minorities under control and providing less law enforcement service to minority communities. The argument of Williams and Murphy is that the position of the police during the political era indicates that police served political interests and thus minority communities, which were politically powerless in those years, received no benefits from law enforcement services.

REFORM ERA AND CLASSICAL SCHOOL

The spoils system in the political era had produced a time of chaos, corruption, and inhumane working conditions. There were no legal protections for employees’ jobs, and working conditions were intolerable. This situation led to some labor-management confrontations, and it also became the milestone for reform in civil service. Supported also by many civic groups and professional associations, President Ulysses S. Grant, endorsed an appropriation bill in 1870 that authorized him “to prescribe such rules and regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service . . . . to employ suitable persons for the conduct of inquiries, to prescribe their duties, and to establish regulations for the conduct of persons who may receive appointments in the civil service.” The successor of presidents Grant and Rutherford B. Hayes continued reforms in civil service and for the first time in American civil service history instituted competitive examinations in the New York City customs house, a practice that later spread to other states. Moreover, he forbade political activity by public employees. The tenure of the next president, James A.
Garfield, again became a time for patronage appointments. Eventually, pressures for a position in the government by many office-seekers resulted in the assassination of Garfield after five months after his inauguration in 1881 by a man who wanted to be the general consulate to Paris. This unexpected event both increased tensions and at the same time opened a window of opportunity to change this corrupted way of personnel management. It accelerated the process of enacting the Pendleton Act of 1883, which was developed and sponsored by George H. Pendleton, a Democrat from Ohio. The Pendleton Act was the most comprehensive reform in civil service.

The Pendleton Act neutralized civil service and ensured that all classes of citizens could compete on a (theoretically) equal footing for public positions. Competence, as determined by competitive examinations, was adopted as the most important selection criterion. It was required that these exams be “practical in character” and related to the duties to be performed (Hayes & Reeves, 1984, p. 16).

A meritorious system, which is the core feature of Pendleton Act, is defined as one where personnel actions are taken on the basis of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of current employees and job applicants rather than factors such as personality or political affiliation (Nalbandian & Klingner, 1985, p. 9). However, differing explanations and definitions of “merit” made the criterion vague and indiscernible for some. Beamount (1974), for example, argues that there is a prevailing belief that a merit system is good, but the way it is practiced is not. He asserts that there are two conflicting meanings of “merit.” One is reward for being deserving and the other for being excellent. He argues that practices to meet one of these criteria differ from those to meet the other. To him, the
competition between these two criteria challenges the basic foundations and beliefs of the merit system. The results are nonrepresentative work forces, poor employee morale, high absenteeism, and low productivity (p. 426). Another definition of “merit” focuses on whether a meritorious selection decision actually is the one that best conforms to the legitimated values the selection is intended to implement. Shafritz (1975) posits that three aspects are crucial to be able to say that a meritorious system reflects the legitimated values. These aspects are efficiency and effectiveness, representativeness, and responsiveness.

Efficiency and effectiveness are related to assessing job applicants on the basis of their technical ability to do the job. Organizational effectiveness, however, is enhanced to the extent that the composition of the bureaucracy mirrors the clientele because the public policy outcomes will be more just if those members of the bureaucracy can be relied upon to promote the interests of those affected by those outcomes. Such a scenario parallels that of a representative legislature. Responsiveness is reflected in personnel actions within the civil service with respect to professional program predispositions as well as political affiliations. In the past, a certain number of positions have been set aside as political appointments to enhance the responsiveness of the executive branch to elected leadership. This discussion asserts that rather than being a values-free system that leads to a routine personnel technology, the traditional merit system embodies specific values that are institutionalized, often at the expense of representativeness, equity, and responsiveness (Nalbandian & Klingner, 1985, pp. 31-45).
Savas and Ginsburg (1973) found that because civil service is not an integral part of management and works independently, it inhibits productivity and fails to respond to the needs of the citizens. Hays and Reeves (1984) argue that the merit system is overseen by many different governmental organizations, such as presidents, Congress, the civil service commissions, courts, and bureaucratic agencies, and that as the number of organizations included increases, it becomes more difficult to coordinate the affairs (p.43). A possible assumption can be that all groups do not work in accordance with each other or in a time sequence and that each part tries to maximize their benefits (e.g., votes on the side of political parties, efficiency on the part of governmental organization). Being a part of the process hence makes the process slower if there are conflicts in their interests. Savas and Ginsburg go on to argue that the merit system is overtly protectionist and makes employees believe that they cannot be fired at all and that they are guaranteed regular pay and promotions in accordance with the theory of boundary rules shaping and limiting the exit rules. One last criticism they make is about the scientific nature of the civil service tests, which initially were generated to provide political neutrality. Tests and digit numbers to assess the quality of applicants and the performance of employees totally neglects the human side of enterprise and, in Sayre’s (1948) words, it becomes a “triumph of techniques over purpose.”

The reform era in policing, Kelling and Moore (1988) note, also highlighted the desire for control over police work, which was hampered significantly through intimate relations between politicians and police and conflicts between urban reformers and local ward leaders (p. 4). Reformers narrowed the police function to crime control and
criminal apprehension; this era represented impersonality between police and the citizens and was aimed at limiting discretion in police work. The idea of policing in the reform era was one that viewed the job as only enforcing the laws.

Williams & Murphy (1990), again with a minority view, suggest that it was only after the reform era that minorities began to increase their political power and to receive more law enforcement services through fairer standards and procedures.

COMMUNITY POLICING ERA

The reform era continued to influence law enforcement until the 1960s and 1970s, but the period before the 1960s was a relatively stable period in American law enforcement. Beginning in the 1960s, disorder became prevalent, and crime rates soared as a result of the growing violence and civil unrest due to the civil rights movement, the anti-Vietnam war movements, the feminist movement, and racial riots that necessitated a revolution in the old ways of policing to find new solutions—including recruitment and selection. This era was distinguished by two fundamental changes in law enforcement: affirmative action programs mandated by the U.S. Congress and the shift to community policing.

Affirmative Action and Minority Recruitment

Even though the First, Fifth, and 14th amendments to the U.S. Constitution prohibited deprivation of employment rights without due process of law, for most of the U.S. history, both private- and public-sector employers felt free to hire and promote and
fire employees according to whatever standard they had established. Affirmative action programs, which first appeared in the Wagner Act in 1935, aimed to eliminate the discrimination with requirements that employers alleviate the conflict regarding labor employment and provide equal employment. Executive Order 8802, issued by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1941, and then the Executive Order 10925, issued by President John F. Kennedy, required all government contracts to bar employment discrimination and to offer employment to applicants regardless of race, color, or creed. In law enforcement, affirmative action also meant hiring and promoting women and minorities to redress past discrimination and to correct racial and gender disparities in the workforce. Similarly, the Fair Employment Practices Commission was created, but World War II limited its capacity to work effectively, and it expired after the war. Seven years after the war, in 1946, President Harry S Truman promulgated Executive Order 9980, which mandated that fair employment be implemented throughout the federal government, but the order was never enforced. The concept of affirmative action also was mentioned in Kennedy’s Executive Order 10925, but it did not call for preferential treatment; it stated only that all applicants were potential employees, regardless of race, creed, or color (adapted from Felkenes & Unsinger, 1992, pp. 4-11).

Increasing demands for equality and employment regardless of race, color, national origin, and sex eventually gave birth to Civil Rights Act of 1964, which also created the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). This groundbreaking legislation had far-reaching effects on the nation’s education and employment policies, providing a strong basis to eliminate any tools supporting discrimination. This period
required organizations to become less homogeneous and more responsive to the needs of various constituents, such as women and people of color, and required an organizational change (Kezar, 2001, p. 2). Williams & Murphy (1990) also suggest that after the 1960s and the civil rights movement, progressive mayors and the police executives appointed by them, efforts were made to distribute more police services, use less deadly force, and respect individual rights for minority communities (p. 2).

Affirmative action programs, however, could not be easily embraced by all police departments. External forces or pressures such as court orders, lawsuits, and financial incentives (e.g., federal grants) helped to make affirmative action programs an integral part of recruitment policies (Allen, 2003, pp. 411-413).

**Community Policing**

The second most significant era in law enforcement history was acknowledged to be community policing, which represented a change in the operational mission of policing (Trajonawitcz et al., 2002; Goldstein, 1987; Manning, 1984; Cordner, 1997; Palfrey, Jr., 2000; Skogan, 1997; Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994; Kratcoski & Dukes, 1995; Pelfrey, 2000).

Trojanowicz et al. (2002) suggest that community policing reflects a different mentality beyond just enforcing laws. It instead emphasizes the importance of “mobilizing neighborhood residents and establishing police-community partnerships” to address crime and its related correlates. Citizens are expected and encouraged to unite and assist police both individually and collectively in addressing a wide range of
community problems rather than relying exclusively on police services. Edwin Meese III (1993) similarly asserts that the community policing era indicated that a “police [force] is not only the highly visible representative of governmental authority but also recognize that their responsibility for community service and peacekeeping is of equal importance to law enforcement and crime suppression” (p.2). Community policing strategy encourages citizens to bring problems directly to beat officers or precinct offices. Police are expected to gather information about citizens’ needs and demands and diagnose the problems and devise possible solutions to be able to best serve to the community (Kelling & Moore, 1988, p. 12).

Community policing was attempted in some U.S. police departments in the 1970s, but serious implementation problems were encountered when management resisted plans for decentralization (Brodeur, 1998). During the 1980s, community policing initiatives were receiving substantial publicity. It was perceived to be more attractive as the level of government funding began to decline. In the late 1980s and 1990s, violence, drug problems, gang activities, and police brutality received growing attention in the media, and police chiefs found themselves under increased pressure to generate more impressive and effective strategies. Several demonstration program, such as foot patrol in Newark, New Jersey, and Flint, Michigan; problem solving projects in Newport News, Virginia; and several community-oriented activities in Newark and Houston, Texas, including storefront mini stations, newsletters, door-to-door contacts, and voluntary community organizations were developed (Brodeur, 1998 pp. 3-29; Miller & Braswell, 2002, pp. 1-3).
This new orientation also required a new type of police officer. The philosophical change required police officers to be independent thinkers and problem solvers rather than just law enforcers who followed regular orders. Meese III (1993) suggests that in community policing, qualities that traditionally have been associated with supervisory roles, such as “leadership, communication skills, and the ability to persuade and motivate others” must also be required for police officers. He goes on to cite the words of a well-known police chief that “the officer in a modern department today must possess many skills including those of information processor, community organizer, crime analyst, counselor, street corner politician, arresting officer, school liaison, and community leader” (p. 5).

Metchik & Wilson (1995) also discuss the new challenges for recruitment in the community policing era. They argue that selection systems in most police departments focus on “selecting out;” namely, eliminating the candidates who do not have the desired skills or have deviant behavior. They go on to say that in the era of community policing where proactive policing is valued and promoted and cooperation and communication with the public become more important, it is of great value to add a “prosocial” aspect to the selection system and the methods used for selection. In other words, it is more crucial to select the best available candidates than it is to eliminate applicants with lower standards (pp. 107-109).
THEORY BUILDING

Many field, such as public administration, law, psychology, sociology, psychiatry, health sciences, criminology, policing, and behavioral sciences, have contributed concepts and theories to the development of the recruitment methods and processes of professions. It is difficult to say, however, that these contributions are well integrated into a general theory of recruitment, particularly for the police profession (Caglar, 2004, p. 348). Despite that difficulty, several existing theories facilitate the description and understanding of the processes involved in the present study of selection decision-making. To best support the processes underlying selection, multiple theories needed to be considered simultaneously. This study explains police recruitment and selection using the following classical-school theories:

- Scientific management, developed by Frederick W. Taylor
- Bureaucratic, developed by Max Weber
- Varieties of institutional theory; in particular, rational choice institutionalism and normative institutionalism
- Organizational change; in particular, evolutionary and teleological change
- Rational choice, or boundary rules, from Ostrom’s (2005) classification of rules

Uncertainty and adverse-selection issues also will be discussed.
ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY

Scientific Management

One of the pioneering studies, which mentions selecting workers/officers based on scientific method, comes from Taylor’s (1910) research on the principles of scientific management. Using the term “scientific management,” Taylor, a mechanical engineer, wanted to eliminate the inefficiency he observed in the workplace. He specifically emphasized using scientific-management tools as opposed to providing incentives to workers to complete their work. Taylor proposed four principles that would increase productivity in the workplace, which include items related to personnel selection as well. These four principles are:

1. The replacement of rule-of-thumb methods for determining each element of a worker’s job with scientific determination. The method requires gathering the traditional knowledge that workers have and then recording, tabulating, and reducing this knowledge to laws, rules, and even to mathematical formulae to get the highest productivity from each worker.

2. The scientific selection and training of workers. This principle posits that selection and training as a duty of management involves studying not only the nature, character, and performance of each worker but also determining each worker’s limitations and the possibility of the worker’s future development. Taylor also suggests that scientific selection is not a single act; it requires year-to-year revision and the subject of continual study.

3. Taylor proposes that the usage of scientific tools and the selection of workers using
scientific methods is not enough; the science and workers must be brought together.

He suggests that the cooperation of management and labor is needed to accomplish work objectives. This is accomplished by bringing science and thus scientifically selected workers together and is required for maximum productivity. Taylor highlights that most of the trouble in the workplace comes from managers (accounting for nine-tenths of the trouble) who are reluctant to do their fair share.

4. Taylor’s last principle is a more equal division of responsibilities between managers and workers. It emphasizes a team approach between management and workers (Robbins, 1990, p. 35; Shafritz et al., 2004, pp. 43-45).

The essence of this approach was to find the “one best way” to achieve the highest productivity possible and stop wasting resources. These principles of scientific management influenced all the 20th century and were embraced by many industrial organizations; however the principles were not being implemented in their entirety. The theory was criticized for what was believed to be an extreme emphasis on specialization among workers and was found to be impractical and difficult to enforce by many managers.

**Bureaucratic Theory**

Another approach that also emphasized the selection of workers based on some procedures and methods was Weber’s (1920) bureaucratic theory. Early in the 20th century, he developed a structure to create a rational and efficient form that he identified as the ideal structure to achieve the ends. What Weber called “bureaucracy” highlighted the
“division of labor, a clear authority of hierarchy, detailed rules and regulations, impersonal relationships and formal selection procedures.” His model envisaged that selection and promotion decisions were based on technical qualifications, competence, and the performance of the candidates. Here selection decisions are based on merit; that is, the candidates’ qualifications become more important than “who they know” (Ostrom, 1989, pp. 25-26; Robbins, 1990, p. 310). As an outgrowth of this reform era, a merit system was created to apply scientific management tools in personnel management to both eliminate political influence and guarantee equal treatment to all applicants through the use of open, competitive examinations, and by freeing an appointee from working for a political party (Stein L., 1987, p. 263; Nalbandian & Klingner, 1985, p. 32-3; Williams et al. 2007, p. 66).

Even though the bureaucratic approach brought standardization and had an enormous effect on even today’s organizations, critiques of the process said that it valued the means more than the ends and limited flexibility. The division of labor created subunits under one authority that in turn produced goal displacement, the displacement of organizational goals with subunit goals, and the loss of organizational effectiveness. Also the impersonality of organizations led to employee alienation and hindered the commitment of employees to the organization’s goals (Robbins, 1990, pp.317).

INSTITUTIONAL THEORY

In explaining law enforcement recruitment and selection, another potential theoretical basis is institutional theory. Institutionalism has its roots in the prebehavioral
times before the World War I (Gunnell, 2005). At first, it just served as descriptions and
normative pieces that advocated democracy (Gunnell, 2005). Peters (YEAR, p. 43) states
that the term “institution” means a variety of different things to different people. Moe
(1990) examines the term “institution” from a structural-political perspective and suggests
that institutions are “structures that emerge and take the specific form they do because
they solve the collective action problems and thereby facilitate gains from trade” (Moe,
pp. 217-218). For March and Olsen (1989), an institution is not necessarily a “formal
structure but rather is better understood as a collection of norms, rules, understandings,
and routines.” Rules and routines are means through which members of an organization
can minimize the transaction and decision-making costs during participation (Peters,
2004, p. 32). They also help institutions monitor and react to change in their work
environments.

Peters (2004) argues that there are four common assumptions of institutions:

1. Institutions have a structural feature. Structure, either formal or informal, is crucial to
   being able to talk about an institution. To understand recruitment in an institutional
   approach, it is a precondition to note that recruitment in law enforcement has a
   structure. There are laws, rules, regulations, norms, and departmental priorities that
   shape recruitment decisions.

2. Institutions require stability over time. This assumption emphasizes that a certain
   amount of time should pass for the rules and regulations to acquire stability and thus
   take effect. In other words, in order to get stability, the rules, regulations, and
   procedures are not supposed to be diverted and/or changed very often. To understand
recruitment in law enforcement, this assumption says that implications for selecting officers should be used for some time to result in stability.

3. Institutions affect individual behavior. This assumption suggests that institutions are rules and that both shape and limit individual behavior. Any individual (either a worker or an officer) who has a contract with an employer knows that the contract becomes binding and limits free and independent behavior unless determined otherwise. Rules that shape recruitment decisions also shape and limit entry into the organization. These rules, which can range from height and weight standards to background checks, allow some applicants to enter the organization while excluding others who do not meet the requirements.

4. Institutions have shared values and meaning among the members. The values of an institution are so influential on member behavior that as March and Olsen (1989) argue, member behavior is intentional more than willful. That is, even though members make some decisions autonomously, they are concerned whether their decisions are within the boundaries of their institutional values.

**Normative Institutionalism**

Normative institutionalism strongly emphasizes the role of norms, routines, and procedures in examining institutions. They introduce the concept of “logic of appropriateness” and suggest that institutions have a “logic of appropriateness” more than a “logic of consequentiality.” That is, if an institution has an influence on its members, members think more about whether their behaviors conform to the determined norms
more than about the consequences that he or she will encounter (Peters, 2004, p. 29).

Normative institutionalists do not consider the rules as the central component of their approach. They argue that rules to some extent play a role in formalizing the structure and logic of appropriateness. Recruitment in law enforcement can be interpreted under these premises as such that members of the law enforcement community who apply norms that shape recruitment and selection are more interested in whether their behavior is more congruent with the already determined rules and procedures. The members are not concerned with the consequences their behaviors produce. This strict attachment to rules may play a negative role for underrepresented groups and hinder organizations from making quick choices and/or beginning initiatives.

**Rational-Choice Institutionalism**

Rational-choice institutionalism is based on utilitarianism, which emphasizes that behaviors are a function of rules and incentives rather than norms (Peters, 2004, p. 19; Marsh and Stoker, 2002). They suggest that institutions are systems of rules in which individuals attempt to maximize their own utilities. In other words, the basic argument of the rational-choice approach is that utility maximization is the primary motivation of individuals, but those individuals may realize that their goals can be achieved most effectively through institutional action and find that their behavior is shaped by the institution (Peters, 2004, p. 19). Rational-choice institutionalism manifests itself this way because institutions constrain competitors and produce some predictability and regularity of outcomes. These institutions also clarify the probable range of discussions. When their
decisions are in conflict with management and others in the institution, it is again rational to use institutional rules to overcome the conflict or change the direction of the policies.

Ostrom (2005) also highlights the rational-choice approach and emphasizes that institutions are rules (p. 138). She states two reasons for focusing on rules: “Institutional analysis conducting policy analysis is frequently asked to analyze the impact of some change in rules. And institutional analysis working to craft solutions to negative outcomes in an action situation recognize that changes in the rules may be easier or more stable than attempts to change the situation through changes in the biophysical world or attributes of the community” (p. 138). She classifies rules as position rules, choice rules, aggregation rules, information rules, payoff rules, scope rules, and boundary rules.

Position rules set the positions to be filled by the participants. These rules also will be used in the decision-making process (p. 193). For example, “member” or “supervisor” is a position created by the institution or organization, and it is to be filled by certain people. Choice rules define what a participant occupying a position must, must not, and may do at a particular point in a decision-making process. For example, a social worker cannot make a choice to grant food stamps to a person whose income is not below some certain amount. Choices are determined and/or restricted by already defined criteria and past actions and decisions. (p. 200). Aggregation rules determine if a decision by a single participant or by multiple participants is required before a certain action is followed (p. 202). An example is in legislatures; every representative has a vote for and against a bill, but promulgating and/or amending a bill requires an aggregation of votes from the representatives. Information rules refer to the “information available for any
action situation for the participants about the current state of individual state variables, the previous and current moves of other participants in positions, and their own past moves” (p. 206). A possible example is managing a project. To be able to manage a project successfully, managers and participants should know what was done previously for that project, the nature of the procedures, and obstacles that may be encountered.

Payoff rules determine the external rewards or sanctions assigned to particular actions. A simple example is the pay schedule designed to pay the salaries to participants occupying certain positions. Scope rules define which variables must, must not, or may be affected by taking a certain action position (p. 208). An example is developing nuclear power. The development of nuclear power will assist countries in supplying their energy needs, but it will have dire consequences for the environment.

