

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Data Resources Program

FEBRUARY 1992

DATA SET JU.126.131

Automated Reporting System Pilot Project

Lt. David Doan
Bronston T. Mayes, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force

A User's Guide
To the Machine-Readable Files and Documentation

Prepared by
Sociometrics Corporation

46237
A.1

CONTENTS OF THE DATA SET

Machine-Readable

- (1) JU126W.DAT Data File (139 records; 139 cases; 57 variables)
- (2) JU127W.DAT Data File (1124 records; 281 cases; 35 variables)
- (3) JU128W.DAT Data File (708 records; 354 cases; 23 variables)
- (4) JU129W.DAT Data File (35 records; 35 cases; 13 variables)
- (5) JU130W.DAT Data File (206 records; 103 cases; 37 variables)
- (6) JU131W.DAT Data File (9594 records; 738 cases; 177 variables)

Paper

User's Guide to the Machine-Readable Files and Documentation (this document; 21 pages)

Codebook (58 pages)

Includes variable names, value labels, column positions for each data file.

Original Instruments (45 pages)

See Appendix A for complete list of instruments, with a brief description of each.

Ordering Information

Machine-readable files and paper documentation can be ordered from the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, 170 State Street, Suite 260, Los Altos, California 94022-2812.

Suggested Bibliographic Citation for the Data Set (All Machine-Readable Files and Paper Documentation)

Doan, D., Mayes, B. T., & The Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force. (1990). *Automated Reporting System Pilot Project*. (Data Set JU.126.131, Lexcen, F. J., & Peterson, J. L., Archivists) [machine-readable data file and documentation]. Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force (Producer). Los Altos, CA: Sociometrics Corporation, Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice (Distributor).

Suggested Bibliographic Citation for the User's Guide Alone

Lexcen, F. J., & Peterson, J. L. (1992). *Automated Reporting System Pilot Project: A User's Guide to the Machine-Readable Files and Documentation* (Data Set JU.126.131). Los Altos, CA: Sociometrics Corporation, Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice.

146237
Pt. 1

Data Set JU.126.131

Automated Reporting System Pilot Project

Award No. 89-IJ-CX-0008

Original Investigators:

**Lt. David Doan
Bronston T. Mayes, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force**

**Los Angeles Police Department
P.O. Box 30158
Los Angeles, CA 90030**

Documentation Produced by

**Frances J. Lexcen
James L. Peterson**

Sociometrics Corporation

1st ed., 1991

Distributed by

**Data Resources Program of the
National Institute of Justice**

**Sociometrics Corporation
170 State Street, Suite 260
Los Altos, California 94022-2812
(415) 949-3282**

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

146237

Pts 1,2,&3

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

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Automated Reporting System Pilot Project has been deposited at the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, for public distribution, by Lt. David Doan, Bronston T. Mayes, Ph.D., and the Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force of the Los Angeles Police Department. Data collection was funded by the National Institute of Justice under Award No. 89-IJ-CX-0008. Funding for the work done by the Data Resources Program to prepare the data for public use was provided by the U. S. Office of Justice Programs under Contract No. OJP-89-C-008 to Sociometrics Corporation.

Users of the data are strongly urged to inform the Data Resources Program of any errors or discrepancies. They are further urged to bring to the attention of the Data Resources Program all problems and difficulties encountered, particularly those that may prevent effective and convenient use of the data.

All manuscripts based on data made available through the Data Resources Program should acknowledge that fact as well as cite the data set (see suggested citation format, inside front cover). Users of these data are urged to follow some adaptation of the following statement.

The data used in this publication were made available by the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, 170 State Street, Suite 260, Los Altos, CA 94022-2812. The study entitled *Automated Reporting System Pilot Project* was conducted by Lt. David Doan, Bronston T. Mayes, Ph.D., and the Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force, Los Angeles Police Department, P.O. Box 30158, Los Angeles, CA 90030. Data collection was funded by the National Institute of Justice (Award No. 89-IJ-CX-0008). Funding support for preparing the revised documentation for public distribution was provided by a contract (OJP-89-C-008) between the U. S. Office of Justice Programs and Sociometrics Corporation. The original investigators, funding agency, and the Data Resources Program are not responsible for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about Data Resources Program participants' research activities, each user of these resources is requested to send a copy of each completed manuscript, thesis abstract, or reprint to the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, 170 State Street, Suite 260, Los Altos, CA 94022-2812.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
General Study Overview	
Study Identification	2
Key Words	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Methods	3
Summary of Contents	4
Geographic Coverage	5
Evaluation	5
Reports and Publications	5
Specifications for Machine-Readable Files	
Available Formats	6
File Structure	6
Mainframe Orders	7
Microcomputer Orders	7
Data Completeness Report	9
Appendix A: Original Instruments	18