The criteria and/or tests used for recruitment and selection are in Ostrom’s typology, classified as boundary rules or entry and exit rules. She suggests that boundary rules define who is eligible to enter a position, the process that determines which eligible participants may (or must) enter, and how an individual may (or must) leave a position (Ostrom, 2005, p. 194). She asserts that ascribed and acquired attributes are frequently used in this type of entry rule. Individuals may have to meet certain criteria, such as physical standards, educational requirements, or age requirements, or they may be required to possess a certain range of experience, be a member of a certain group, or live in a certain geographical area. In other words, Ostrom suggests that rules should define and shape either the entry criteria that anybody not meeting the standards and/or
requirements cannot be accepted or the exit rules that anybody who wants to quit a job faces some requirements and/or sanctions.

The public civil service system and the patronage system differ significantly from each other in defining their standards. For instance, civil service has a significant responsibility in selection decisions and applying tests; governmental agencies do not have the sole right to administer selection processes or create new techniques and tests to apply. They can help civil service to determine job standards and enforce some additional tests to ensure that they hire high-quality officers.

Recruitment and selection, however, have some limitations in terms of the rational-choice approach. Literature has different explanations for the limitations embedded in recruitment decisions. Perhaps the most common and oldest approach in understanding these limitations is bounded rationality. In Simon’s (1997) words, organizational missions and goals are ultimately shaped by informational constraints known as bounded rationality (p. 94). He argues that the decision-making task involves three steps:

1. The listing of all possible alternatives
2. The determination of all of the consequences that follow each alternative
3. The comparative evaluation of these sets of consequences

Simon states that it is impossible for an individual to know all of the alternatives and the consequences of all these alternatives (p. 77). He asserts that a proverbial solution for eliminating or decreasing the effect of bounded rationality is “limiting the number of variables and the range of consequences resulting in isolation from the rest of the world” (p. 94).
Another limitation discussed in the literature uses the term “uncertainty” (external or internal) and “adverse selection.” For scholars studying organizations, a fundamental issue in personnel selection is exposure to external uncertainty and adverse selection that complicate an organization’s response to change (Burnes & Stalker, 1961; Schleifer, 1969; Nalbandian & Klingner, 1981, p. 541; Belasen, 2000, p. 74). Robbins (1990) argues that organizations that operate in environments characterized as “scarce, dynamic, and complex” face the greatest degree of uncertainty. Such an environment has a “low tolerance for errors, demands are unpredictable, and a large number of factors must be constantly monitored and handled.” Evidence suggests that the more dynamic the environment, the more organic the structure of the organization should be (pp.209-210). Lawrence and Lorsh (1967) argue that the amount of uncertainty and the rate of change in an environment have a certain impact on the development of internal features in organizations, such as tasks, roles, and the flow of information (p. 14). In other words, organizational environment is critical in shaping the processes (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).

Adverse selection derives from “unobservability of the information, beliefs, and values on which the decisions of others are based” (Moe, 1984, p. 754). It is true that most employers (or principals) try to hire the best possible individuals (or agents) to get the maximum benefit and reach the highest efficiency possible, but their ability is limited because they cannot know any given applicant’s true intelligence, skills, aptitude, or work habits. So it is possible that the employer may attract and suffer from a disproportionate number of low-quality applicants through adverse selection. Only basic parameters, such as education and background, determine and shape of their decisions and the price they
offer for the job the individual is expected to complete. There is an information asymmetry; namely, “the employee does know his own qualifications and work habits better than the employer” (Moe, 1984, p. 755).

Moe (1984) investigates police service as a good example of adverse selection, which lends support for the basic discussion of uncertainty. He argues that police work appeals to many people who are more interested in power and physical combat than they are with keeping peace and restoring order. For efficient policing, Moe argues, officers should have sensitive judgment, and well-developed interpersonal skills. He asserts further that these qualifications are difficult to observe and measure. Similarly, the operative goals of a police department also are unclear. The performance measurement is rooted in ambiguous goals such as crime prevention and well-established race relations that are difficult to monitor, leading to moral-hazard problems. Moe suggests that these potential problems lead either to contracting out police services to other agencies, which gives the service provider a chance to increase the price and/or reduce quality, or establishing a public bureaucracy for the provision and monitoring of police services.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE THEORY**

Another theoretical basis for further discussion of diverse and differing recruitment decisions is organizational change. For both private companies and public organizations, the only predictable constant may be rapid change, which in turn requires management to be both proactive and responsive (Hammer & Champy, 1995; Stoney, 2001). Generically, organizational change refers to “understanding alterations within
organizations at the broadest level among individuals, groups, and at the collective level across entire organization” (Burnes, 1996 p. 173). Whiteley (1995) explains change as the “negotiation or renegotiation of shared meaning about what is to be valued, believed in and aimed for.” (p. 34). Whitely also asserts that organizational change requires the renewal of many components and parts in an organization, including “structures, processes and relationships with the outside environment and even the whole of organizational culture” (p. 34).

In his description of strategic management, Stoney (2001) states that unlike initial definitions of strategic management that focus on the identification of long-term goals and planning, protecting the capacity of the organization to adapt to new demands and challenges in the changing environment is more instrumental (p. 30). Belasen (2000) suggests that adaptation requires that organizations receive continual feedback, adjust their processes, and improving their performance. He asserts that continuous feedback is essential for aligning the organization with its external environment (p. 83).

Effective change can occur only in a nondirective way. It requires the top management to specify the parameters for a desired adaptation without insisting on specific solutions. Some argue that change should be a bottom-up and loosely coupled approach that does not impose an organizationwide change program. The term “loosely coupled” refers to a change model that can be referred to as a “reverse of one-size-fits-all” philosophy. The one-size-fit–all understanding of the model is designed to cover everyone and everything; however, because the demands and priorities are different and
day-to-day realities are not the same with what the model anticipates, it mostly produces nothing and covers no one (Kezar, 2001, pp. 14-15).

**Evolutionary Change Theory**

There are many different explanations about organizational change, ranging from evolutionary or emergent change to teleological, life-cycle, social cognition, cultural and dialectical changes. Among these models, evolutionary and teleological change models have the longest history and the most empirical support. Evolutionary models (sometimes referred to as named environmental theories) argue that environmental influences shape the change in an organization and that it happens in a “slow stream of mutations (Morgan 1986). In other words, the main assumption of evolutionary models is that “change is dependent on circumstances, situational variables, and environment faced by each organization” (Morgan, p. 253). Here the distinctive part is that evolution is basically “deterministic and human impact is minimal on change.” That is, the evolutionary model assumes that change is crucial to survive because the environment forces the change. Change is a slow process and more important than discrete events and activities. Here adaptation is important and can be inevitable with no preparation or proactive and anticipatory action.

Evolutionary models have received strong empirical support for certain types of change. The models’ focus on unplanned change and on organizations as systems advanced the thinking on change; however, the models ignore the fact that organizations are social phenomena. Supporters of evolutionary models have failed to consider the
human psychology, the organization of work, and the way organization fits into society (Collins, 1998). Some also argue that it is difficult to directly link environmental variables to organizational change while controlling other variables. Burns (1996), for example, suggests that organizations are complex entities and that there are indirect and informal variables that are needed to explain this complexity besides a few external and internal factors such as resources and the size of the organization. He goes on to say that adaptation to environmental forces is not the only way because these forces can be manipulated.

Teleological Change Theory

Teleological change models are also referred to as planned change, scientific management, and rational models (Kezar, 2001). Some common features of this theory are strategic planning, organizational development, and adaptive learning. Teleological models assume that organizations are “purposeful and adaptive.” The key point here is that change occurs because leaders, change agents, and others see the necessity of change. The process for change is linear and rational, as in evolutionary models, but “individual managers are much more instrumental to the process” (Carnall, 2003, p. 146; Carrel et al., 1996, p. 15). Unlike evolutionary models, which emphasize external factors, teleological models highlight the idea that internal features or decisions motivate change.
strategy, restructuring, and reengineering” (Carnall, 2003; Kezar, 2001; Huber & Glick, 1995). Also in contrast to evolutionary models, teleological models highlight the leader as the main figure at the center who aligns goals, sets expectations, models, communicates, engages, and rewards. In other words, teleological models value the human side of organizations and consider individual interventions, human creativity, and strategic choices to be important (Kezar, 2001).

Teleological models encourage first-order change, which suggests a change during the process and not in a time of crisis. In this sense, teleological models are like learning-organization models. It is essential to inventory and assess the organizational structures and modifying some aspects of the organization in a reengineering model. It is vital to collaborate with all divisions involved and identify the ways that the processes can collectively be altered (Kezar, 2001, p. 34).

In the literature, teleological models have become another dominant explanation of change; however, the model has received many criticisms as well. Critics focus on the models’ very rational and linear process and emphasis on the human factor (Kezar, 2001, p. 35). Critics say that “organizations are often irrational, events occur spontaneously, environments change without predictability, and leader’s ability to change is not exactly real.” It is not the case that managers can easily alter the path of events and that people respond to change (Burnes, 1996). Many times humans can create problems and/or hinder change rather than assist in the change process (Levy & Merry, 1986).

Organizational change theories are important in understanding law enforcement recruitment because law enforcement organizations also are in an era of change. This
change requires law enforcement official to regularly examine and develop their ways of
argues that declining revenues combined with demographic changes, changes in
employees’ values, and the need to retain effective workers are some of the forces that
have compelled public and nonprofit organizations to become concerned with their
survival. However, while survival (i.e., continued existence within the market) is a crucial
issue for private companies, it may not be that much of a concern for public organizations
when one considers that the nonexistence of some public services is simply unthinkable
no matter how inefficient or poorly provided. For instance, no city would consider
operating without a police organization or any outsourced policing services even when
the police services cannot survive based on private-sector standards. But the matter is still
worth discussing because survival, not as a continued existence but as continued
efficiency and effectiveness, is important for public-sector organizations and services.
Thus developing knowledge about recruitment or police organizations is important
because an inevitable results of poor recruitment decisions are, at a minimum, low
productivity, inefficiency, and the loss of public trust and cooperation in the long-run
(Pynes, 2005, Preface, xv).

One of the crucial research questions of this dissertation is whether applying new
selection and screening techniques to police departments to determine the better qualified
officers requires an organizational and philosophical change or vice versa. The history of
policing indicates that community policing is the most significant change from the traditional
understanding of policing. Thus it is likely that a correlation exists between this change in
police organizations and using diverse selection and screening techniques in policing.

Considering the fact that the history of using different psychometrics, tests, and assessment centers in the selection process dates back to the end of World War II (Edenborough, 2005, p. 15) and came widely into use in the 1960s and 1970s, it should not be incorrect to assume that community policing and a new understanding of recruitment operationalized by the diversification of selection techniques may be the products of the same period of organizational shift. Therefore, it is essential to analyze the cultural and organizational shift in police departments in 1960s and 1970s to be able to discern better the differences in policing implementations since this new understanding of policing emerged. This also helps one understand the increasing sensitivity to selecting officers.
CHAPTER 3

MODEL FOR ANALYSIS

After discussing the literature, the historical background, and the theories, the discussion will continue with a review of the concepts that comprise the model for analysis. This chapter examines the components of the research and discusses the relevance of the literature to the hypotheses that follow the discussion. This chapter also specifically reviews the two dependent variables (i.e., selection methods and techniques and clearance rates) and the seven independent variables (i.e., community policing, citizen complaints, civilian review board, minimum education requirement, racial diversity, crime rates, and total technology) used to analyze the hypotheses of this dissertation research.

SELECTION METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

Selection methods and techniques comprise the first dependent variable. Selection is “choosing, from a number of available applicants, a smaller number to be hired for a given job” (Guion, 1965, p. 8). Selection practices, or psychometrics, literally means “mental and physical measurement, and psychometric tests or instruments are measurement devices.” The measurement is used to “gain understanding of an individual so as to be able to predict behavior and provide a basis for future action” (Kendall & Stone, 1956, p. 233). Personnel testing, therefore, is done with the aim of “selecting
certain individuals from among the applicants for a job or of determining to which of two or more possible job categories a particular individual shall be assigned” (Ferris & Rowland, 1990).

Selection techniques are efficient to the extent that they measure the qualities required to effectively operate any profession. In a law enforcement setting, techniques used for selection should be able to identify what shapes an ideal police officer. Police officers need to have diverse abilities, meaning that the selection technique used to find the ideal police officer (if there is just one type) must address this diversity. Ho (1999) suggests that considering the unique nature of police work, police recruits are expected to be “mentally stable, socially adaptable, and intellectually competent to perform a wide range of police tasks.” In a study conducted by Lorr and Strack (1984) using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire Scales along with 12 measures of psychopathology to find a personality profile of a police candidate indicated that the majority of police candidates could be categorized in one profile group. The characteristics of the profile group labeled "Typical Cop" were found to be “self-disciplined, socially bold, extroverted, emotionally tough and low in experienced anxiety.” Lorr and Strack enriched their study by also using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the California Personality Inventory (CPI) as a means of comparing personality profiles of deputies and traffic officers. After comparing the CPI and the MMPI profiles, they found that traffic officers and deputies share the characteristics of “high defended, energetic, dominant, well adjusted, independent, spontaneous, socially flexible and free from anxiety-related behaviors.” The scores indicated that introversion was undesirable
and that traits such as dominance and leadership were related to effectiveness. The overall results of this study suggest that “there are personality dimensions that set officers aside from the general public.” Another study by Carpenter and Raza (1987) also analyzed the possibility that a set of personality characteristics exists among law enforcement officials. Yet another study looked at whether law enforcement work consists of a more homogenous group than the general population. The participants in this study were 257 police applicants from a southwestern state (92.2 percent male, 7.8 percent female). To obtain their results, Carpenter and Raza administered the MMPI to their participants. The results of the MMPI indicated that as a whole, the group of law enforcement officials tended to be “cheerful, outgoing and effective in living and had a strong interest in practical matters.” The results also indicated that male police officers were more likely to present a “good image of themselves, to be less depressed and anxious, to be more assertive and energetic and to have a greater tendency to seek social contacts as compared to the normative population data.” The female participants were also found to be more likely to “present a good impression of themselves, to be less depressed, to be more psychologically mature, more assertive and more aware of the needs of others” as compared to the normative population data. Becker’s (2005) pilot work conceptualizes that certain attributes—especially rational decision making, benevolence, honesty, independent thinking, justice, and productivity—are characteristic of high-integrity employees. Becker also suggests that common consequences of integrity are likely to include respect, trust, positive relationships, career progress, positive influences on others, serving as an advisor, and positive business outcomes.
Before tests can be devised, or any other procedures established for such selection and classification, it is imperative for the investigator to know as much as possible about the job in question (Thorndike, 1949, p. 3). In other words, before any recruitment process is selected, it is essential to determine what is required for the job. This task (in public and private organizations) begins with a job analysis, where the level of difficulty of the job, the supervision given, and physical and mental requirements are studied and the qualifications assessed (Lipsett et al., 1964; Thorndike, 1949).

It should be noted that psychometric tests cannot solely measure and determine whether an individual is suited for a particular job, because it is difficult to generate tests that are perfectly correlated with actual job performance. Therefore, the key to the successful application of tests is to “find tests whose scores correlate to the greatest possible extent with eventual performance and that are least subject to cognitive or other biases in application” (Baron & Kreps, 1999, p. 352).

*Individual difference* is a concept that generated a different school in psychology and led to distinct discussions that have the potential to affect selection and screening practices as well. While social psychologists argue that people are all the same, individual psychologists, who are the advocates of the idea of *individual difference*, suggest that people are psychologically very different from one another (Edenborough, 2005, pp.7-8, Guion, 1965, p. 6). People differ in terms of personality, interpersonal relations, vocational interests, values, orientations, motivations, and perceptions. Each of those individual-difference variables affects behavior in organizations (Zedeck, 1996, p. xii). Murphy (1996) suggests that individual-difference domains that contribute to
effective job performance include cognitive ability, personality, orientation (i.e., values and interests), and affective disposition (i.e., mood, affect, temperament) [p.10]. Given today’s team-oriented environment, there are a variety of individual behaviors that bear directly on accomplishing the goals of the organization. These include not only individual task performance but also nontask behaviors such as “teamwork, customer service, organizational citizenship, and prosocial organizational behaviors” (p. 226).

History shows that selection examinations were first developed in China under the Han Dynasty (206 B.C. to A.D. 220) in order to select candidates for government service. They began using performance on written tests as a means of selecting government administrators. Tests were used in this way for the next 20 centuries and have endured because they apparently favored the selection of successful candidates. The Jesuits introduced competitive examinations into their schools in the 17th century, possibly influenced by Jesuit travelers’ experiences in China. It was not until the late 18th century and early 19th century that examinations developed in northern Europe—Prussia and then in France and England—again in order to select candidates for government. As modern states industrialized, improved communications, and evolved their large bureaucracies, the practice of selection by written, public examinations previously confined to China became increasingly common (Eckstein & Noah, 1993, p. 3). In China, the exams were used only to select bureaucrats, with competition as the major characteristic. In Britain, it was the medical profession that, in 1815, first instituted qualifying exams. These exams were designed to determine competence and, therefore, limited access to membership in the profession. Written exams for solicitors came in 1835, and exams for accountancy in
1880. In 1855, entry exams were introduced as an alternative to patronage for selection of candidates for the rapidly expanding civil service. Certification emerged later in Europe and then in the United States as an adjunct to the selection process (Broadfoot, 1979).

Eckstein and Noah (1993) confirm that at every level of government, examinations were instituted in the hope that doing so would check the pervasive practice of politicians favoring their supporters when filling job openings. In the early 1870s, exams were introduced for entry into the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the U.S. Census Bureau, and the Indian office. From 1883, civil-service exams were required for all candidates except those at the highest level. Thus it is clear that assessment for the selection and certification of employees had a key social role to play in a range of countries. Such examinations were generally instituted to control patronage and to limit privileged access to specialized or higher education, the professions, and government posts. In Japan, examinations were used to select individuals for appointment to government positions from the mid-19th century, in an effort to remove the Samurai class from its dominant position in education and government. However, even by the start of the 20th century, sons from Samurai families were in the majority at the various schools that allowed access to these examinations (Eckstein & Noah, 1993).

In America, the history of using selection tools also stemmed from the problem of political patronage. Four months after entering World War I in 1917, a group of American psychologists led by Robert M. Yerkes created the Army Alpha, the first large-scale, group administered examination of general mental ability. Different pilot studies were carried out to collect evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity decades
before these concepts were clearly enunciated. Between implementation in September of 1917 and the end of the war in November of 1918, 1.7 million individual took the Alpha examination. Some 8,000 recruits with raw scores of 0 to 14 were discharged immediately for “mental inferiority,” and 10,000 with raw scores of 15 to 24 were assigned to heavy-labor battalions. Use of selection testing boomed after the war and led to significant research; however, there always has been incongruence between the practice and the theory. In addition, questions about appropriate uses of tests were readily raised and debated (Campbell & Knapp, 2001, pp. 1-2).

Selection tests generally fall into two categories. One category has to do with assessing an individual’s ability to perform the work. Methods in this category are competency based. One example might be job applications that seek information about individual competencies instead of work history or credentials that may not be directly related to proven performance. Another example is preparation of structured interview guides to solicit information about competencies linked to successful or exemplary performance and the behavioral indicators associated with them. Methods in the second category address an individual’s fitness to perform, and they take into consideration additional requirements, such as drug tests and medical examinations that are peripheral to an applicant’s ability to perform (Dubois & Rothwell, 2004, p. 105).

Guion (1965) asserts that the only objective of personnel testing is “to contribute to the increasingly effective use of manpower within an organization (p. 3). Lawshe and Balma (1966) suggest that human beings differ and that individual differences are the basis for personnel testing. The researchers also suggest that the measurement of the
differences related to job performance is the object of personnel testing (p. 10).

Edenborough (2005) contends that using psychometrics helps organizations better match individuals to jobs by improving the accuracy of selection, while at the same time limiting personal and financial costs stemming from poor recruitment decisions. Indeed the use of psychometrics increases the productivity and performance of an organization because it allows the organization to achieve better career management by “matching individual aspirations to their organization’s and optimizing the use of people’s capacities by helping focus development activity” (p. 4).

Two concepts are crucial to reaping the greatest benefit from selection techniques. The first concept is what qualities the techniques or tests will measure and what qualities will be regarded as the standards for the said profession.

**Objectivity of Tests**

One of the very critical aspects of reliable tests is their *objectivity*. Selection on the basis of academic merit has a firm philosophical foundation in terms of equity. Equity was the driving force behind the development of “objective” tests. Here *objective* means multiple-choice tests and others that require no judgment in scoring. Such tests have highly replicable and reliable scoring, hence the word *objective*. However, subjective judgment enters into writing the tests through the selection of material and answer choices.

Guion (1965) maintains that objectivity in personnel testing should be evaluated in terms of the following three-dimensional model: (1) factual vs. qualitative
(unverifiable) information, (2) clear vs. disguised purpose of the test, and (3) free response vs. restricted response format. Based on these criteria, Guion contends that the ideal personality test should be factual in nature, disguised, and have a free-response format:

Personality measurement is objective to the extent that it avoids distortion by calling forth unrestricted responses, the correctness of which can be assessed with external criteria, and by not calling forth cognitive awareness of the purpose of measurement (p. 355)

According to this criterion, the least objective personnel test is one in which responses are unverifiable, the purpose is clear, and the response format is restricted. This, of course, is the type of personnel measure most often used by researchers in organizational behavior. It is known as a the self-report, questionnaire-type device (Ferris & Rowland, 1990, p. 81)

**Validity of Tests**

Another instrumental issue in using selection techniques is *test validity*. Validity refers to “the degree to which inferences made from test scores are appropriate.” In personnel selection, the validity of a test has a very specific meaning: It is represented by the magnitude of the correlation between scores on the test and scores on one or more aspects of job success (Ferris & Rowland, 1990, p. 81). The three most common types of validity are criterion-related, content validity, and construct validity. Criterion-related validation work is simply a study of whether a hypothesis about an operationalization of some construct is correct. Content validity is not validity at all and usually indicates an assessment of the adequacy of the test construction or the operationalization of some
construct. But no test is valid, and no criterion measure is relevant without content validity. Construct-validity evidence for a measure is the extent to which an empirical network of results conforms to an assumed theoretical network of relationships among the construct in question and other constructs of importance.

Beamount (1974) emphasizes the significance of validity of test, stating and warning that the court demand for valid, job-related tests is much more complex than has been acknowledged. He argues that jobs, people, and situations change and, in such a dynamic environment, it is crucial to ask how one determines validity. In addition, measures of validity are costly and require much more sophistication than is usually found in civil service staffs. Validity also requires conditions that are difficult to simulate (Beaumont, 1974, p. 4).

**Fairness of Tests**

One other significant issue related to the effectiveness of selection techniques is *fairness*. The term *fairness* has been explained by citing synonymous words such as *just*, *unbiased*, and *honest*. However, the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology’s Principles for Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures states that “fairness is a social rather than a psychometric concept” and its definition depends on what one considers to be fair. Gilliland (1993) approaches fairness with a procedural-justice concept and comments that “procedures are perceived to be fairer when affected individuals have an opportunity to either influence the decision process or offer input.” Leventhal (1980) also states that procedural justice was suggested to be a function of the
extent to which a number of procedural rules are satisfied or violated. He goes on to say that decisions should be made “consistently, without personal biases, with as much accurate information as possible, with interests of affected individuals represented in a way that is compatible with their ethical values, and with an outcome that could be modified.” In other words, fairness is not a technical psychometric term, and it may have different definitions in different social and political circumstances (Arvey & Sacket, 1993, p. 172). For example, in the days when political patronage was promoted, loyalty to political party and service to the party may be enough to consider employment decisions to be fair. With this approach, it is possible to ignore any concerns about concepts such as representativeness and egalitarianism, which are linked directly to the rights of women and underrepresented groups.

Gilliland (1993) proposed a model that could examine selection practices in an organizational-justice theory. The model had eight fairness dimensions for selection techniques: job relatedness, opportunity to perform, opportunity for reconsideration, and consistency of administration (formal characteristics of the procedures); feedback, selection information, and honesty in treatment (explanation of the procedures); interpersonal effectiveness of the administrator, two-way communication, and propriety of questions (interpersonal treatment of applicants) [p. 701-703].

One fairness dimension is job relatedness, which is the degree to which the selection procedure either appears to measure content that is relevant to a job or appears to be valid (p. 703). Gilliland’s definition includes two components: content validity and predictive validity.
Another key procedural-justice dimension is opportunity to perform, which involves how much applicants are allowed to demonstrate what they know during the selection process (p. 704). Gilliland suggests that an interview is considered superior to the testing of an applicant because the interview gives the applicant more opportunity to express his or her views and to communicate with interviewers directly. An unstructured test is valued higher than a structured test because the unstructured test gives more freedom to the applicant to share what he or she knows and thinks.

The third fairness dimension is defined as consistency of administration, or consistency of selection procedures, in terms of standardized administration and scoring (p. 705). Inconsistencies in test scoring affect fairness perceptions, and multiple-choice tests can be regarded as fair because they are group-administered and scored objectively; some test, such as video-based tests or assessment centers can be regarded as a little less objective because these tests give raters some freedom in terms of assessing the applicant, while leaving some room for ambiguity in the mind of the applicant (Ployhart & Ryan, 1998).

Gilliland defines another procedural-justice dimension in selection process as reconsideration opportunity, which involves the degree to which a selection test allows an applicant to modify the evaluation process or receive a second chance (p. 704-705). There is some supporting evidence for that rule, especially in drug tests. A study suggested that a drug test was found to be perceived as more justifiable when a second method was used to confirm results (Murphy et al., 1990). In general, any test that allows
applicants to consider and modify their answers can be regarded as more fair and objective.

Perceptions of distributive justice (outcome fairness) derive from equity of outcomes, objectivity of the outcomes, and perceived need for outcomes. Gilliland’s model argued that these perceptions of process and outcome-fairness in turn affect reactions and behaviors during and after hiring (e.g., job-acceptance, self-efficacy, and litigation).

On fairness, Lind (2001) also argues that although people’s general fairness judgments are stable, they can be changed when new information is received that falls outside of expectations or during times of transition. For example, for a position for which few people are likely to be selected or hired, explaining this beforehand may reduce the negative perceptions about the selection process. Another factor affecting applicant perception is the familiarity of the applicant with the selection procedures and techniques. Through friends and/or media, any applicant may have some initial information about the selection process and this may help the applicant have more positive judgments about the process. Also, the perception that a technique is widely used affects the perception of the applicant’s fairness view.

On the other hand, while the traditional psychometric approach to selection based on job analysis remains the most effective means of demonstrating equality of treatment (Arvey and Sackett, 1993), it also can lead to negative perceptions about its fairness if it results in a highly proceduralized process that undervalues the importance of personal interaction. The psychometric job-related and job-specific approach to selection also is
being challenged by the growing demand for selection methods that can identify those individuals who are best able to cope with increasingly transitory roles (Heriot and Anderson, 1997).

The aforementioned discussion about selection and selection techniques are obviously valid and required tools for the police profession as well. The result of various changes and pressures in the law enforcement environment has created a condition in which law enforcement agencies are required to make better selection decisions. In order to adapt, these agencies need to clearly identify the skills that are essential to good performance and make selection decisions in a nondiscriminatory way (Hogue et al., 1994, pp. 114-115). In 1967, the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967) recommended the screening of all potential officers. Confirming the committee’s recommendation in 1973, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommended that every police agency follow a formal selection process that includes “a written test of mental ability or aptitude, an oral interview, a psychological examination, and a background investigation” (Cochrane et al., 2003, p. 510).

In the current study, the test techniques comprised to create the dependent variable for the analysis will be discussed to give insights about their use and possible advantages and disadvantages.
Analytical/Problem-Solving Tests (Written Tests)

The academic and problem-solving assessment measures general intellectual skills. They test the applicant’s ability to see relationships and solve problems. Academic assessment consists of three parameters: verbal reasoning, numerical reasoning, and abstract reasoning. Bakers (1995) emphasizes that these three parameters are crucial in coping with both the intellectual demands of police training and police work and must be applied to all police recruits. However, most civil service written tests measure individual traits and usually some form of intelligence. But psychology now tells us that such traits have little to do with job success. Intelligence measures simply do not hold up when compared to job performance; extensive work is needed to determine what types of intelligence (and at what levels) are related to job performance (Beamount, 1974, p. 428). Information tests, however, are widely used and defended as they keep police departments away from allegations of favoritism because written tests are scored and objective and can be rechecked for charges and biases. Criticisms about written tests point out that civil service rules overemphasize the information tests for the selection, while the core function of selection is to select the best candidates who excel in different skills. Many civil service agencies have no responsibility to analyze the character of any potential candidate. The most common way to check on a candidate’s character problems is by checking the candidate’s fingerprints and past records. But it is imperative that a candidate is investigated through his or her family, peers, teachers, close associates, employers, and other persons (Wilson, 1953; Beamount, 1974, p. 428).
Assessment of Understanding Diverse Cultures

The racial and cultural profile of populations, specifically in the United States, has been changing significantly for many regions. An explanation of this change requires an understanding of the different features and priorities of other cultures and the development of a multicultural view of policing. Coderoni (2002), based on a research findings, suggests that most of the major civil disorders that have occurred in the United States were a result of police-citizen conflicts. He goes on to argue that the police conflate race with different cultures. To him, policing a black society is not necessarily enough to determine what constitutes a black community because within a black population, there may be different cultures for black African-Americans, black Hispanics, or black European, or persons of Asian descent. So it is necessary to be a part of (rather than separated from) the culturally diverse group and to understand their differing priorities.

Background Investigation

The background investigation is widely used in personnel selection in law enforcement and is considered to be one of the best predictors of future employee behavior. Galton (1902) probably was the first to suggest that “the future of each man is mainly a direct consequence of the past . . . .” It is, therefore, of high importance “when planning for the future to keep the past under frequent review” (Jones, 1991, p. 6).

Investigating the history of an applicant can take different forms, such as background investigations, biodata, and reference checks. Biographical data for selection was first
used in the insurance industry in 1894 and then expanded rapidly to other organizations. A number of studies showed the effectiveness of biodata for the prediction of a wide variety of human performance measures, but psychologists have not considered biographical data to be an effective predictor of delinquency or proneness to criminal behavior. McDaniel (1988) studied the validity of background investigations to predict suitability of candidates for positions of trust in sensitive occupations (e.g., law enforcement, nuclear power, and military and civilian positions requiring government-issued security clearances). Even though history is the basic predictor in both methods, McDaniel found some significant distinctions between the two. He found that biodata is a self-report, paper-and-pencil instrument that provides both positive and negative information and is empirically scored. It also brings a wide variety of history items to the forefront, whereas a background investigation focuses more on identifying any undesirable behavior in the past to evaluate a candidate’s security risk. Because a background investigation is conducted by the investigators, it allows for the evaluation of a candidate’s past more judgmentally. Trautman (2000) also contends that the code of silence (i.e., witnessing misconduct by another employee but taking no action) is a serious problem seen in law enforcement agencies. Conducting quality background investigations of individuals applying to become officers can be an effective way to prevent the code from being invoked (p. 6).

Reference checks also are used to verify information an applicant has provided to a prospective employer. Reference checks may help reveal some facts that cannot be provided through a formal background check (William, 2007). A previous employer’s
opinion about an applicant may well contribute significantly to recruitment decisions. Reference checks also are helpful in overcoming accusations of negligent hiring practices about an organization or agency. When applicants expect reference checks (for example, because it is stated on the application form that false statements subsequently discovered are grounds for dismissal), they tend to be more truthful about the information they supply to the prospective employer. Usually reference checks are costly and time-consuming when one considers the amount of information produced. Employers also are very reluctant to provide information about their employees because it is possible for employers to be exposed to lawsuits for defamation of character and invasion of privacy claims when they provide information about current or former employees to other employers seeking job references (Edwards & Kleiner, 2002, p. 136).

**Credit History Check**

The rationale behind reviewing an applicant’s credit history that applicants with either a great need for money to pay bills or a history of irresponsible financial management are thought to be greater risks for positions of trust. Although there apparently is no empirical evidence to support this belief and credit history checks seem to have a high probability of producing adverse impact against racial minorities, it does seem likely that “individuals who need a great deal of money might be more tempted to steal than those without a great need” (Jones & Terries, in Jones, 1991, p. 45).
Criminal History Check

“Criminal background checks and investigations can range from little more than a reference check to a complete investigation of an individual’s entire life” (Jones & Terries, 1991, p. 44). Usually the background check is limited to a person’s past criminal history. Arrest records, while probably valid, are seldom used to make hiring decisions because of possible legal ramifications. Several states ban employers outright from either asking about or using arrest information to make a hiring decision. While federal laws apparently do not absolutely forbid using arrest information, using arrest records to make hiring decisions probably would result in an adverse impact against blacks and some other minority groups.

Convictions, on the other hand, can be considered when making hiring decisions, although one possible requirement is that only relevant or job-related criminal histories be considered. For example, an applicant with a prior conviction for theft could be denied employment where the opportunity for on-the-job theft is great (e.g., clerks in a jewelry store).

There are a number of problems with criminal checks. First, legal and practical obstacles make it time-consuming and difficult to obtain criminal records. Any information obtained is likely to be incomplete or misleading. For example, most crimes are never detected, most detected crimes never lead to an arrest, and apparently many arrests do not lead to a conviction. Furthermore, many convictions are based on plea bargaining or some other type of reduced sentencing (Jones & Terries, in Jones, 1991, p. 44).
Driving Record Check

Driving records help employers check whether an applicant has any traffic violations or delinquent driving experience in his or her past. Regarding the costs of accidents and fixing police cars, many police departments also require a driving record check for applicants. Also, a suspended or expired license may reveal information about the character and driving skills of the applicant.

Drug Test

The general conditions and logic behind using a drug test in almost all employment practices are “workplace safety, workplace morale, productivity, and employer liability” (Mieczkowski & Lersh, 2002, p. 581). It is particularly important to have a drug-free police organization. Kraska and Kappeler (1988) state that illegal drug use by police is seen as hypocritical because the police try to create a drug-free society; an officer’s use of illegal drug could damage public confidence in the police. Kraska and Kappeler also warn that illegal drug use by police is potentially corrupting and significantly raises concerns about public safety and hazard issues, such as use of firearms and police pursuits, because using drugs may negatively affect officers’ use of force and firearms when needed. For most of the departments, applicants who are currently using and/or selling or have used and/or sold illegal drugs in the past are rendered unsuitable for the job. However, some applicants who used illegal drugs in the past and quit using drugs still might be eligible for recruitment. Some policies are
regulated based on when the applicant used illegal drugs and when he or she quit drug using them.

**Mediation Skills/Conflict**

An important strength for all police officers is mediation skills because handling conflicts, such as domestic quarrels, neighbor conflicts, and landlord-tenant disputes (Pearce & Snortum, 1983, p. 71), is one of the most significant parts of police work. Cooper (1997) suggests that using conflict-resolution methods, such as “mediation, problem solving, problem management, facilitation, reconciliation, and counseling,” helps patrol officers “defuse a scene, prevent a scene from escalating, make scenes safer for patrol officers, improve police-citizen relations, prevent having to send a unit to the same scene over and over again” (p. 88). Experience in mediation requires strong persuasion and communication skills. Use of these skills can solve problems faster and even save lives. In some cases, such as domestic violence, mediation skills may become more important because tensions may be elevated if regular procedures requiring the use of force are applied. At the same time, however, poor mediation skills could result in escalating the situation, requiring the use of force, while risking officer safety, and increasing the chance of family assaults and homicides (Bard, 1970).

**Medical Exam**

Police work naturally and inevitable places officers in risky situations where good health becomes a fundamental requirement. In both staying healthy and providing quality
service, officers must keep themselves fit and ready for work. It is imperative that in
some situations it is the most significant factor in being successful on the job. Thus, any
officer who is unhealthy may find it difficult to cope with stressful situations such as
making arrests is not likely enforce his/her duties effectively. Therefore, in recruiting
police officers, a minimum standard for measuring a candidate’s health is one of the most

**Personal Interview**

The personal interview is one of the oldest ways of personnel selection. It is used
for preliminary screening to determine whether or not an applicant’s qualifications are
good enough for the desired job or task. It should be thorough enough to bring about
evidence of motivation, social skills, leadership, and other traits, in addition to more
factual information about education, work experience, and other specific job
qualifications (Lipset et.al., 1964, p. 66). The general validity of the interview apparently
depends on the interviewer’s having accurate and complete information about the job and
worker requirements (Landy, 1976). But most of the time, interviewers rely on certain
stereotypes when making a judgment regarding honesty (e.g., firm handshake, shifty
eyes, type and style of clothes). Arvey & Faley (1988), citing different research on the
reliability of interviews, state that interviews are used predominantly to search for
reasons to reject candidates. The employee interview also is likely to cause problems in
areas related to equal employment opportunities. The researchers go on to say that the
interview process is open to “subjective biases, prejudices, and stereotypes on the part of
interviewers.” In other words, interviewers may evaluate minority-group members lower than nonminority candidates, even though the candidates have similar qualities. As a consequence, this leaves the employer open to civil right litigation. Also, stereotypes developed by subjective biases such as women are generally “emotional, excitable, gentle, and nurturing,” while the men are “more aggressive and independent than women” may lead to discrimination against people even though these are not the real requisites of the job (p. 214-215).

Psychological Tests (Personality Inventories)

The use of psychological tests has a long history, but it is only recently that law enforcement agencies increased their knowledge about when to use psychological tests and what they best predict. Studies conducted in recent years revealed that psychological tests were valid and reliable predictors of police performance. Another reason tests are gaining popularity in police selection is because they reduce some of the human influence on recruitment and selection (Surrette et al., 2003). Baker (1995) states that psychological tests are used in law enforcement for two purposes: screen in candidates who meet the personality profile of successful officers and screen out candidates who display deviant characteristics or questionable personality traits that indicate a potential for trouble (p. 39). Personality tests measure “emotional, motivational, interpersonal, and attitudinal characteristic rather than abilities” (Anastasi, 1988, p. 523). Personality inventories or tests got under way in the 1930s when trait theories were prominent. The first inventories were constructed to classify personality into traits such as dominance, sociability, self-
confidence, and the like; however, many people do not want to give a true response to such questions, especially when they apply for employment. But the use of such tests has increased since the 1970s. The most commonly used personality test by municipal police departments are the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), which was first developed at the University of Minnesota, and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). There are studies suggesting that personality tests predict academy-training outcomes and job performance correctly.

**Physical Agility Test**

The physical agility test is a set of exercises in addition to the medical exam to determine the applicant’s muscular endurance, flexibility, absolute strength, and cardiovascular capacity. The consequences of employing physically unfit individuals for a physically demanding job can be costly, both in human and economic terms. Injuries, turnover, and poor performance can all result from a failure to adequately screen out physically unsuited applicants (Relly et al., 1979, p. 262). Police work also requires strong and physically fit officers who can cope with the difficult nature of police work.

**Polygraph Exam**

The polygraph exam (often referred to as a lie-detector test) is defined as including “a polygraph, deceptograph, voice stress analyzer, psychological stress evaluator or any other similar device (whether mechanical or electrical) that is used . . . for the purpose of rendering a diagnostic opinion regarding the honesty or dishonesty of
the individual” (Abrams, 1989; Philip Ash, in Jones, 1991). The polygraph investigator asks the subject questions, the answers to which are known only by him or her, and deviation from the baseline for truthfulness is taken as sign of lying.

Although originally designed to determine truthfulness or deception about past (usually criminal) activities, the polygraph exam began to be used widely for preemployment screening as well. The history of the polygraph goes back to Erisistratus (200 B.C.), who first took pulses to detect deception. But its scientific use began with Lombroso’s (1895) studies. He used a plethysmograph for continuously monitoring blood pressure during the questioning of suspects, anticipating the first development of the polygraph. Munsterberg (1908), a pioneer in industrial psychology, later developed two approaches to the measurement of veracity and honesty. The first used four physiological measures (breathing rate, blood pressure, breathing depth, and heart rate, while the second used three “association latency” tests (Abrams, 1989; Jones 1991) Before passage of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act in 1988, preemployment accounted for probably 75 to 80 percent of all polygraph tests administered; estimates ranged up to 4 million preemployment tests a year.

Reaction against the preemployment polygraph soon began, stimulated to a large extent by labor-union opposition and the opposition of the American Civil Liberties Union. California and Delaware passed laws limiting polygraph usage in 1953; by 1987, 27 states, plus the District of Columbia, prohibited the use of the polygraph for employment selection. The American Psychological Association (APA) passed a resolution opposing employee screening by polygraph unless it was validated in compliance with APA
standards. Eventually, the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate passed bills to prohibit most preemployment polygraph screening in the private sector nationally. And in 1988, Congress passed and the president signed the Employee Polygraph Protection Act, effective December 17, 1988. This act prohibits the use of polygraph testing in preemployment screening in the private sector and defers to state laws, which are more stringent than federal law. The act, however, excludes the use of the polygraph for screening applicants to sensitive positions in the private sector and applicants for law enforcement, security, intelligence, and military positions in the public sector.

Second-Language Test

Knowledge of a second language is necessary where some members of the community speak a language other than the one that police use. Separate from conflicts between minority groups and the police, language barriers can impede communication, for example, between those members of the Hispanic population who heavily use Spanish and the police who primarily speak English. Figures indicate that as a result of both immigration and birthrate, Hispanics comprise the fastest-grown population in the United States. Between 1949 and 1997, the Hispanic population increased from 9.1 million to 29 million. The U.S. Census Bureau says that as of July, 1, 2006, the population of Hispanic was 44.3 million, accounting for 14.8% of the total population of 299 million.

It is estimated that by 2009, Hispanics will outnumber the African-American population in the United States. By 2050, almost 47% of the U.S. population will be Hispanic (Herbst & Walker, 2001, p. 329). This indicates a need for police officers in
largely Hispanic area to be able to communicate in Spanish. Assessing an officer’s bilingual status may require a test that measures writing, speaking, and grammar in the second language. For example, a candidate may be asked to write an essay in the second language.

**Voice-Stress Analyzer**

Voice-stress analysis is a type of lie-detector test that measures stress in a person’s voice. It was developed by a group of Army intelligence officers around the mid-1970s. Notwithstanding some of the negative provisions about it, such as test’s chance of detecting lies being no more than a guess (Hansen, 1999, p. 1), it may have a respective success in detecting lies. Panosh (1996) suggests that it may be superiority to a polygraph exam in that an actual person does not need to be present; his or her voice in a tape-record format is enough to make a voice analysis (p. 1). Voice-stress analysis is a simple technology that measures the frequencies in the human voice. It is suggested by medical researchers that frequencies in the human voice in the range of 8 Hz to 12 Hz are sensitive to honesty. The scores for analysis indicate that when a person is being honest, the average sound in that range generally is below 10 Hz, but usually is above 10 Hz when a person is being dishonest (http://www.lie-detection.com).

**Volunteer/Community Service**

Some departments may require applicants to serve as volunteers for the department or have them engage in community service to evaluate their performance.
Volunteers are individuals who donate their time, efforts, and experience to an organization without receiving money or in-kind payment (Brudney, 1990 in Pynes, 2004). There are different explanations about why people volunteer. Some say they volunteer to express intrinsic rewards such as satisfaction or a sense of accomplishment. Other say they volunteer to be able to get benefits such as discounts and/or memberships granted to volunteers (Pynes, 2004, p. 124). Pynes (2004) states that the public sector benefited from the services of more than 2.4 million volunteers, or 26 percent of total volunteer employment (p. 121).

**Written Aptitude Test**

Psychologists have developed special aptitude tests for a wide variety of specific abilities, or aptitudes. Aptitude tests measure abstract mental, spatial, clerical, musical, and artistic abilities (Baker, 1995, p. 27) Applicants for police work also mostly take aptitude tests. Some jurisdictions require memory and recognition tests, assuming that memory is important in identifying criminals and suspects from their photographs and remembering the chronological sequence of events (p. 28).

**Clearance Rates**

The second dependent variable for this research is clearance rates. Even though it is not a perfect measure, the clearance rate for crime is an indicator of police work in the areas of criminal investigation and identification and apprehension of offenders (American Bar Association, 1980, Burton et al., 1993) and a standard measure of productivity in law
enforcement (Alpert and Moore, 1993). Typically, the term clearance rate refers to the number of incidents in which at least one suspect is charged and/or arrested for the offense, divided by the number of total incidents known to the police (Pare et al., 2007 p. 1). The clearance rate is used as a dependent variable to see if selecting good officers makes any difference in fighting crime and clearing criminal cases.

Some scholars doubt whether clearance rates are good indicators of police performance (Riedel & Jarvis, 1999). Among some possible considerations are differences in the definition of clearing crime (a crime may be considered cleared if someone is charged or a suspect is arrested even if there is no charge or a likely suspect is identified even if no arrest is made). Some departments also manipulate their records to increase their clearance rates. They do so by not reporting difficult cases or by overly defining clearance, or encouraging suspects to confess to a series of offenses in exchange for more lenient charges (Pare´ et al., 2007, p. 2). Others argue that the difficulty of a task is an important concern for clearance rates. Namely, if a police department handles a significantly high number of difficult cases, it is less likely to clear a high number of them. Clearance rates are highly associated with the type of crime (Cordner, 1989). Some offenders are identified when the crime was detected, such as drug possession or driving while intoxicated. FBI crime reports indicate that violent crimes are more likely to clear than are property crimes. It is likely that offender and victims encounter in violent crimes and victims help law enforcement officers as witnesses, while this is not the case for most property crimes.
Some studies also indicate that another association with clearance rates is workload. If there are too many cases to clear, there is less time and fewer resources available for a particular case (Bayley, 1994, pp. 39-40). It also is likely that heavily populated urban areas give more anonymity to offenders and makes clearing crimes less likely or more difficult (Pare’ et al., 2007, p. 3).

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Community Policing

Trajonawicz (1983), also known as the founder of community policing and the late director of the National Center for Community Policing, defines community policing as “a philosophy of full service policing involving a partnership between the police and the community to solve problems through permanently assigned areas to patrol generalists in a decentralized organization.”

Kessler (1999) asserts that “community policing has emerged as an approach to establish better relationships with the community in order to improve service through cooperative efforts.” Community policing differs from traditional policing, which emphasizes detached police services rendered by officers in patrol cars as they respond to calls for service (Trajonawicz et al., 2002, p. 19).

Community policing emphasizes the value of the patrol officer as an individual. Patrol officers have broader freedom to make decisions about what should be done and how it should be done in their communities. In other words, they assume managerial responsibility for the delivery of police services to their assigned area. The logic behind
this assumption is that patrol officers are mostly together with the community members they serve, which allows them to be more familiar with the needs and strengths of their communities than those of other officers. It gives officers the opportunity to come together with the community and discuss potential reasons for local problems and possible solutions. It also is true that having close ties with the community gives officers a sense of “pride of ownership,” while motivating both parties to solve the problems that threaten the security and safety of the neighborhood (Community Policing Consortium, 1994). The benefit of community policing is more meaningful considering the American public’s widespread attitude against police, as it fosters criticism and cynicism that is reinforced by the American culture of individual freedom. This separation of police and community may have been the result of technological innovations or the historically political and corruptive influences concerning the police role or changing social values and structures. The media also are quick to publicize criticism of law enforcement but slow to offer praise (Miller & Braswell, 2002, pp. 1-2, Trajonawicz, 2002, p. 36).

However, it is important for policymakers to understand officers’ acceptance of community policing and to be able to identify those officers who have favorable attitudes toward community policing (Novak et al., 2003, p. 58). As Lurigio and Skogan (1994) also noted, “the success of community policing depends on the police officers who are responsible for implementing the programs. In essence, their attitudes, perceptions and behaviors must be substantially changed before community policing can be put into practice.” (p. 315). They go on to say that it is imperative for officer to accept and embrace community collaboration and its positive impact on determining and solving
problems. Otherwise, if officers undermine the required implementations, community policing will be compromised and resources will be wasted.

**Citizen Complaints**

Citizen complaints are another variable in this research on recruitment practices in police departments. Toch (1996) argues that complaints against police represent “an underlying dysfunction that might require corrective action.” Although there are many forms of complaints about police—ranging from excessive use of power, to incivility and abusive language, to failure to enforce given powers, to corruption (Peter & Barton, 1970, p. 449)—the greatest concern is about police brutality, which is most visible in the excessive use of power, deadly force, and shootings (Cao & Huang, 2000, p. 203; Pare´ et al., 2007). Police authority to exert non-negotiable force is seldom challenged but its proper use always has become an issue of concern because it is a part of police brutality (Kerstetter, 1985, p. 149). It is an important topic for both academicians and police administrators because it may “reduce the public confidence in the police, depress officer morale, and generate conflict between police and the community” (Langworthy & Travis, 1994); therefore, police behavior is a fundamental issue to be considered in recruitment. Kelling et al. (1988) argues that police brutality risks the “organizational stability and continuity of leadership” because the organization is at risk of outside interference, and the police chief is at risk of losing his job (p. 1).
**Civilian Review Board**

Dislike for the police, fear of the police, or the lack of confidence in the police may make some citizens reluctant to submit complaints to the police. Hudson (1971) argues that most complaints about the police should be made in a police station and that such a requirement is bound to have a deterrent effect, particularly on those in lower socioeconomic classes. This in part can be interpreted as the police departments wanting to deter citizen complaints. A common aspect of a reprisal, he argues, is making a false charge and not prosecuting the complaint if the complaint is later withdrawn (p. 454).

As a consequence of problems related to investigating citizen complaints against the police (e.g., complaints were not prosecuted and/or complainants were not notified of the results an investigation of a complaint), citizen review boards were established as an independent board to follow citizen complaints in a more objective manner and advise the mayor on ways to improve police-community relations based on citizen complaints (Hudson, 1972, p. 427). Guzman (2001) argues that review boards play the same role in police departments that the system of checks and balances does in democracies. He argues that in democracies, this principle means that the governmental institutions are established in a way that no agency has a monopoly of governmental power. In other words, an external body has the power to control the sources of checks for any particular agency (Guzman, 2001, p. 12). It is thus a good source for developing recruitment policies in that dysfunctions and deficiencies in police departments can be observed more objectively and be reported honestly and in a timely manner to the mayor. It is this practice that helps to shape and develop recruitment policies.
Minimum Education Requirement

Educational requirement for police candidates is another predictor of the recruitment policies of police departments. The issue is whether increasing the minimum education requirement also leads to more efficient selection using more diverse techniques. This predictor, however, is subject to considerable discussion among law enforcement personnel (Krimmel, 1996; Cascio & Real, 1976; Polk & Armstrong, 2001; Shernock, 1992; Decker & Huckabee, 2002; Carter et. al., 1988; Eskridge, 1989). Despite counterarguments such as “policing is more like a craft than a science, in that officers believe that they have important lessons to learn that are not reducible to principle and are not being taught through formal education” (Bayley & Bittner, 1997 pp. 128-129).

Starting with Volmer’s (1932) initiatives, the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, also known as the Wickersham Commission, recommended that police departments require their personnel to have a college education. Later, the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice revisited this recommendation and suggested that “the ultimate aim of all police departments should be that all personnel with general enforcement powers have baccalaureate degrees” (President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, 1968, p. 279). Unlike the recommendation of the Wickersham Commission, which only recommended a college education, the President’s Commission lead to the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. That act in turn provided monies to fund criminal justice students in the form of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) [Eskridge, 1989]. Arguments highlighting a higher education level for police
officers were also shared by some other agencies, such as the American Bar Association, the Police Foundation’s Task Force on Education and Training, and the logic behind this consensus might be that a liberal education is required if the police are to escape from the rigid conservatism that characterizes the harsh way of policing in the 1960s. As Carter et al. (1989) suggested, those with college experience would be more responsible and better suited for the complex problem of crime. Despite this emphasis and encouragement, a study conducted by Hickman and Reaves (2002) indicated that the number of police agencies requiring a four-year college degree to be hired as a police officer nationally corresponds to only 1% of police agencies. The researchers also found that 6% of police agencies require some college, and 8% require a two-year degree. Nonetheless, many police departments have made college experience an informal requirement for hiring and advancement (Carter & Sapp, 1990).

Trajonawicz and Nicholson (1976) investigated the behavioral styles of college graduates versus noncollege police officers. They found that “noncollege police officers prefer to follow schedules and daily routines; like to work closely with their supervisors rather than by themselves; would rather have their supervisors make decisions for them; and finally, value themselves according to how successfully they have conformed to the role requirements of the organization” (p. 56).

In contrast, college-graduate police officers were found to be “willing to experiment and try new things, as opposed to preferring the established and conventional way of doing things; prefer to assume leadership roles and like to direct and supervise the work of others; use a step-by-step method for processing information and reaching
decisions; like to engage in work providing a lot of excitement and a great deal of variety, as opposed to work providing a stable and secure future; and finally, value themselves by their achievement of the status symbols established by their culture” (Trajonawicz & Nicholson, 1976, pp. 56-59).

In addition to these behavioral styles, studies have shown that college-graduate police officers perform better on the street as well. A study conducted by Finnigan (1976) divided the performance criteria into four dimensions: performance of various types of duties (e.g., regular duties, administrative duties, supervision of subordinates/officers, handling citizens, evaluating officers, training personnel), exhibition of various traits and characteristics (e.g., endurance, personal appearance, dignity of demeanor, attention to duty, cooperation, initiative, judgment, presence of mind, force leadership, loyalty). Finnigan controlled for the effect of age, IQ, race, and military service and found that college graduates consistently rated higher than noncollege police officers (pp. 60-62). Polk & Armstrong (2001) also found that officers with a higher level of education are more likely to hold command and supervisory positions in the future (p. 22).

Racial Diversity

In the globalized 21st century, the concept of race has become a significant one in the political arena and has generated a multiculturalism, or racial diversification. There is no doubt that this change provided a new face of pluralism (Winant, 2000, p. 171). However, it is difficult to deny that racial groups (in particular, the African-American community) were underrepresented in police departments in the United States (Raganella
& White, 2004, p. 501). Much of this underrepresentation was attributed to either the negative relationship between police and racial groups or discrimination in the selection process (p. 501).

Selection-system characteristics are considered fair to the extent that they comply with or violate certain procedural and distributive justice rules. The extent to which applicants believe the selection system complies with or violates these procedural rules that shape and define the selection systems and techniques used by a police department leads to a perception of overall fairness, which in turn produces individual and organizational outcomes. In other words, any selection system is fair to the extent that it provides and maintains the procedures and rules that guarantee an equal selection opportunity for people from all diverse groups of the community (Raganella & White, 2004, p. 502).

The form of equality that workplace equal-opportunity initiatives are intended to achieve have been the subject of many discussions in the equality and workforce-diversity literature (Liff & Wajman, 1996, Dickens, 1994, Slonaker et al., 2001; Johnston, 2006; Carrell & Mann, 1995). There are many different approaches in defining what workforce diversity is or what diversity means in a human resource management context. The definition of diversity ranges from seeing it as an organizational multiculturalism (Rosen & Lovelace, 1991, pp. 78-84) to seeing it as an affirmative action goal or supporting affirmative action programs (Copeland, 1988; Coleman, 1990), or seeing it as reflecting the demographic diversity of the population served (Kellough, 1990). Meisinger (2008) discusses diversity in terms of its value-adding aspect, suggesting that managing diversity
is not just recruiting from diverse groups and being in compliance with legal stipulations; instead, it requires the inclusion of different people so that “each employee's contributions are valued, leveraged and appreciated, generates opportunities for growth, flexibility, greater adaptability and, often, more creative problemsolving” (p. 8).

In practice, the antidiscrimination legal framework in the United States and the United Kingdom lends support to a collective equal-treatment/sameness approach to selection. Liff and Wajman (1996) argue that the objective is to appoint, promote, and reward individuals on the basis of job-relatedness criteria so people are treated equally irrespective of their sex or ethnic origin.

Discriminatory outcomes before or after recruitment are discussed under two common concepts. These are disparate treatment and disparate impact (Slonaker, 2001; Pynes, 2005). It is disparate treatment when individuals or groups are intentionally treated differently or discriminated against by a superior or by organizational policies. Intention, or “evil motive,” is important when trying to prove disparate treatment. To illustrate how disparate treatment occurs, Sloanaker et al. (2001) give the example that if between two applicants for a job, a younger officer is selected with no explanation to the older applicant while the older applicant has more experience and the same educational level as the younger one and the police chief is known to have said, “Whenever given the choice, I’ll always take the younger officer.” The second term is disparate impact (also called adverse impact). This type of discrimination occurs when policies implemented by employers seem fair to all employees while adversely affecting one group. Here, motive is not important. In fact, disparate impact can occur when the employer is trying not to
discriminate. Historically, a common example of disparate impact would be if a department requires applicants to be at least 5 feet 10 inches tall, as that would rule out a vast majority of female applicants and also many applicants from minority national origins (Sloanaker, 2001, p. 294).

The Uniform Guidelines for Employee Selection Procedures (1978) also states:

> The use of any selection procedure which has an adverse impact on the hiring, promotion, or other employment or membership opportunities of members of any race, sex, or ethnic group will be considered to be discriminatory and inconsistent with these guidelines. Where two or more selection procedures are available which serve the user's legitimate interest in efficient and trustworthy workmanship, and which are substantially equally valid for a given purpose, the user should use the procedure which has been demonstrated to have the lesser adverse impact.

**Crime Rates**

Increasing prominence of order maintenance and media coverage leads people to take into account the crime rate where they live. Arguments on the potential effect of police presence in deterring crime suggest that the crime rate will decrease as the number of police per capita recruited increases (Yoon & Joo, 2005, p. 32). One opposing view suggests that social, demographic, and economic forces determine the bulk of aggregate crime rates. This view makes treating crime rates as an indicator of police effectiveness unjustifiable (Sung, 2005, p. 348; Bayley, 1994, p. 3).

Gordon (2007) suggests that more officers are often needed, not only for reducing crime rates but also for the safety of officers. At the same time, he suggests the reverse argument that “adding cops wouldn't make crime appear to decline, since more police generally means more arrests for offences like possession of drugs and stolen property,”
which means an increase in reported crime rates (cited from Geddes, 2007, p. 2).

Also there are arguments stating that the collection of crime statistics is a waste of time because it has potentially had many inconsistencies, while some who defend reports, such as the Uniform Crime Report, believe they may help many police departments. Some groups believe that crime statistics are excellent social facts as well. It seems reasonable that people avoid working, playing, and living in high-crime areas. If they can afford to do so, they do not move there and, if they live there, they move out. These social processes help shape the economic and racial makeup of communities (Liska & Bellair, 1995, p. 582).

**Total Technology**

In the last two decades of the 20th century, the expenses for information technology increased to $600 billion in the United States and $2 trillion globally (Brown & Brudney, 2003, p. 30). The contribution of technological advances also has had a very fundamental role in increasing the capacity of police to fight crime. It helped increase the police presence where it is not possible to deal with all crimes (Manning, 2003, p. 109) and stimulated productivity, performance, and effectiveness (Brown & Brudney, 2003, p. 30). Technology also began to encompass human resources activities, including recruitment and training, position classification, and job evaluation (West & Berman, 2001, p. 38). Given that criminals also use sophisticated technology to commit crime, the need for more advanced technology is more evident. As the International Association of Chiefs of Police noted, “Police departments must be up to the same technological
standards as criminals” (Nunn, 2001, pp. 11-12). Advancements in analytic technology for collecting and processing data, training officers, and improving communication, and the increased quality of cars and equipment (e.g., video cameras, biometric systems such as DNA testing) have helped police organizations deliver their services more effectively and gain leverage or control in turbulent environments (Brown & Brudney, 2003, p. 31). The widespread use of the Internet and e-mail also accelerated police-public interaction. A detailed Web site for the organization can increase the public’s awareness about the department’s policies and procedures. Inclusion of computer technology made it easier to arrange and store data sources than had been the case (Manning, 2003, pp. 123-143). All of these technological advancements reflect a reform in police work and indicate a willingness to implement a significant change in the traditional mentality of policing. It definitely requires a new cadre of officers who are ready to use or ready to adapt themselves to the new world of technology.

Based on the above classifications of the components of the model for analysis, this study proposes a number of hypotheses. The objective is to better understand the factors affecting the selection and screening decisions of police departments at an empirical level.

**HYPOTHESES**

**Hypotheses for Selection Techniques**

**Hypothesis 1-a:** The more racially diverse the police jurisdiction, the more selection techniques a department will use.
**Hypothesis 1-b:** Departments having a more racially diverse workforce use more selection techniques than departments having a more homogenous workforce.

**Hypothesis 1-c:** The more community policing activities a police agency has, the more selection techniques the agency uses.

**Hypothesis 1-d:** Police departments use more diverse selection techniques as the minimum education requirement for recruitment increases. The higher the minimum education requirements for recruitment, the more selection techniques are used.

**Hypothesis 1-e:** Police departments that enforce higher numbers of functions use more selection techniques.

**Hypothesis 1-f:** Police departments with more clearances use more selection techniques.

**Hypothesis 1-g:** Police departments use more selection techniques as they receive more citizen complaints regarding their excessive use of force.

**Hypothesis 1-h:** Police departments of the cities where there is a civilian review board to investigate the civilian complaints use more diverse selection techniques.

**Hypothesis 1-i:** Police departments use more selection techniques as the median income of the population increases.

**Hypothesis 1-j:** Police departments using more technology in pursuing criminals use more selection techniques.

**Hypothesis 1-k:** Police departments having more financial resources invest more money in recruitment and selection and use more diverse selection techniques.
Hypotheses for Clearance Rates by Police Departments

**Hypothesis 2-a:** Police departments using more diverse selection techniques clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-b:** Departments having a more racially diverse workforce clear more crime.

**Hypothesis 2-c:** Police agencies involving more community policing activities clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-d:** Police departments having higher education requirements clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-e:** Police departments that enforce more functions clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-f:** Departments policing a racially more diverse population clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-g:** Police departments receiving more citizen complaints clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-h:** Police departments of the cities where there is a civilian review board to investigate the civilian complaints clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-i:** Police departments in cities with higher median income clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-j:** Police departments using more technology in pursuing criminals clear more crimes.

**Hypothesis 2-k:** Police departments having more financial resources clear more crimes.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

DATA SOURCES

The data were obtained from three sources: LEMAS (Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics), UCR (Uniform Crime Report), and census records. The three data sets were merged to include the relevant variables needed to analyze the factors that affect the application of different selection techniques for recruitment and selection of police officers. Due to the merged nature of the data, some cases were inevitably lost. The main reason for this problem is that LEMAS and UCR data are not compatible with census data because census data are at the place level. As a result, an exact match for some cases could not be found. The merged data set consisted of 2,569 cases and was merely a sample of municipal, sheriff, and county police agencies.

Also, in order to avoid removing some variables, the total number of cases decreased significantly because some of the questions such, as such as review boards and citizen complaints, were not asked of those departments having less than 100 officers, and the number of valid cases for some analyses decreased to 700 to 800. The unit of analysis for this study is police and sheriff departments in the United States.
Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statics (LEMAS)

LEMAS is a national-level survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics that was initiated in 1987 and is repeated almost every three to four years. It provides a broad level of information about the organizational characteristics of law enforcement agencies, such as size of the population served by the department, levels of employment and spending, various functions of the department, average salary levels for uniformed officers, policies and programs, weapons and armor policies, education and training requirements, computers and information systems, vehicles, special units, community policing activities, complaints against officers, and other matters related to management and personnel in the United States (Hickman & Reaves, 2002). LEMAS 2003 is the seventh survey in the series. The law enforcement agencies were separated into two groups for sampling purposes: self-representing (SR) and non-self-representing (NSR) agencies. All state police or agencies with 100 or more sworn full-time-equivalent (FTE) employees are SR agencies. All remaining sheriff's departments, local police department, and special police categories are NSR (http://www.icommunity.policingsr.umich.edu).

Uniform Crime Report (UCR)

The UCR was initiated in 1929 by August Vollmer, the founder of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, to meet the need for reliable crime statistics all over the nation. Later in 1930, the FBI took responsibility for collecting, arranging, publishing, and archiving the statistics (http://www.fbi.gov/ucr). The nature of the data collection is voluntary, and the participating law enforcement agencies provide
information in two major crime categories: Part I offenses include criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor-vehicle theft, and arson. Part II offenses include all other reportable crimes. This research will use 2003 UCR data in analyzing the relationship between selection techniques and the variables “crime rates” and “clearance rates.”

Census

Census 2000, the 22nd of its series, is known as the largest effort in determining the extensive information about both the population and the socioeconomic characteristics of the U.S. residents. It has two different forms: short and long. The short form is sent to every household and asks general questions such as sex, race, age, and whether the house is owned. The long form and is sent only to a sample group (almost 1-in-6) and includes more detailed questions, such as marital status, place of birth, citizenship, school enrollment, educational attainment, ancestry, migration status, veteran status, disability, and housing information (e.g., the value of the home or monthly rent paid, number of units in the structure, the number of rooms overall, the number of bedrooms, the year the current occupants moved into the residence, utilities, mortgage, taxes, insurance, and fuel costs) [http://www.census.gov].

An important focus of this study is the effect of racial diversity and the median income of the population served. These two pieces of information help in understanding whether a selection technique are affected by the racial composition of the population and whether selection techniques are used in a discriminatory way against minority groups.
Median income was selected as the measurement, on the assumption that as median income raises, the quality of life also increases and people are more aware of their right. Median income as a measurement tool also provides a way to question the public services that people and where their taxes are spent. In terms of law enforcement recruitment, they require the selection of high-quality and competent officers. The variables median income and racial diversity were derived from 2000 Census data and merged with LEMAS and UCR data.

MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES

This section provides detailed information on how each variable used to test the hypotheses was coded (see Table 1) and the main descriptive statistics, such as total number in sample \((N)\), minimum and maximum values, mean, standard error \((SE)\), standard deviation \((SD)\), and the variance (see Table 2).

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Selection Techniques

The dependent variable is a count variable of recruitment techniques used by police departments. The LEMAS survey provides a wide range of techniques and procedures for reference, and it gives the opportunity to see how many of these techniques and procedures are used by each police department. The techniques and procedures used in the survey are analytical/problem-solving tests, understanding diverse cultures, background investigation, credit history check, criminal history check, driving record check, drug test, mediation-skills assessment, medical exam, personal interview,
personality inventory, physical agility tests, polygraph exam, psychological evaluation, second-language test, voice stress analyzer, volunteer community service, written aptitude test.

Each of the 18 techniques was coded as a separate dummy variable in the LEMAS data, where “1” stands for the existence of the technique and “0” for nonexistence of the technique. After recoding the techniques to convert the missing cases as system missing, all the techniques were converted to a single-count variable by summing the dummy variables. The distribution was approximately normal (see Table 2 and Figure 1). The final variable had a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 18, with a mean of 9.638 selection techniques and a standard deviation of 2,657 (see Table 3).
## Table 1 - Coding Scheme For The Dependent And Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>CODING(MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DEPENDENT** | A count variable of the recruitment techniques used in police departments using the question personnel section of LEMAS 2003 (9.638; 2,657)  
Total number of crime clearance rates using the figures of UCR divided by the total number of sworn officers(5.790;6.566) |
<p>| <strong>INDEPENDENT</strong> | |
| Racial diversity of population | Measured with racial diversity index developed by Hill and Leighley (1999) In numbers between 0 and 1. “1” refers to maximum or perfect diversity(.276;.189) |
| Racial diversity of sworn officers | Measured with racial diversity index developed by Hill and Leighley (1999) In numbers between 0 and 1. “1” refers to maximum or perfect diversity(.176;.183) |
| Community policing involvement of departments | An index variable to measure the level of implementation of community policing across police agencies using community policing section of the LEMAS 2000 data. In numbers ranging between 0 and 34 (11.077; 8,768) |
| Education requirement | Indicates the educational requirement before recruitment process begins. The question about educational requirement in LEMAS was used for coding and it ranges from 1 to 5. 1 refers to four year college education 2 refers to two years of education 3 refers to some college but no degree(some credit hours) 4 refers to high school and 5 no formal educational requirement (2.268;.662) |
| Total number of functions | An index variable of the functions police departments operate. In numbers ranging from 1 to 35(21.140;4.719) |
| Crime rates | Total number of crime rates using the figures of UCR divided by the total number of sworn officers(19.981; 17.112) |
| Citizen complaint rates | Number of citizen complaints about excessive use of force from LEMAS 2003. Missing cases were treated as no complaints and recoded as 0 (9.520;110.88) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Median income</strong></th>
<th>Here refers to income that is measured with median household income from Census 2000 divided by 1000 (41.841; 16.916)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civilian Reviewboard</strong></td>
<td>If the city has a civilian reviewboard to investigate citizen complaints. (.147; .354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Technology</strong></td>
<td>The total number of technology used in police departments (12.59;3.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Salary</strong></td>
<td>The minimum salary officers receive. Divided by 1000(31.318;8.679)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Budget</strong></td>
<td>Total operation budget for the 12-month period that includes June 30, 2003’. Divided by 1000.’ (96.675;55.425)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Frequency of Selection Techniques Across Police Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>VALID PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2679</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from SPSS Frequency Analysis for the Selection Techniques Count Variable
Figure 1 – Histogram Showing Distribution of Selection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min’m</th>
<th>Max’m</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Techniques</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Requirement</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total technology</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>3.460</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>193.16</td>
<td>41.84</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>286.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Complaints</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review board</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total functions</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>22.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community policing</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial diversity</td>
<td>2641</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Diversity</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget per officer</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1080.8</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>3072.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Rates</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>199.00</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>43.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Converted from SPSS Descriptive Statistics for the Dependent and Independent Variables
Clearance Per Officer

The variable “Clearance per officer” was created in a similar way with complaints per officer. UCR (Uniform Crime Report) provides detailed information about the clearance rates for both violent and property crimes. It is possible to find the total clearance rates either computing the numbers of clearance for each crime or just computing the number of total clearances of violent crimes and total number of clearances for property crimes. The variable “Total clearance rates” was created through adding these total numbers for violent and property crime clearance rates. Then it was divided by the total number of sworn officers to find the number of clearances per officer to keep the values within a reasonable range. The “clearances per officer” variable has a minimum of .00 and a maximum of 199.00 and a mean of 5.79 and a standard deviation of 6.56

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Community Policing Index

This index covers 34 community-policing variables:

- Community policing
- Community policing training for new officers
- Community policing training for in-service sworn officers
- Community policing training for civilian personnel
- Encouraged SARA (Scanning Analysis Response Assessment)-type projects
- SARA-type percentage
• Conducted a citizen police academy

• Created a community policing plan

• Assigned geographic areas/beats

• Geographic areas/beats percentage

• Problem-solving in evaluation criteria

• Trained citizens in community policing

• Upgraded technology

• Partnered with citizen groups

• Mission statement included community policing

• Met with advocacy groups

• Met with business groups

• Met with religious groups

• Met with local government

• Met with other local law enforcement agencies

• Met with neighborhood associations

• Met with senior-citizen groups

• Met with school groups

• Met with youth-service organizations

• Surveyed public satisfaction

• Surveyed public perception

• Surveyed personal crime experiences
- Surveyed reporting of crimes
- Surveyed other
- Other survey description
- Used information for allocating resources
- Used information for evaluating performance
- Used information for evaluating effectiveness
- Used information to prioritize problems
- Used information for providing information
- Used information for redistrict areas
- Used information for training development
- Used information for other purposes

These variables were recoded as dummy variables and then converted to a single index variable. The new index variable had a minimum of 0.00, a maximum of 34, a mean of 11.07, and standard deviation of 8.76.

**Racial Diversity**

The idea for constructing the “racial diversity” variable was taken from Hill & Leighley (1999), who made use of an index of ethnic fractionalization based on Taylor & Hudson’s (1972) *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*. Basically, the racial-diversity index indicates how racially heterogeneous a population is with respect to the racial composition of that population. It is measured by the probability that two randomly chosen individuals from a given population do not belong to the same race.
category. Therefore, the index ranges between 0 and 1, and higher values of it indicate greater ethnic diversity.

According to the definition of how racial diversity is measured, the formula for calculating this probability is as follows:

\[
1 - \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{6} X_i (X_i - 1)}{T(T-1)} \right)
\]

Where:
- \(T\) = total number of population,
- \(X_1\) = number of whites,
- \(X_2\) = number of blacks,
- \(X_3\) = number of Native Americans,
- \(X_4\) = number of Asians,
- \(X_5\) = number of Pacific Islanders,
- \(X_6\) = number of others.

An example calculation for the racial diversity of the Cleveland (Ohio) Police department jurisdiction is as follows:

\[
1 - \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{6} X_i (X_i - 1)}{T(T-1)} \right) = 1 - \frac{[X_1 (X_1 - 1) + X_2 (X_2 - 1) + X_3 (X_3 - 1) + X_4 (X_4 - 1) + X_5 (X_5 - 1) + X_6 (X_6 - 1)]}{T(T-1)}
\]

\[
= 1 - \frac{[199594 * 199593 + 242481 * 242480 + 1406 * 1405 + 6878 * 6877 + 196 * 195 + 17234 * 17233]}{478393 * 478392}
\]

\[
= 1 - \frac{98980665300}{228859384056}
\]

\[
= 1 - 0.43 = 0.57
\]
The result of the calculation indicates that the jurisdiction the Cleveland Police Department serves has a 57% diverse population. The “racial diversity of the population” variable has a minimum of 0.00, a maximum of 0.82, a mean of 0.27, and a standard deviation of 0.189.

**Sworn Officer Diversity**

The same formula was used to calculate the percentage of the diversity of sworn officers. In the data set, there are numbers for white, black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, and other ethnicities. Each ethnicity was coded in two different variables for male and female officers. A total male number and a total female number for each ethnicity was coded in two different variables. To be able to see the total number of officers of any ethnicity, the two variables for each ethnicity were added and then, based on the number of sworn officers, the racial diversity of sworn officers was calculated using the same racial diversity formula shown above for racial diversity.

An example of the diversity of the sworn officers working in the Houston Police Department is as follows:

\[
1 - \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{6} X_i (X_i - 1)}{T(T-1)} \right) = 1 - \frac{[X_1 (X_1 - 1) + X_2 (X_2 - 1) + X_3 (X_3 - 1) + X_4 (X_4 - 1) + X_5 (X_5 - 1) + X_6 (X_6 - 1)]}{T(T-1)} = 1 - \frac{(3074 * 3073 + 1089 * 1088 + 1033 * 1032 + 6 * 5 + 148 * 147 + 0 * 0 + 0 * 0)}{28617150} = 1 - \frac{11719076}{28617150} = 1 - 0.40 = 0.60
\]
The result indicates that the Houston Police Department has a 60% diverse sworn personnel population. The “sworn diversity” variable has a minimum of 0.00, a maximum of 1.00, a mean of 0.17, and a standard deviation of 0.183.

Civilian Review Board

The “civilian review board” variable is a dummy variable and questions whether the city has a civilian review board. The question is twofold. The first part asks if there is a civilian review board; the second question asks whether any of these civilian review boards work independently. It is important to note that the LEMAS survey was prepared in two similar but different forms. The latter was sent to the small departments that were identified as departments with fewer than 100 officers. The survey of the smaller departments is a shorter one and does not contain all of the questions in the survey of the larger departments. The logic was that small departments may not have answers to all questions asked in the first survey. For example, questions regarding the units the departments have, small departments were considered to not having some of the units that larger departments have. Likewise, the question about civilian review boards also is not available in the second survey. Therefore, the cases with no answer for the question about civilian review boards were not added to the analyses. and this listwise deletion decreased the total number of the population to 900 from a previous total of 2,600. The “civilian review board” variable has a minimum of 0.00, a maximum of 1.00, a mean of 0.14, and a standard deviation of 0.354.
Total Number of Functions

The “total number of functions” variable was added to see if the diversity and specialization in different law-enforcement functions increase recruitment policies and decision-making in police departments. The variable also was used as an indicator of department size. Questions about the functions were all dummy variables. After recoding the missing cases as “system missing,” a count variable from 36 functions was generated, as it gives a picture of how many functions each police department has and therefore the size of the department. The functions are responding to citizen calls, providing patrol services, responding to crime incidents, enforcing drug laws, enforcing vice laws, enforcing traffic laws, providing traffic direction/control, investigating accident, enforcing parking laws, enforcing commercial vehicle laws, investigating homicides, investigating arsons, investigating cybercrimes, pursuing other types of crime, executing arrest warrants, providing court security, serving civil process papers, serving eviction notices, enforcing protection orders, enforcing child support orders, providing animal control, providing school-crossing services, providing emergency medical services, providing civil defense services, providing fire services, educating the public about crime prevention, providing bomb/explosives disposal services, providing search-and-rescue services, providing a special weapons and tactics (SWAT) team, helping with underwater-recovery operations, operating the jail, operating a lockup facility, operating a temporary holding cell, transporting inmates, providing law enforcement dispatch service, providing fire dispatch services, and operating a training academy.
The “total functions” variable has a minimum of 1.00, a maximum of 35.00, a mean of 21.14, and a standard deviation of 4.71.

**Complaints per Officer**

The LEMAS survey asks a question about the total number of citizen complaints regarding the use of force, and it is this question that was used as an indicator of citizen complaints in general. This variable was used to see if there is a link between citizen complaints and recruitment decision-making. Increasing numbers of citizen complaints is likely to be hypothesized as having a relationship with more careful recruitment. Before finding the complaints per officer, two things were completed. First a variable with the total number of sworn officers was created, and then the variable “total number of citizen complaints regarding use of force” was divided by this number of sworn officers.

The “complaints per officer” variable has a minimum of 0.00, a maximum of 0.91, a mean of 0.48, and a standard deviation of 0.78.

**Median Income**

The “median income” variable is taken from census data and is measured in dollars. The numbers are high. It was divided by 1,000 to keep the numbers in a reasonable range and make the calculations easier. The original form of the variable in census data was labeled “p053001.” The label was recoded as “median income.”

The “median income” variable has a minimum of 0.00, a maximum of 193.06, a mean of 41.84, and a standard deviation of 16.91.
Minimum Education Requirement

The “minimum education requirement” variable consists of five groups. These groups were recoded in a reverse order as shown below:

1 = Four-year college degree required
2 = Two-year college degree required
3 = Some college but no degree (specify credit hours)
4 = High school diploma or equivalent degree
5 = No formal education requirement

The “minimum education requirement” variable has a minimum of 1.00, a maximum of 5.00, a mean of 2.26, and a standard deviation of 0.662

Minimum Salary

The “minimum salary” variable is available in the LEMAS data, but the numbers are high; therefore, it was divided by 1,000 to keep the numbers within a reasonable range and reduce the risk of wrong calculations.

The “minimum salary” variable has a minimum of 10.00, a maximum of 90.00, a mean of 31.31, and a standard deviation of 8.67.

Crime per Officer

The “crime per officer” variable was created by using UCR figures for both violent and property crimes. The “total crime rates” variable is possible under one variable, though it also is possible to compute a number violent crim and property crime
individually. The number for total crime was then divided by the total number of sworn officers to find the crimes per officer.

The “crimes per officer” variable has a minimum of 0.00, a maximum of 328.00, a mean of 19.981, and a standard deviation of 17.112.

**Budget per Officer**

An operational budget in dollars is a variable in the LEMAS data. The operational-budget number was divided by the number of sworn officers to find the amount of money spent per officer. The numbers were high, making it necessary to divided the number by 1,000 to keep the numbers within a reasonable range.

The “budget per officer” variable has a minimum of 4.036, a maximum of 1080.8, a mean of 96.67, and a standard deviation of 55.4.

**Total Technology**

The “total technology” variable was generated using the questions in LEMAS related to the equipment and other technological devices used by police departments. As dummy variables questioning whether or not police departments use these technologies, each question was first recoded for the missing variables and then converted to a count variable to see how many technologies each department uses.

The “total technology” variable has a minimum of 1.00, a maximum of 23.00, a mean of 12.59, and a standard deviation of 3.460.
STATISTICAL METHOD

Multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used to test the hypotheses because the distribution of the techniques forming the dependent variable was normal. Hamilton (2004) suggests that OLS regression is ideal if the errors are normally, independently, and identically distributed. However, when heavily tailed error distributions, namely outliers, are present, some other unbiased estimators such as robust regression work better (p. 239). Clearance rates and complaint rates are ratio-level variables and are suitable for OLS regression analyses. The independent variables are a combination of dummy, ordinal, and ratio-level variables.

Selection Techniques

The method used for the analysis of the dependent variable “selection techniques” tested hypotheses 1a to 1k (pp.90-91). The equation is as follows:

\[ Y \text{ (selection techniques)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X\text{(racial diversity)} + \beta_2 X \text{ (sworn diversity)} + \beta_3 X\text{(education requirement)} + \beta_4 X \text{ (community policing index)} + \beta_5 X \text{ (total functions)} + \beta_6 X \text{ (budget)} + \beta_7 X \text{ (minimum salary)} + \beta_8 X \text{ (review board)} + \beta_9 X \text{ (median income)} + \beta_{10} X \text{ (citizen complaints)} + \beta_{11} X \text{ (total technology)} + e_1 \]

Clearance Rates

The method used for the analysis of the dependent variable “clearance rates” tested hypotheses 2a to 2k (pp. 91-92). The equation is as follows:
\( Y(\text{clearance rates}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X (\text{racial diversity}) + \beta_2 X (\text{sworn diversity}) + \beta_3 X (\text{education requirement}) + \beta_4 X (\text{community policing index}) + \beta_5 X (\text{total functions}) + \beta_6 X (\text{budget}) + \beta_7 X (\text{minimum salary}) + \beta_8 X (\text{reviewboard}) + \beta_9 X (\text{median income}) + \beta_{10} X (\text{selection techniques}) + \beta_{11} X (\text{citizen complaints}) + \beta_{12} (\text{total technology}) + \beta_{13} (\text{crime rates}) + \epsilon \)
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

This chapter examines the impact of different organizational and social factors on recruitment decision-making in police departments. The research hypotheses detailed at the end of Chapter 3 were tested.

The equations were checked for multicollinearity and heteroscedasticity. The multicollinearity check was done by using collinearity diagnostics, such as variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance values. Berry (1993) suggests that multicollinearity is a problem referring to correlated independent variables in a specific sample of data. In other words, multicollinearity impedes the researcher’s ability to see the effect of one independent variable over the dependent variable when partial slope coefficients are used to hold other variables constant. However, when the independent variables in an equation are highly correlated, it is impossible to see the separate effect of any single independent variable (pp. 24-25). Multicollinearity does not make regression-coefficient estimators biased, but it does impact the variance of the estimated regression coefficients. Namely, as the collinearity between two independent variables increases, the standard errors of regression-coefficient estimators increase. When high multicollinearity is present, “confidence intervals for coefficients tend to be wider and t statistics for significance tend to be very small” (p. 41). In most analyses of the study, a multicollinearity problem was not detected. A possible explanation is that “the only situation a researcher risks perfect
Multicollinearity is with a small data set” (Berry & Feldman, 1985, p. 38). It is actually the case that in social life, most variables explaining different things are intercorrelated, and it is considered inevitable to some extent. So what is important about multicollinearity is not its existence but the degree. Berry & Feldman (1985) also warn that coefficient estimates with high standard errors may not be caused by multicollinearity alone. Using a small sample or having variables with little variance in the sample can also lead to high standard errors (p. 41).

Heteroscedasticity was checked by using the Breush-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test. Heteroscedasticity is a problem seen in cross-sectional research and means that “the error term in a regression model does not have constant variance” (Berry & Feldman, 1985, p. 73). In other words, the variance of the error term gets larger as X increases not constant across values of X. It is possible to see heteroscedasticity when the dependent variable is measured with error, and the amount of error varies with the value of independent variables (Berry & Feldman, 1985, p. 74). “Heteroscedasticity does not make the values for intercept and partial slope coefficients biased but the least square estimators of the intercept and partial slope coefficients are no longer BLUE.” (p. 77). For the analysis of the correlates of diverse selection techniques (see Table 2), no heteroskedasticity was detected ($\chi^2 = 1.63$ and $p > \chi^2 = 0.2014$). In the analysis examining the effect of selection techniques on clearance rates (see Table 4) heteroskedasticity was detected and they were corrected using STATA robust command.

Table 4 shows the model for the determinants of using diverse-selection techniques to analyze the impact of independent variables on the number of selection
techniques. Table 5 presents the backward regression model for the “selection techniques” variable, which eliminates the insignificant variables from the analysis. Table 6 presents the model examining the impact of various social and organizational variables on clearance per officer. Here the purpose is to see if using diverse selection techniques during the recruitment stage has any effect on clearance rates and therefore an effect on department productivity. Table 7 is again the backward logistic regression model for the “clearance rates” variable. Table 8 presents the logistic regression analysis of each selection techniques with other independent variables.

The analysis in Table 4 presents the factors affecting the selection practices in police departments. The F-value of 19.42 tells us that our model is significant at \( p < .000 \) and the model explains approximately 23 percent of the variation in using diverse selection techniques. The analysis indicates that at the organizational level, four variables produced statistically significant relationships. One is the community policing involvement of police agencies. Ranging from community policing activities with people to civic groups such as advocacy groups, faith groups etc, community policing involvement positively affects the recruitment practices of police agencies. In other words, the more involved departments are in community policing activities, the more selection techniques they use.

The second organizational level variable which produced statistically significant result was the minimum salary paid to the newly recruited officers. The positive effect of the variable “minimum salary” indicates that police departments with higher minimum salaries use more selection techniques. In other words, police departments want to make
sure that they pay high salaries to high quality officers.

The third significant relationship is between crime rates and selection decision-making. The significant relationship in the positive direction indicates that as the number of crime rates increases, police departments use more selection techniques.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p &gt;</th>
<th>z</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Functions</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Technology</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Diversity</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Budget</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Involvement</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Education Requirement</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rates</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Review Board</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>-1.168</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Complaints</td>
<td>-0.579</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.383</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Square</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A merged data set, including “LEMAS 2003,” “UCR 2003,” and “Census 2000” was used. Multivariate ordinary least squares regression and unstandardized regression coefficients reported. Probabilities are based on two-tailed test (p ≤ .05) No multicollinearity or heteroskedasticity were detected.
The last variable which produced statistically significant relationship was “civilian reviewboard”. Even though it is a dummy variable that questions if the city has a civilian reviewboard, the analysis indicates that existence of a civilian reviewboard affects the number of selection techniques in the positive direction. If there is a civilian reviewboard in a city which investigates citizen complaints independent from police agencies, it leads police agencies to attempt to select higher quality officers by using more selection techniques to receive less or not any citizen complaints that in the long run may affect their credibility and cause excessive burden of litigations against the department.

The variable “total functions” produced a nearly significant result and can be interpreted that as the number of functions of police departments increase, it leads to using more selection techniques. It can be interpreted that different work requirements for different functions require different skills and abilities.

At the organizational level, the number of functions and technology in each police department does not have a significant effect on selection techniques of police agencies. Racial diversity of the police department, in other words how much a police department reflects the heterogeneity of the neighborhood they serve, does not have a significant effect on selection decisions, either. Total operational budget and minimum educational requirement do not have a statistically significant relationship with selection decision-making.

Variables classified at the societal level, median income and racial diversity of population, and complaints received from citizens did not produce statistically significant
results. No significant relationship between citizen complaints and using diverse selection techniques may seem contradictory when considering the significant relationship between civilian reviewboard and selection. This finding indicates that citizen complaints are handled differently in police departments than in civilian reviewboard. A subjective approach which supports the departmental arguments may not work in a civilian reviewboard environment and objective standards and investigations made by civilian reviewboards force police agencies to consider reviewboard effect more. These boards may or may not affect the number of complaints, but they may affect the department’s consciousness of the need for good officers. It also can be interpreted that police agencies are more sensitive to external forces than internal ones. Unless external dynamics force police departments to correct their procedures and policies, it is less likely to make a significant change.

Table 5 presents the backward elimination of the multiple regression analysis for the variable selection techniques. The insignificant variables were removed beginning from the independent variable whose significance level is the closest to “1”.

The objective of this test is to eliminate the variables which do not have a significant effect on the dependent variable and to see and analyze the already significant variables. The table indicates that eliminating insignificant variables resulted in finding “median income” also having a significant relationship with using diverse selection techniques. Thus it may be interpreted that as the income level of the population increases, concern on police functions and operations increase at the public level, and it leads to using more diverse selection techniques. The F-value of 48.86 tells us that our
model is significant at $p < .000$ and the model explains approximately 23 percent of the variation in using diverse selection techniques.

Table 5 - Backward Regression Analysis of Total Selection Techniques ($n = 815$)

| Independent Variable          | B Coefficient | SE  | Beta | $p > |z|$ |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----|------|-------|
| **Organizational Level**      |               |     |      |       |
| Minimum Salary                | 0.057         | 0.008 | .242 | .073  |
| Community Policing            | 0.059         | 0.007 | .220 | **.000** |
| Crime Rates                   | 0.024         | 0.004 | .188 | **.000** |
| Civilian Review Board         | 0.516         | 0.194 | .085 | **.008** |
| **Societal Level**            |               |     |      |       |
| Median Income                 | 0.012         | 0.006 | .073 | .048  |
| Constant                      | 6.612         | 0.340 |      | **.000** |
| Adjusted R-Square             | 0.227         |     |      |       |
| $F$                            | 48.860        |     |      | .000  |

Note: A merged data set, including “LEMAS 2003,” “UCR 2003,” and “Census 2000” was used. Multivariate ordinary least squares regression and unstandardized regression coefficients reported. Probabilities are based on two-tailed test ($p \leq .05$) No multicollinearity or heteroskedasticity were detected.
Table 6 presents the analysis to determine whether using diverse selection techniques has any effect on crime clearance rates. Along with other independent variables, selection techniques were used as an independent variable. Clearance rates is used as the dependent variable as an indicator of police performance and success and the analysis tries to explain if using diverse selection techniques affect clearance rates thus has an effect on police performance and productivity.

The results indicate that using diverse selection techniques does not have a significant relationship with crime clearance rates. The variables of diversity of sworn officers, community policing involvement of police departments, crime rates, and civilian reviewboard have significant relationship with clearance rates.
Table 6 - Multivariate Regression Analysis of Clearance Rates (n = 766)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B Coefficient</th>
<th>Robust SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p &gt;</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Functions</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Technology</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Diversity</td>
<td>-3.190</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Budget</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Education</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rates</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Review Board</td>
<td>-1.020</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Selection Techniques</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Complaints</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
<td>.443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Square</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>83.510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A merged data set, including “LEMAS 2003,” “UCR 2003,” and “Census 2000” was used. Multivariate ordinary least squares regression and unstandardized regression coefficients reported. Probabilities are based on two-tailed test (p ≤ .05) No multicollinearity was detected. A heteroskedasticity problem was detected and corrected using robust standard error.
The Table 7 presents the results of backward regression analysis for the dependent variable “clearance rates”. The analysis produced the same results with the first analysis using clearance rates as the dependent variable (Table 6). The same variables—sworn diversity, community policing involvement, crime rates, and civilian reviewboard—produced statistically significant result. The F-value of 273.38 tells us that our model is significant at $p < .000$ and the model explains approximately 59 percent of the variation in using diverse selection techniques.

| Independent Variable | B Coefficient | $SE$   | Beta  | $p > |z|$ |
|----------------------|---------------|--------|-------|--------|
| **Organizational Level** |               |        |       |        |
| Sworn Diversity      | -3.214        | 0.749  | -.102 | .000   |
| Community            | 0.034         | 0.014  | .058  | .016   |
| Crime Rates          | 0.237         | 0.007  | .761  | .000   |
| Civilian Review      | -0.997        | 0.354  | -.069 | .005   |
| Constant             | 1.065         | 0.346  |       | .002   |
| Adjusted R-Square    | 0.588         |        |       | .000   |

F: 273.380

Note: A merged data set, including “LEMAS 2003,” “UCR 2003,” and “Census 2000” was used. Multivariate ordinary least squares regression and unstandardized regression coefficients reported. Probabilities are based on two-tailed test ($p \leq .05$) No multicollinearity or heteroskedasticity were detected.
The last table, Table 8, presents a logistic regression model for each selection technique with the independent variables. The purpose of this analysis is to identify which of the 18 dummy variables are included for each independent variable. The table, for example, indicates that police departments that participate in community policing activities tend to use personal interviews, personality inventories, problem-solving tests, polygraph exams, second-language tests, psychological evaluations, tests of understanding diverse cultures, volunteer-service histories, and written aptitude tests. A direct link between these techniques and the independent variables may seem difficult, but a logical estimation can be that selection tools such as testing for an understanding of diverse cultures, problem-solving skills, and second-language skills along with volunteer history are linked to effective communication and mediation skills with the community—in particular, racially diverse groups—that can be regarded as an integral part of community policing activities.

Another significant variable, “minimum salary,” indicates in this logistic regression that drug testing, credit-history checking, medical exams, mediation skills tests, physical agility tests, problem-solving tests, polygraph exams, psychological evaluations, an understanding of diverse culture, a history of volunteer service, and written aptitude tests are mostly used where minimum salary offered is high. Concurrent to the findings, this analysis indicates that police departments use more diverse techniques if they pay more money to their officers because each test in this example corresponds to measuring a different aspect of a possible candidate.

A close look indicates that some variables do not significantly require the use of any
specific selection techniques. The variables “citizen complaints,” “educational 
requirement,” “technology,” and some other variables do not significantly correlate with 
any of the selection techniques. They also did not produce significant results with the 
number of selection techniques used. So, for these variables, the logistic regression and 
multiple regression analyses produced the same result, which means consistency.
## Table 8 – Binary Logistic Regression Analysis of Selection Techniques (Part 1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable (B &amp; SE)</th>
<th>Selection Techniques</th>
<th>Background Investigation</th>
<th>Criminal History Check</th>
<th>Credit History Check</th>
<th>Driving Record Check</th>
<th>Drug Test</th>
<th>Mediation-Skills Test</th>
<th>Medical Exam</th>
<th>Personal Interview</th>
<th>Personality Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>-7.41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Zero</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>92.16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>65.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Complaints</td>
<td>-2.91</td>
<td>-9.20</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rates</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Diversity</td>
<td>-3.54</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-8.96</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-4.04</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Review Board</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Functions</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Technology</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Requirement</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3407.4</td>
<td>2895.9</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>-7.41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Techniques</td>
<td>Physical Agility Test</td>
<td>Problem Solving Test</td>
<td>Polygraph Exam</td>
<td>Psych Eval</td>
<td>2nd Lang. Test</td>
<td>Understand Diverse Culture</td>
<td>Voice Stress Analyzer</td>
<td>Volunteer Service History</td>
<td>Written Aptitude Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-5.66</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>-4.27</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Zero</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>59.34</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>86.55</td>
<td>93.63</td>
<td>92.99</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Complaints</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-3.63</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rates</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Diversity</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Review Board</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Functions</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Technology</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Requirement</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-5.66</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>-4.27</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The previous chapter provided analyses of the determinants of the use of diverse selection techniques. This chapter includes a discussion of the findings and their implications for policies related to recruitment and selection practices in police departments and offers suggestions for future research.

The analyses indicate that police departments’ policies and practices are significantly affected with external factors. The significant relationship between selection practices and community policing implementations and the existence of civilian review boards suggests that police departments recognize the involvement and contribution and reactions of the public to their practices and implementations. The community values interacting with police officers who have social and interpersonal skills (Metchik & Witton, 1995). The movement to community policing asks for a “fundamental change in the role and responsibilities of police departments and how they work” (Morash & Ford, 2002, p. 126). These changes may include changing the police organizational culture, the rewards system, the assessment process, and the commands. Other potential changes include how the police and the community are expected to communicate and anticipations of the police (Manning, 1984). The significant relationship supports the current literature, which highlights a change in recruitment policies for implementing
community policing successfully and effectively and advises that if police departments expect to foster police-community relations and fight crime they need to consider their recruitment policies. Failure to do so makes it impossible to achieve community policing with officers prone only to follow orders and implement rules.

The study results relating to the significant relationship between minimum salary and selection decisions indicate that despite no significant relationship between operational budget and selection, police departments are concerned about their financial resources and capacities and simply want to make sound investments. In other words, they do not want their money to be wasted. However, given that 61% of local government budgets go to law enforcement operations (Pynes, 2001), it is not easy to say that police departments are not financially backed-up. It seems that financially supported departments have no hesitation to make sound and courageous decisions in personnel selection. Departments with limited financial resources automatically limit their decisions with a limited number of choices or selection methods. Hogue, Black and Siegler (1994) found that the screening techniques that tend to be used extensively are those that are the least expensive and most traditional. In their research, all of the respondent departments stated that they would use the 22 techniques asked about in the survey if they could afford them (p. 118). This barrier may be overcome with the provision of special funds for recruitment, selection, and training needs. The “minimum salary” variable also is more meaningful compared to the “operational budget” because the operational budget consists of all a police department’s expenses.
The significant relationship between crime rates and selection indicates that as the crime rates increases, police departments reconsider their recruitment policies and use more diverse techniques. This result suggests that because the main function of police departments is fighting crime, police departments think in a rational way and try to maximize their goals of solving crime. Facilitation of those factors that help to achieve this goal, such as using more diverse selection techniques, are strongly appreciated and supported. In other words, this analysis advises that police departments that want to reduce crime rates should invest money on the recruitment of higher-quality officers.

The establishment of civilian review boards, the data suggest, play a significant role in curbing police brutality and misconduct. Although the widespread belief is that police work is a special task that only the police can understand (Terrill, 1982, p. 398) and that having a civilian review board duplicates the job of investigating police misconduct along with other legislative bodies (such as courts and prosecutorial offices) and contributes to bureaucratic redundancy (Locke, 1967), external investigation is considered to be a grievance agency for the public, providing it with a voice and some measure of control over the police in a democratic system. The civilian review board allows for citizen input with investigations of the dysfunctions that occur in police departments better, more timely, and more effectively (Guzman, 2001, p. 70). In fact, some argue that citizen complaints are a positive sign of police-community relations as well. Klockars et al. (2006), for instance, posit that citizen complaints can be interpreted in many different ways: “as a sign of citizen trust in the police, an indication of the level of police misconduct, a measurement of the agency’s willingness to deal with potentially
damaging information, a source of learning for the police agency, and a measurement of police democratization” (p. 199). Beral and Sisk (1964) make a similar argument stating that citizen complaints can help promote and maintain desired standards of conduct for officers by punishing aberrant behavior and increasing satisfaction among the public against the police force (p. 500). Therefore, many cities see citizen feedback as a good indicator of their performance and encourage citizens to make complaints if they are not satisfied with the performance of their agencies (p. 199). Many agencies differ from each other in terms of the methods for filing and investigating citizen complaints. This makes comparison between cities or agencies extremely difficult. Also some review systems allow a great deal of latitude within which to deal with complaints informally. For instance, in some cities such as Los Angeles, during the 1980s, complaint numbers appear extremely low because “only those complaints that cannot be dealt with informally turn into statistics for review” (p. 191).

However, expectations about a significant relationship between some variables such as “racial diversity,” “operational budget,” and “police selection” have not been substantiated, and results indicate that changes in laws and mentality in a more representative government and bureaucracy heavily affect recruitment and selection practices of police departments. The most visible change and improvement in recruiting racially diverse groups should be minority recruiting programs operated by many police departments.
STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

An exact result of this research and the current literature on police selection signifies that there is an evident gap in police-selection studies. It is essential to conduct more research and new analyses and surveys in this field. As noted before, most studies on police selection focus on testing the validity of selection techniques and/or the analyses of the relationship between using any given selection technique and police performance. Assuming that an effective way of making good selections is using diverse selection techniques to measure the different aspects of the candidates, the possible determinants for making such selections that can help identify the most appropriate and competent officers are mostly anecdotal and lack empirical support. Future studies are needed to analyze the determinants or correlates of selection decisions.

Given the paucity of literature concerning police recruitment and selection—except for the use of tests and validity studies of these tests—it was sometimes was necessary to use references from other fields (in particular, business administration) and adapt some of the information used there to explain private-sector recruitment and its applicability to law enforcement selection.

Second, the aggregate nature of the data did not allow making analyses at the individual level, such as leaders’ ability and their perception of recruitment and selection practices and how they affect recruitment policies, would be a good research topic. The topic merits specific research on leadership factors on selection decisions regarding the fact that in most departments, the final decision-maker in recruitment and selection
decisions is the police chief. The same is true where a civilian review board that makes decisions on citizen complaints about officers does not exist.

Such research also will help researchers to understand whether police departments are the subjects of environmental determinism and have nothing against external changes (as would be congruent to an evolutionary-change model), or whether there are things that a leader can change and manipulate (congruent to a teleological change model) and read the environment timely and react to changes in a logical way that makes a difference. In other words, the study would help researchers understand whether there should be a top-down change that would lead to making a better selection decisions.

One other topic of future research could be about media coverage and police recruitment. One of the significant issues facing the law enforcement community is “developing and maintaining positive media relations” (Chermak & Weiss, 2006, p. 135). Police forces need to control their external environment to maintain their organizational legitimacy (Chermak & Weiss, 2005), and the media play a very significant role in molding and shaping public opinion about crime and police effectiveness (Selke & Bartoszek, 1984). Police and the media have an interdependent relationship valued by both groups for different reasons. The police want to use the media to promote the organization, while the media value their relationship with the police because the police provide data for them to easily create crime stories (Chermak & Weiss, 2005, p. 501). However, the media often are quick to publicize criticism of law enforcement and slow to offer praise (Miller & Braswell, 2002, pp. 1-2) and a negative view of crime reflects a bad image of police because many hold only the police responsible for fighting crime
(Selke & Bartoszek, 1984, pp. 25-26). Manning (2003) suggests that the image of police on the television is mostly “selective and ironic and framing of encoded events,” and it creates and sustains a media reality that appears to shape policing (p. 62). In understanding recruitment policies in this regard, it is possible to say that media coverage of police departments is negative, police departments are forced to regulate their policies, recruiting higher-quality officers to eliminate the department’s negative image.

Yet another future study is likely to be the effect of political and organizational culture on recruitment and selection decisions of police agencies. Wilson (1973), for examples, says that policing styles—mainly watchman style, legalistic style, and service style—are heavily influenced by the local political culture (p. 231). Also in the taxonomy of Elazar’s (1966), political culture index, American states are grouped under three different political cultures: individualistic, moralistic, and traditional. Shafritz (1975) examines the possible interaction between these three cultures and a meritorious selection system. He suggests that individualistic culture values and promotes individual development socially and economically. Therefore, an individualistic political culture promotes a meritorious system to the extent that it facilitates individual improvement both socially and economically and approves using selection techniques to measure the true abilities and character of candidates.

A moralistic culture understands good government in terms of honesty, selflessness, and commitment to the public welfare, and any personnel system is acknowledged to the extent that it promotes the public good. In other words, a meritorious system, in its original definition, provides a system for selecting civil service
officials on the base of applicants’ true abilities and skills and is highly likely to be appreciated in a moralistic culture.

The traditional system is known to be an elitist approach and defends a hierarchical society, where those at the top of the social structure are expected to take a dominant role in the government. It no doubt is another form of political patronage and does not value a meritorious system (pp. 126-138) nor the use of selection techniques to choose the appropriate candidates for the job. Elazar’s taxonomy of political culture also is available in data format; however, it is a state-level data set and an ecological fallacy occurs if state-level data are used to make inferences at the departmental level. Collection of the data at the departmental level is necessary.

Similarly, organizational culture may play a very significant role in shaping recruitment policies. Again using Wilson’s varieties of police behavior, there are differing police cultures. The first values a legalistic approach that strictly focuses on law enforcement activities. Another is a service style that highlights and promotes serving the needs of the public and business owners. A third is a watchman style that stresses the order-maintenance function or emphasizes the control of social disorder in the local community (Wilson, 1873, pp. 140-226). Coderoni (2002) argues that traditional police culture promotes and values the status quo and that it is challenging to change this mindset. He suggests that each organization has its own cultural norms, rituals, jargon, and traditions that influence their daily operations and relations within their environment. (p. 18). Therefore, it also has the potential to lead a change in policies—including
recruitment—or impede implementation of new approaches, such as using diverse selection techniques.

The current study provides some good insights about the factors shaping selection implementations in the law enforcement community. Regarding the statistically significant relationship between selection practices and crime rates and civilian review board that clearly refers to changes in the external environment of the police, it is possible to make the argument that police departments’ recruitment practices are affected by external changes. It proves the validity of using a change model to understand the recruitment practices. Also, the relationship between selection practices and community policing, which can be regarded as an internal change in a police organization, suggests that police organizations are affected by internal changes as well. Based on the availability of data and variables, the study suggests that public safety managers and police chiefs take the selection very seriously if the department wants to make a change in their regular law enforcement duties, such as implementing community policing. Civilian review boards may be regarded as a duplication of work in investigating citizen complaints by the members of police departments, but this study highlights that civilian control over police work is different than internal-affairs procedures of law enforcement agencies. The review board’s work may be more direct and far from doubts about the integrity of close police investigations of the complaints. Crime rates, this study found, affect the selection preferences of police departments; a reverse interpretation can tell police chiefs that soaring crime rates require more competent and higher-quality officers
to combat the offenses. When police chiefs invest money for recruitment, using more diverse selection techniques, definitely harvest the fruits of this investment
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APPENDIX 1

CORRELATION TABLE FOR DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
### Appendix 1 – Correlation Table for Dependent and Independent Variables (Part 1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total Selection Techniques</th>
<th>Clearance Rates</th>
<th>Total Functions</th>
<th>Citizen Review Board</th>
<th>Community Policing</th>
<th>Racial Diversity</th>
<th>Sworn Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Requirement</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Technology</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Complaints</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rates</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Diversity</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Review Board</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Functions</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Rates</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Selection Techniques</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 – Correlation Table for Dependent and Independent Variables (Part 2 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Crime Rates</th>
<th>Citizen Complaints</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Total Technology</th>
<th>Education Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Requirement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Technology</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Complaints</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rates</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Diversity</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Review Board</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Functions</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Rates</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Selection Techniques</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT
AND ADMINISTRATIVE STATISTICS SURVEY
2003 SAMPLE SURVEY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics
U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics

OMB No. 1121-0240: Approval Expires 06/30/2006

Agency Internet Home Page address:

Agency central e-mail address for citizen use:

INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY:

NAME

TITLE

AGENCY

TELEPHONE ( )  ----  EXT.  ----

FAX NUMBER ( )  ----

IMPORTANT: Please read the instructions below prior to completing this questionnaire.

- There are three ways to submit this survey:

  1) Complete the survey online at http://survey.policeresearch.org/CJ44L.pdf

  If completing the survey online, please make sure to enter your ID NUMBER, which is located at the top right of
  this page. Without the ID NUMBER, you will not be able to complete the survey online.

  2) Mail the survey to PERF using the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

  3) Fax the survey to PERF at 202-466-7826.

- Please retain a copy of the completed survey for your records.

- Please use either blue or black ink and print as neatly as possible using only CAPITAL letters.

- Do not leave any items blank.

  - If the answer to a question is not available or is unknown, write "OK" (don't know) in the space provided.

  - If the answer to a question is not applicable, write "NA" in the space provided.

  - If the answer to a question is none or zero, write "0" in the space provided.

  - When exact numeric answers are not available, provide estimates.

- Unless otherwise noted, please answer all questions using June 30, 2003 as a reference.

- If you have any questions, please call Bruce Kuba at PERF at 202-454-8308 or email bkuba@policeresearch.org.

Burden Statement

Public Reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average three hours per response, including time for
reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing
the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate, or any other aspects of this collection of information,
including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 810 Seventh Street, NW, Washington,
DC 20531.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1998, as amended (42 USC 3732), authorizes this information collection.
Although this survey is voluntary, we urgently need and appreciate your cooperation to make the results comprehensive, accurate,
and timely.
1. Which of the following functions did your agency have PRIMARY responsibility for or perform on a regular basis during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003?

Mark (■) all that apply.

**Law enforcement functions**
- [ ] Responding to citizen calls/requests for service
- [ ] Patrol services
- [ ] First response to criminal incidents
- [ ] Drug law enforcement
- [ ] Vice enforcement

**Traffic and vehicle-related functions**
- [ ] Traffic law enforcement
- [ ] Traffic direction/control
- [ ] Accident investigation
- [ ] Parking enforcement
- [ ] Commercial vehicle enforcement

**Criminal investigation for:**
- [ ] Homicide
- [ ] Arson
- [ ] Cybercrime
- [ ] Other crime types

**Court-related functions**
- [ ] Execution of arrest warrants
- [ ] Court security
- [ ] Serving civil process
- [ ] Serving eviction notices
- [ ] Enforcing protection orders
- [ ] Enforcing child support orders

**Special public safety functions**
- [ ] Animal control
- [ ] School crossing services
- [ ] Emergency medical services
- [ ] Civil defense
- [ ] Fire services
- [ ] Crime prevention education

**Special operations**
- [ ] Bomb/explosives disposal
- [ ] Search and rescue
- [ ] Special weapons and tactics (SWAT)
- [ ] Underwater recovery

**Detention-related functions**
- [ ] Jail operation
- [ ] Lockup or temporary holding facility separate from jail (for overnight detention)
- [ ] Temporary holding cell (not for overnight detention)
- [ ] Inmate transport

**Other functions**
- [ ] Law enforcement dispatch services
- [ ] Fire dispatch services
- [ ] Operating a training academy

2. Enter the number of facilities or sites, SEPARATE FROM HEADQUARTERS, operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. If none, enter ‘0’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of facilities separate from headquarters</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District/precinct/division stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fixed neighborhood/community substations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mobile neighborhood/community substations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Enter the number of AUTHORIZED FULL-TIME paid agency positions and ACTUAL full-time and part-time paid agency employees as of June 30, 2003. Full-time employees are those regularly scheduled for 35 or more hours per week. If none, enter ‘0’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorize full-time paid positions</th>
<th>Actual paid agency employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sworn personnel with general arrest powers</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Officers without general arrest powers (e.g., jail or court officers in some agencies)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Nonsworn employees</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. TOTAL (sum of lines ‘a’ through ‘c’)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. As of June 30, 2003, how many reserve/auxiliary officers were employed by your agency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve/auxiliary officers</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sworn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sworn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Of the total number of actual FULL-TIME sworn personnel with general arrest powers (3a), how many are communications technicians (e.g., call takers, dispatchers)?

If none, enter ‘0’.

Communications technicians.............. [ ] [ ] [ ]
6. Of the total number of actual FULL-TIME sworn personnel with general arrest powers (as entered in 3a), enter the number of each of the following: (Personnel may be counted more than once. If none, enter '0')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Uniformed officers with regularly assigned duties that include responding to citizen calls/requests for service</td>
<td>□ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Community Policing Officers, Community Resource Officers, Community Relations Officers, or other sworn personnel specifically designated to engage in community policing activities</td>
<td>□ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. School Resource Officers, School Liaison Officers, or other sworn personnel whose primary duties are related to school safety</td>
<td>□ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Enter the total number of actual FULL-TIME sworn personnel with general arrest powers (5a) who performed the following duties as their PRIMARY job responsibility? Count each officer only once. If none, enter '0'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Patrol duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Investigative duties (e.g., detectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Jail-related duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Court security duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Process serving duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Enter your agency's total operating budget for the 12-month period that includes June 30, 2003. If data are not available, provide an estimate and mark (□) the box below. Include jails administered by your agency. Do NOT include building construction costs or major equipment purchases.

| $ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ |

Please check here if this figure is an estimation: □

9. Enter the total estimated value of money, goods, and property received by your agency from a drug asset forfeiture program during calendar year 2002. If no money, goods or property were received, enter '0'.

| $ □ □ □ □ □ □ |

10. Indicate your agency's minimum education requirement which new (non-lateral) officer recruits must have within two years of hiring. Mark (□) only one response.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college degree required</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year college degree required</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college but no degree required --- Enter number of semester credit hours required</td>
<td>□ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent required</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education requirement</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Which of the following screening techniques are used by your agency in selecting new officer recruits? Mark (□) all that apply.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical/problem-solving ability assessment</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of understanding of diverse cultural populations</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background investigation</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit history check</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal history check</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving record check</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug test</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation/skills/conflict management assessment</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical exam</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical agility test</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality inventory</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological evaluation</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second language test</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice stress analyzer</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/community service history check</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written aptitude test</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many total hours of ACADEMY training and FIELD training (e.g., with FTO) are required of your agency's new (non-lateral) officer recruits? Include law enforcement training only. If no training of that type is required, enter '0'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academy Training</th>
<th>Field Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. State-mandated hours</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Additional training hours</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total hours of training (sum of 'a' and 'b')</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. On average, how many total in-service hours of training are required annually for your agency’s NON-PROBATIONARY field/patrol officers? Include law enforcement training only. If no training of that type is required, enter ‘0’.

Average annual hours per officer
a. State-mandated hours
b. Additional training hours
c. Total hours of training (sum of ‘a’ and ‘b’)

14. Of the total number of actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (as entered in 3a), enter the number that were NEW HIRES during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003. If none, enter ‘0’.

a. Entry-level hires (non-lateral)
b. Lateral transfers/hires
c. Other (please specify)
d. Total NEW HIRES (sum of ‘a’ through ‘c’)

15. Enter the number of actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers who separated from your agency during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003. If none, enter ‘0’.

a. Resignations
b. Dismissals
c. Medical/disability retirements
d. Non-medical retirements
e. Probationary rejections
f. Other separations (e.g., death)
g. Total separations (sum of lines ‘a’ through ‘f’)

16. Over the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, how many of your agency’s FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers were called up as full-time military reservists (and, therefore, were no longer available for local law enforcement duties)? Count each reservist only once.

17. Enter the number of actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (3a) by RACE and GENDER for the pay period that included June 30, 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, not of Hispanic origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, not of Hispanic origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (sum of lines ‘a’ through ‘g’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Is collective bargaining authorized for your agency’s employees?

a. Sworn employees
b. Nonsworn employees

19. Does your agency provide special pay/benefits for any of the following?

a. Education incentive
b. Hazardous duty
c. Merit/performance
d. Shift differential
e. Special skills proficiency
f. Bilingual ability
g. Tuition reimbursement
h. Military service
20. Enter your agency's salary schedule for the following FULL-TIME sworn positions as of June 30, 2003. If a position does not exist on a full-time basis in your department, enter 'NA.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base ANNUAL salary</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Chief executive (chief, director, sheriff, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sergeant or equivalent first-line supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Entry-level officer or deputy (post-academy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Enter the total capacity and maximum hours of holding time for adults and juveniles in temporary holding (backup) facilities operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. Include only overnight facilities separate from a jail used to hold persons prior to arraignment. If none, enter '0.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Juveniles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Total capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maximum holding time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Does your agency participate in an operational 9-1-1 emergency telephone system (i.e., your agency's units can be dispatched as a result of a call to 9-1-1)? Mark (■) only one response.

- ■ Yes - Enhanced 9-1-1 system
- ■ Yes - Basic 9-1-1 system
- ■ No

23. Does your agency's 9-1-1 system have the following capabilities for incoming calls from wireless/cellular phones?

- Displays phone number of wireless caller... ■ Yes □ No
- Displays location of wireless caller... ■ Yes □ No

24. Enter the total number of calls for service received by your agency during 2002, and the total resulting in dispatch of officer(s). If data are not available, provide an estimate and mark (■) the box below. If none, enter '0.' If you cannot provide the number of calls for service broken down by "Type of call system," provide the total number of calls in row 'd.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of call system</th>
<th>Total number of calls/requests for service received</th>
<th>Number of calls/requests for service resulting in dispatch of officer(s) or use of on-site unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 9-1-1 emergency system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 7-digit or 10-digit non-emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 3-digit (e.g., 3-1-1) non-emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Total calls for service (sum 'a' through 'c')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please check here if any of these figures are estimates: ■

25. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, did your agency use the following types of patrol on a REGULARLY SCHEDULED basis?

- Automobile... ■ Yes □ No
- Marine...... ■ Yes □ No
- Motorcycle.... ■ Yes □ No
- Horse...... ■ Yes □ No
- Foot............ ■ Yes □ No
- Bicycle...... ■ Yes □ No
- Aviation....... ■ Yes □ No
- Other.)... ■ Yes □ No

Please specify: __________________

26. As of June 30, 2003, how many actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (3a) did your agency have assigned to a special unit for drug enforcement or a multi-agency drug enforcement task force? If none, enter '0.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Full-time</th>
<th>Assigned Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Special unit for drug enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Multi-agency drug task force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. How does your agency address the following problems/tasks? Mark (■) the appropriate box for each problem/task listed below. Mark only one box per line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of problem/task</th>
<th>(1) Agency HAS specialized unit with FULL-TIME personnel to address this problem/task</th>
<th>(2) Agency DOES NOT HAVE a specialized unit with full-time personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Bias/hate crime</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bomb/explosive disposal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Child abuse/ endangerment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Community crime prevention</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Community policing</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Crime analysis</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Cybercrime</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Domestic violence</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Drug education in schools</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Gangs</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Impaired drivers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Internal affairs</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Juvenile crime</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Methamphetamine labs</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Missing children</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Prosecutor relations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Repeat offenders</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Research and planning</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. School safety</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Terrorism/homeland security</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Victim assistance</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Youth outreach</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION V - COMMUNITY POLICING

#### 28. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, what proportion of agency personnel received at least eight hours of community policing training (problem solving, SARA, community partnerships, etc.)? Mark (■) one choice per line. If your agency did not conduct training for a particular type of employee, please check 'None.' If your agency did not have a particular type of employee for the specified time period, please mark 'NA.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Half or more</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New officer recruits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service sworn personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 29. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, which of the following did your agency do? Mark (■) all that apply.

- Actively encouraged patrol officers to engage in SARA-type problem-solving projects on their beats (if yes, please specify the approximate percentage of patrol officers engaged in these projects during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003.)
- Conducted a citizen police academy
- Maintained or created a formal, written community policing plan
- Gave patrol officers responsibility for specific geographic areas/beats
- Included collaborative problem-solving projects in the evaluation criteria of patrol officers
- Trained citizens in community policing (e.g., community mobilization, problem solving)
- Upgraded technology to support the analysis of community problems
- Partnered with citizen groups and included their feedback in the development of neighborhood or community policing strategies
- Did not survey the general public - SKIP to Section VI

#### 30. Does your agency's mission statement include a community policing component?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] NA - Agency does not have a mission statement

#### 31. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, did your agency have a problem-solving partnership or written agreement with any of the following? Mark (■) all that apply.

- Advocacy groups
- Business groups
- Faith-based organizations
- Local government agencies (non-law enforcement agencies)
- Other local law enforcement agencies
- Neighborhood associations
- Senior citizen groups
- School groups
- Youth service organizations
- None of the above

#### 32a. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, did your agency conduct or sponsor a survey of citizens on any of the following topics? Mark (■) all that apply.

- Public satisfaction with police services
- Public perception of crime/disorder problems
- Personal crime experiences of citizens
- Reporting of crimes to law enforcement by citizens
- Other (please specify) ____________________________
- Did not survey the general public - SKIP to Section VI

#### b. For which purposes does your agency use the information described in Q32a? Mark (■) all that apply.

- Allocating resources targeted to neighborhoods
- Evaluating agency performance
- Evaluating officer performance
- Evaluating program effectiveness
- Prioritizing crime/disorder problems
- Providing information to patrol officers
- Redistricting beat/reporting areas
- Training development
- Other (please specify) ____________________________
- None of the above
33a. Does your agency have a written plan that specifies actions to be taken in the event of terrorist attacks? (Include emergency operation plans that would be applicable to such an attack.)
- Yes
- No
- No - SKIP to Question 34

b. Does your agency’s plan include mutual aid or cooperative agreements between city, county, transit, public works, and/or other agencies?
- Yes
- No

34. Do the public safety agencies operating in or nearby your jurisdiction (including your agency) use a shared radio network infrastructure that achieves interoperability?
- Yes
- No

35. As of June 30, 2003, did your agency have any of the following types of emergency response equipment? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)
- Chemical detection equipment
- Radiological detection equipment
- Biological detection equipment
- Chemical/biological decontamination equipment
- Explosives detection equipment
- None of the above

36. In which of the following terrorism preparedness activities did your agency engage during the period ending June 30, 2003? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Partnership with culturally diverse communities
- Publicanti-fear campaigns
- Dissemination of information to increase citizen preparedness
- Community meetings on homeland security/preparedness
- Increased sworn officer presence at critical areas
- None of the above

37. As of June 30, 2003, how many personnel did your agency have assigned to a multi-agency terrorism task force?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Type</th>
<th>Assigned Full-time</th>
<th>Assigned Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sworn personnel with general arrest powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. All other employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Of the total number of actual FULL-TIME personnel, how many are intelligence personnel with primary duties related to terrorist activities? If none, enter ‘0’.
- Sworn
- Non-sworn

39. Does your agency supply or give a cash allowance to its regular field/patrol officers for the following? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Primary sidearm
- Backup sidearm
- Body armor
- Uniform
- Cash allowance
- Neither

40. Which types of sidearms are authorized for use by your agency’s field/patrol officers? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Semiautomatic: Primary sidearm
- Backup sidearm
- Off-duty sidearm

41. Are your agency’s uniformed field/patrol officers required to wear protective body armor while in the field?
- Yes, all the time
- Yes, in some circumstances (e.g., serving warrants)
- No

42. Enter the number of animals regularly maintained by your agency for use in activities related to law enforcement. If none, enter ‘0’.
- Dogs
- Horses
43. Which of the following types of less-than-lethal weapons or actions are authorized for use by your agency's field/patrol officers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Impact devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional baton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-24 baton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapsible baton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft projectile (e.g., bean-bag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackjack/slapjack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber bullet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other impact device</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Chemical agents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC (pepper spray)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN (tear gas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other chemical agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Other weapons/actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand-held electrical device - direct contact (e.g., stun gun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-held electrical device - stand off (e.g., taser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold or neck restraint (e.g., carotid hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High intensity light source (e.g., laser dazzler)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other weapon/action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. As of June 30, 2003, did your agency use any of the following technologies on a regular basis? Mark (□) all that apply.

**Digital imaging**
- Fingerprints □
- Mug shots □
- Suspect composites □
- Facial recognition □

**Night vision/electro-optic**
- Infrared (thermal) imagers □
- Image intensifiers □
- Laser range finders □

**Vehicle stopping/ tracking**
- Electrical/engine disruption □
- Stolen vehicle tracking □
- Tire deflation devices □

45. Enter the total number of vehicles operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. Include owned, rented, leased and confiscated vehicles that your agency uses. If none, enter "0."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Marked cars</th>
<th>□ Other marked vehicles (SUV, truck, van, etc.)</th>
<th>□ Unmarked cars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Other unmarked vehicles (SUV, truck, van, etc.)</td>
<td>□ Fixed-wing aircraft</td>
<td>□ Helicopters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Boats (motorized)</td>
<td>□ Motorcycles</td>
<td>□ Bicycles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46a. Does your agency allow officers to take marked vehicles home?
- □ Yes □ No - SKIP to Question 47

46b. Does your agency allow officers to drive marked vehicles for personal use during off-duty hours?
- □ Yes □ No

47. As of June 30, 2003, did your agency operate the following on a regular basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Red light cameras</th>
<th>□ Yes □ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ The number in use as of June 30, 2003:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Speed enforcement cameras</th>
<th>□ Yes □ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ The number in use as of June 30, 2003:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

48a. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, did your agency operate video cameras on a regular basis?
- □ Yes □ No - SKIP to Question 49

48b. Enter the number of video cameras operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. If none, enter "0."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ In patrol cars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Fixed-site surveillance (e.g., CCTV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Mobile surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Traffic enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
49. Indicate whether your agency's field/patrol officers use any of the following types of computers or terminals WHILE IN THE FIELD. Mark (■) all that apply.

(1) Vehicle-mounted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of computer used in the field</th>
<th>Agency uses - Mark (■) and enter the number in use</th>
<th>Agency does not use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Laptop computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mobile digital/data computer (MDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mobile digital/data terminal (MDT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Portable (not vehicle-mounted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of computer used in the field</th>
<th>Agency uses - Mark (■) and enter the number in use</th>
<th>Agency does not use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Laptop computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mobile digital/data computer (MDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mobile digital/data terminal (MDT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Personal digital assistant (PDA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Do any of your agency's field/patrol officers have direct access to the following types of information using IN-FIELD vehicle-mounted or portable computers?
- Motor vehicle records...□ Yes □ No
- Driving records................□ Yes □ No
- Criminal history records...□ Yes □ No
- Warrants........................□ Yes □ No
- Protection orders...............□ Yes □ No
- Inter-agency information system................................□ Yes □ No
- Address history (e.g., repeat calls for service)...□ Yes □ No

51. How are data from criminal incident reports PRIMARILY transmitted to your agency's central information system? Mark (■) only one response.
- Paper report
- Wireless transmission (e.g., cellular, UHF)
- Telephone line (voice)
- Computer medium
- Data device (e.g., laptop download)
- Not applicable - agency does not handle such reports

52. Does your agency own or have access to an Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) that includes a file or digitized prints? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Agency is exclusive owner of an AFIS system
- Agency is shared owner of an AFIS system
- Agency does not own an AFIS system, but has terminal with access to a remote AFIS system
- Agency has access to AFIS through another agency
- None of the above

53. Does your agency use computers for any of the following functions? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Analysis of community problems
- Automated booking
- Crime analysis
- Crime mapping
- Crime investigations
- Dispatch (CAD)
- Fleet management
- Hotspot identification
- In-field communications

54. Does your agency maintain its own computerized files with any of the following information? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Alarms
- Arrests
- Biometric data for use with facial recognition system
- Calls for service
- Criminal histories
- Fingerprints
- Incident reports
- Illegal attempts to purchase firearms
- Intelligence related to potential terrorist activity
- Stolen property
- Summons
- Traffic accidents
- Traffic citations
- Traffic stops
- Use-of-force incidents
- Warrants
- NONE of the above files
- ALL of the above files
55. Does your agency have a currently operational computer-based personnel performance monitoring/assessment system (e.g., Early Warning or Early Intervention system) for monitoring or responding to officer behavior patterns before they become problematic?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

SECTION VIII - POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

56. Does your agency have written policy directives on the following?  Mark (■) only one response per line.
   a. Use of deadly force/firearm discharge  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   b. Use of less-than-lethal force  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   c. Code of conduct and appearance  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   d. Off-duty employment of officers  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   e. Maximum work hours allowed for officers  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   f. Dealing with the mentally ill  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   g. Dealing with the homeless  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   h. Dealing with domestic disputes  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   i. Dealing with juveniles  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   j. Strip searches  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   k. Racial profiling  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   l. Citizen complaints  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   m. Off-duty conduct  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   n. Interacting with the media  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   o. Employee counseling assistance  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

57. Which of the following best describes your agency’s written policy for pursuit driving?  Mark (■) only one response:
☐ Discouragement (discourages all pursuits)
☐ Judgmental (leaves decisions to officer’s discretion)
☐ Restrictive (restricts decisions of officers to specific criteria such as type of offense, speed, etc.)
☐ Other (please specify)
☐ Agency does not have a written policy pertaining to pursuit driving

58. Enter the current dispositions for all formal citizen complaints received during 2002 regarding use of force.  If none, enter ‘W’.
   a. TOTAL use of force complaints received  ☐ Numbers
   b. Unfounded (the complaint was not based on facts, or reported incident did not occur)  ☐ Numbers
   c. Exonerated (The incident occurred, but officer action was deemed lawful and proper)  ☐ Numbers
   d. Not sustained (Insufficient evidence to prove the allegation)  ☐ Numbers
   e. Sustained (Sufficient evidence to justify disciplinary action against the officer(s))  ☐ Numbers
   f. Pending (Final disposition of the allegation has not been made)  ☐ Numbers
   g. Other disposition (e.g., withdrawn)  ☐ Numbers

59a. Is there a civilian complaint review board/agency in your jurisdiction that is empowered to review use of force complaints against officers in your agency?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No - SKIP to Question 60
   b. Does this civilian review board/agency have independent investigative authority with subpoena powers?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

60. Does your agency have a written policy requiring that citizen complaints about inappropriate use of force receive separate investigation outside the chain of command where the accused officer is assigned?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

61. Who has the final responsibility for acting on the recommendations for disciplinary action in cases involving inappropriate use of force, prior to appeal (non-legal)?  Mark (■) all that apply:
☐ Agency head (e.g., Chief/Sheriff)
☐ Other sworn agency personnel
☐ Government executive
☐ Other (please specify)

62. Who has the right to administrative appeal in cases involving the inappropriate use of force?  
   ○ Citizens  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   ○ Officers  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

***Please retain a copy of the completed survey for your records***
| NAME |  
| TITLE |  
| AGENCY |  
| TELEPHONE (____)____-____ | EXT. |  
| FAX NUMBER (____)____-____ |  

**IMPORTANT:** Please read the instructions below prior to completing this questionnaire.

- There are three ways to submit this survey:
  
     If completing the survey online, please make sure to enter your ID NUMBER, which is located at the top right of this page. Without the ID NUMBER, you will not be able to complete the survey online.
  2. Mail the survey to PERF using the enclosed postage-paid envelope.
  3. Fax the survey to PERF at 202-466-7826.

- Please retain a copy of the completed survey for your records.
- Please use either blue or black ink and print as neatly as possible using only CAPITAL letters.
- Do not leave any items blank.
  - If the answer to a question is not available or is unknown, write "DK" (don't know) in the space provided.
  - If the answer to a question is not applicable, write "NA" in the space provided.
  - If the answer to a question is none or zero, write "0" in the space provided.
  - When exact numeric answers are not available, provide estimates.

- Unless otherwise noted, please answer all questions using June 30, 2003 as a reference.
- If you have any questions, please call Bruce Kaba at PERF at 202-454-8308 or email bkaba@policeforum.org.

**Burden Statement**

Public Reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 90 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate, or any other aspects of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 810 Seventh Street, NW, Washington, DC 20531.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1998, as amended (42 USC 3732), authorizes this information collection. Although this survey is voluntary, we urgently need and appreciate your cooperation to make the results comprehensive, accurate, and timely.
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SECTION I - DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

1. Which of the following functions did your agency have PRIMARY responsibility for or perform on a regular basis during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003? Mark (□) all that apply.

Law enforcement functions
- □ Responding to citizen calls/requests for service
- □ Patrol services
- □ First response to criminal incidents
- □ Drug law enforcement
- □ Vice enforcement

Traffic and vehicle-related functions
- □ Traffic law enforcement
- □ Traffic direction/control
- □ Accident investigation
- □ Parking enforcement
- □ Commercial vehicle enforcement

Criminal investigation for:
- □ Homicide
- □ Arson
- □ Cybercrime
- □ Other crime types

Court-related functions
- □ Execution of arrest warrants
- □ Court security
- □ Serving civil process
- □ Serving eviction notices
- □ Enforcing protection orders
- □ Enforcing child support orders

Special public safety functions
- □ Animal control
- □ School crossing services
- □ Emergency medical services
- □ Civil defense
- □ Fire services
- □ Crime prevention education

Traffic direction/control
- □ Law enforcement dispatch services
- □ Fire dispatch services
- □ Operating a training academy

Detention-related functions
- □ Jail operation
- □ Lockup or temporary holding facility separate from jail (for overnight detention)
- □ Temporary holding cell (not for overnight detention)
- □ Inmate transport

Special operations
- □ Bomb/chemical disposal
- □ Search and rescue
- □ Special weapons and tactics (SWAT)
- □ Underwater recovery

Other functions
- □ Law enforcement dispatch services
- □ Fire dispatch services
- □ Operating a training academy

2. Enter the number of facilities or sites, SEPARATE FROM HEADQUARTERS, operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. If none, enter '0'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of facilities separate from headquarters</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District/precinct/division stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fixed neighborhood/community substations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mobile neighborhood/community substations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Enter the number of AUTHORIZED FULL-TIME paid agency positions and ACTUAL full-time and part-time paid agency employees as of June 30, 2003. Full-time employees are those regularly scheduled for 35 or more hours per week. If none, enter '0'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORIZED full-time paid positions</th>
<th>ACTUAL PAID agency employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sworn personnel with general arrest powers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Officers without general arrest powers (e.g., jail or court officers in some agencies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Nonsworn employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. TOTAL (sum of lines 'a' through 'c')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. As of June 30, 2003, how many reserve/auxiliary officers were employed by your agency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve/auxiliary officers</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sworn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non-sworn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Of the total number of actual FULL-TIME sworn personnel with general arrest powers (3a), how many are communications technicians (e.g., call takers, dispatchers)? If none, enter '0'.

| Communications technicians |        |
6. Of the total number of actual FULL-TIME sworn personnel with general arrest powers (as entered in 3a), enter the number of each of the following: (Personnel may be counted more than once. If none, enter '0')

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Uniformed officers with REGULARLY ASSIGNED DUTIES that include responding to citizen calls/requests for service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Community Policing Officers, Community Resource Officers, Community Relations Officers, or other sworn personnel specifically designated to engage in community policing activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. School Resource Officers, School Liaison Officers, or other sworn personnel whose primary duties are related to school safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Which of the following screening techniques are used by your agency in selecting new officer recruits? Mark (■) all that apply.

- Analytical/probability-solving ability assessment
- Assessment of understanding of diverse cultural populations
- Background investigation
- Polygraph exam
- Credit history check
- Psychological evaluation
- Criminal history check
- Second language test
- Driving record check
- Voice stress analyzer
- Drug test
- Volunteer/community service history check
- Mediation/skills/conflict management assessment
- Written aptitude test
- Medical exam

11. How many total hours of ACADEMY training and FIELD training (e.g., with FTO) are required of your agency's new (non-lateral) officer recruits? Include law enforcement training only. If no training of that type is required, enter '0'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academy Training</th>
<th>Field Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. State-mandated hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Additional training hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total hours of training (sum of 'a' and 'b')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. On average, how many total in-service hours of training are required annually for your agency's NON-PROBATIONARY field/patrol officers? Include law enforcement training only. If no training of that type is required, enter '0'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average annual hours per officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. State-mandated hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Additional training hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total hours of training (sum of 'a' and 'b')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Of the total number of actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (as entered in 3a), enter the number that were NEW HIRES during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003. If none, enter ‘0.’
   a. Entry-level hires (non-lateral)..........................
   b. Lateral transfers/hires.....................................
   c. Other (please specify) ........................................
   d. Total NEW HIRES
      (sum of ‘a’ through ‘c’)......................................

14. Enter the number of actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers who separated from your agency during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003. If none, enter ‘0.’
   a. Resignations....................................................
   b. Dismissals......................................................
   c. Medical/disability retirements............................
   d. Non-medical retirements.....................................
   e. Probationary rejections.....................................
   f. Other separations (e.g., death)............................
   g. Total separations (sum of lines ‘a’ through ‘f’).......  

15. Over the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, how many of your agency’s FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers were called up as full-time military reservists (and, therefore, were no longer available for local law enforcement duties)? Count each reservist only once.

16. Enter the number of actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (3a) by RACE and GENDER for the 12-month period that included June 30, 2003.
   a. White, not of Hispanic origin
   b. Black or African American, not of Hispanic origin
   c. Hispanic or Latino
   d. American Indian or Alaska Native
   e. Asian
   f. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   g. Some other race
   h. Total (sum of lines ‘a’ through ‘g’)  

17. Is collective bargaining authorized for your agency’s employees?
   a. Sworn employees...........☐ Yes ☐ No
   b. Nonsworn employees.....☐ Yes ☐ No

18. Does your agency provide special pay/benefits for any of the following?
   a. Education incentive...........☐ Yes ☐ No
   b. Hazardous duty.............☐ Yes ☐ No
   c. Merit/performance..........☐ Yes ☐ No
   d. Shift differential...........☐ Yes ☐ No
   e. Special skills proficiency...☐ Yes ☐ No
   f. Bilingual ability............☐ Yes ☐ No
   g. Tuition reimbursement.......☐ Yes ☐ No
   h. Military service.............☐ Yes ☐ No
19. Enter your agency’s salary schedule for the following FULL-TIME sworn positions as of June 30, 2003. If a position does not exist on a full-time basis in your department, enter ‘NA’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base ANNUAL salary</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Chief executive (chief, director, sheriff, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sergeant or equivalent first-line supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Entry-level officer or deputy (post-academy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Enter the total capacity and maximum hours of holding time for adults and juveniles in temporary holding (lockup) facilities operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. Include only overnight facilities separate from a jail used to hold persons prior to arraignment. If none, enter ‘0’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Juveniles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Total capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maximum holding time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Does your agency participate in an operational 9-1-1 emergency telephone system (i.e., your agency’s units can be dispatched as a result of a call to 9-1-1)? Mark (■) only one response.

☐ Yes - Enhanced 9-1-1 system
☐ Yes - Basic 9-1-1 system
☐ No

22. Does your agency’s 9-1-1 system have the following capabilities for incoming calls from wireless/cellular phones?

- Displays phone number of wireless caller... ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Displays location of wireless caller... ☐ Yes ☐ No

23. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, did your agency use the following types of patrol on a REGULARLY SCHEDULED basis?

- Automobile... ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Marine... ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Motorcycle... ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Horse... ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Foot... ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Bicycle... ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Aviation... ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please specify:

24. As of June 30, 2003, how many actual FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (3a) did your agency have assigned to a special unit for drug enforcement or a multi-agency drug enforcement task force? If none, enter ‘0’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Full-time</th>
<th>Assigned Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Special unit for drug enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Multi-agency drug task force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, what proportion of agency personnel received at least eight hours of community policing training (problem solving, SARA, community partnerships, etc.)? Mark (■) one choice per line. If your agency did not conduct training for a particular type of employee, please check ‘NA’. If your agency did not have a particular type of employee for the specified time period, please mark ‘NA’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Half or more</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New officer recruits</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service sworn personnel</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian personnel</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, which of the following did your agency do? Mark (✓) all that apply.

☐ Actively encouraged patrol officers to engage in SARA-type problem-solving projects on their beats. (If yes, please specify the approximate percentage of patrol officers engaged in these projects during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003.)

(Specify percentage: □ □ □ %)

☐ Conducted a citizen police academy

☐ Maintained or created a formal, written community policing plan

☐ Gave patrol officers responsibility for specific geographic areas/beats.

(Specify percentage of officers: □ □ □ %)

☐ Included collaborative problem-solving projects in the evaluation criteria of patrol officers

☐ Trained citizens in community policing (e.g., community mobilization, problem solving)

☐ Upgraded technology to support the analysis of community problems

☐ Partnered with citizen groups and included their feedback in the development of neighborhood or community policing strategies

☐ None of the above

27. Does your agency's mission statement include a community policing component?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ NA - Agency does not have a mission statement

29a. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, did your agency conduct or sponsor a survey of citizens on any of the following topics? Mark (✓) all that apply.

☐ Public satisfaction with police services

☐ Public perception of crime/disorder problems

☐ Personal crime experiences of citizens

☐ Reporting of crimes to law enforcement by citizens

☐ Other (please specify) □ □ □

☐ Did not survey the general public - SKIP to Section V

b. For which purposes does your agency use the information described in Q29a? Mark (✓) all that apply.

☐ Allocating resources targeted to neighborhoods

☐ Evaluating agency performance

☐ Evaluating officer performance

☐ Evaluating program effectiveness

☐ Prioritizing crime/disorder problems

☐ Providing information to patrol officers

☐ Redistricting beat/reporting areas

☐ Training/development

☐ Other (please specify) □ □ □

☐ None of the above

SECTION V - EQUIPMENT

30. Does your agency supply or give a cash allowance to its regular field/patrol officers for the following? Mark (✓) all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supplied</th>
<th>Cash allowance</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary sidearm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backup sidearm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body armor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Are your agency's uniformed field/patrol officers required to wear protective body armor while in the field? Mark (✓) only one response.

☐ Yes, all the time

☐ Yes, in some circumstances (e.g., serving warrants)

☐ No
CJ-44S
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32. Which types of sidearms are authorized for use by your agency's field/patrol officers? Mark (■) all that apply.

On-duty weapon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-automatic</th>
<th>Primary sidearm</th>
<th>Backup sidearm</th>
<th>Off-duty sidearm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10mm..............</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9mm..............</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45..............</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40..............</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.357..............</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.380..............</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other caliber (please specify)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any semiautomatic, as long as they qualify. □ □ □
Revolver. □ □ □

33. Enter the number of animals regularly maintained by your agency for use in activities related to law enforcement. If none, enter '0'.

Dogs [ ] [ ] Horses [ ] [ ]

34. As of June 30, 2003, did your agency use any of the following technologies on a regular basis? Mark (■) all that apply.

Digital imaging
Fingerprints. □ Digital photography □
Mug shots. □ Other □
Suspect composites. □ None of the listed digital □
Facial recognition. □ Other □

Night vision/electro-optic
Infrared (thermal) imagers. □ Other □
Image intensifiers. □ None of the listed night vision/electro-optic technologies □
Laser range finders. □

Vehicle stopping/tracking
Electrical/engine disruption. □ Other □
Stolen vehicle tracking. □ None of the listed vehicle □
Tire deflation devices. □

35. Which of the following types of less-than-lethal weapons or actions are authorized for use by your agency's field/patrol officers?

a. Impact devices
Traditional baton. □ Yes □ No
PR-24 baton. □ Yes □ No
Collapsible baton. □ Yes □ No
Soft projectile (e.g., bean-bag). □ Yes □ No
Blackjack/slapjack. □ Yes □ No
Rubber bullet. □ Yes □ No
Other impact device. □ Yes □ No

b. Chemical agents
OC (pepper spray). □ Yes □ No
CN (tear gas). □ Yes □ No
CS. □ Yes □ No
Other chemical agent. □ Yes □ No

C. Other weapons/actions
Hand-held electrical device - direct contact (e.g., stun gun). □ Yes □ No
Hand-held electrical device - stand off (e.g., taser). □ Yes □ No
Hold or neck restraint (e.g., carotid hold). □ Yes □ No
High intensity light source (e.g., laser dazzler). □ Yes □ No
Other weapon/action. □ Yes □ No
36. Enter the total number of vehicles operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. Include owned, rented, leased and confiscated vehicles that your agency uses. If none, enter 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marked cars</th>
<th>Unmarked cars</th>
<th>Other marked vehicles (SUV, truck, van, etc.)</th>
<th>Other unmarked vehicles (SUV, truck, van, etc.)</th>
<th>Fixed-wing aircraft</th>
<th>Helicopters</th>
<th>Boats (motorized)</th>
<th>Motorcycles</th>
<th>Bicycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. Indicate whether your agency’s field/patrol officers use any of the following types of computers or terminals WHILE IN THE FIELD. Mark (✓) all that apply.

**1. Vehicle-mounted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of computer used in the field</th>
<th>Agency uses</th>
<th>Agency does not use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Laptop computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mobile digital/data computer (MDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mobile digital/data terminal (MDT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Portable (not vehicle-mounted)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of computer used in the field</th>
<th>Agency uses</th>
<th>Agency does not use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Laptop computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mobile digital/data computer (MDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mobile digital/data terminal (MDT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Personal digital assistant (PDA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37a. Does your agency allow officers to take marked vehicles home?

- Yes
- No - SKIP to Question 38

b. Does your agency allow officers to drive marked vehicles for personal use during off-duty hours?

- Yes
- No

38a. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2003, did your agency operate video cameras on a regular basis?

- Yes
- No - SKIP to Question 39

b. Enter the number of video cameras operated by your agency as of June 30, 2003. If none, enter 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In patrol cars</th>
<th>Fixed-site surveillance (e.g., CCTV)</th>
<th>Mobile surveillance</th>
<th>Traffic enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

40. Do any of your agency’s field/patrol officers have direct access to the following types of information using IN-FIELD vehicle-mounted or portable computers?

- Motor vehicle records
- Driving records
- Criminal history records
- Warrants
- Protection orders
- Inter-agency information system
- Address history (e.g., repeat calls for service)

- Yes
- No
41. How are data from criminal incident reports primarily transmitted to your agency's central information system? Mark (■) only one response.
- Paper report
- Wireless transmission (e.g., cellular, UHF)
- Telephone line (voice)
- Computer medium
- Data device (e.g., laptop download)
- Not applicable - agency does not handle such reports

42. Does your agency own or have access to an Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) that includes a file or digitized prints? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Agency is exclusive owner of an AFIS system
- Agency is shared owner of an AFIS system
- Agency does not own an AFIS system, but has terminal with access to a remote AFIS system
- Agency has access to AFIS through another agency
- None of the above

43. Does your agency use computers for any of the following functions? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Analysis of community problems
- Automated booking
- Crime analysis
- Crime mapping
- Crime investigations
- Dispatch (CAD)
- Fleet management
- Hotspot identification
- In-field communications
- In-field report writing
- Intelligence gathering
- Inter-agency information sharing
- Internet access
- Personnel records
- Records management
- Resource allocation
- Traffic stop data collection
- None of the above functions
- All of the above functions

44. Does your agency maintain its own computerized files with any of the following information? Mark (■) all that apply.
- Alarms
- Arrests
- Biometric data for use with facial recognition system
- Calls for service
- Criminal histories
- Fingerprints
- Incident reports
- Illegal attempts to purchase firearms
- Intelligence related to potential terrorist activity
- Stolen property
- Summonses
- Traffic accidents
- Traffic citations
- Traffic stops
- Use-of-force incidents
- Warrants
- NONE of the above files
- ALL of the above files

SECTION VI - POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

45. Does your agency have written policy directives on the following? Mark (■) only one response per line.
- Use of deadly force/firearm discharge
- Use of less-than-lethal force
- Code of conduct and appearance
- Off-duty employment of officers
- Maximum work hours allowed for officers
- Dealing with the mentally ill
- Dealing with the homeless
- Dealing with domestic disputes
- Dealing with juveniles
- Strip searches
- Racial profiling
- Citizen complaints
- Off-duty conduct
- Interacting with the media
- Employee counseling assistance

46. Which of the following best describes your agency’s written policy for pursuit driving? Mark (■) only one response.
- Discouragement (discourages all pursuits)
- Judgmental (leaves decisions to officer’s discretion)
- Restrictive (restricts vehicles to specific criteria such as type of offense, speed, etc.)
- Other (please specify)
- Agency does not have a written policy pertaining to pursuit driving

47. Does your agency have a written plan that specifies actions to be taken in the event of terrorist attacks? (Include emergency operation plans that would be applicable to such an attack.)
- Yes
- No

***Please retain a copy of the completed survey for your records.***