SUMMARY

The investigators compared the quality of preliminary investigation reports (PIR) of criminal offenses written between June, 1990 and December, 1990 in two divisions of the Los Angeles Police Department. The existing handwritten form was maintained and used in the Wilshire division, which served as the control condition. In a pilot project, the Hollywood division used a software version of the same report form which was stored in laptop computers that officers carried on patrol. This system was called the Automated Reporting System (ARS). The Hollywood and Wilshire divisions were selected for their similar characteristics of workload and location.

Personnel at the control and experimental sites were asked to complete questionnaires in two waves: before the implementation of the ARS at the experimental site; and 6 months after the implementation of the ARS. In addition, after the 6 month experimental period, officers, supervisors and detectives evaluated the ARS for ease of use. Detectives and attorneys were asked to compare handwritten and automated PIRs for quality and accuracy.

The data is contained in 6 files. JU.126W.DAT has 139 cases and 57 variables describing the patrol officers' evaluations of the laptop ARS. JU.127W.DAT has 281 cases and 35 variables describing the amount of time spent handling both handwritten and automated PIRs. JU.128W.DAT has 354 cases and 23 variables including the patrol officers' evaluations of both handwritten and automated PIRs. JU.129W.DAT has 35 cases and 13 variables, including the Hollywood Division Detectives' evaluations of the ARS. JU.130W.DAT has 103 cases and 37 variables, including the prosecuting attorneys' evaluations of the ARS. JU.131W.DAT has 738 cases and 177 variables, including both waves of the General Information Survey and supervisor's ratings of officer job performance.

GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

Source: Doan, D., Mayes, B. T., and Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force, (1990). *Automated Reporting System Pilot Project*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Police Department.

Study Identification

Automated Reporting System Pilot Project

Lt. David Doan, Bronston T. Mayes, Ph.D., and the Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force

Los Angeles Police Department

Award No. 89-IJ-CX-0008

Key Words

Automated response system (ARS), laptop computers, Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), preliminary investigation report (PIR).

Purpose of the Study

Automation has provided many systems designed to make sense of crime and arrest data for the goal of providing information needed to prevent crime and to catch and convict criminals. The primary source of this information is the preliminary investigation report (PIR) filed by a patrol officer. Usually, these reports are filled out by hand, reviewed by a supervisor, corrected as needed by the original officer, and eventually entered into a database by a clerk. The purpose of this pilot project was to determine if report data could be collected in laptop computers using software versions of the PIR in such a manner as to allow the direct input of that data into the LAPD crime and arrest database without adversely affecting the personnel taking or using the reports.

The data address the following questions:

1. Did officers and supervisors prefer the ARS or handwritten PIRs?
2. Did the ARS affect job satisfaction or morale for officers and supervisors?
3. Did the automated report system (ARS) reduce the amount of time that patrol officers, supervisors, and clerks spent on paperwork?
4. Did the ARS affect the accuracy of information contained in the PIRs?
5. Did detectives and prosecuting attorneys find the ARS a more reliable source than handwritten PIRs?

Methods

Study Design

In April, 1990, personnel at both sites completed the following questionnaires: patrol officers and first line supervisors completed the General Information Questionnaire on overall job attitudes, and the Evaluation of the Existing (Handwritten) PIR system. Sargeants and lieutenants completed Job Performance Evaluations of patrol officers and supervisors. In June, 1990, before ARS training was begun at the Hollywood division, officers, supervisors and clerks completed Time Study Sheets for all handwritten PIRs to evaluate how much time was spent on each stage of filing a PIR.

In December, 1990, patrol officers at the Wilshire division completed a second General Information Questionnaire, and a second Evaluation of the Existing (Handwritten) PIR system form. Officers, supervisors and clerks completed Time Study Sheets for all handwritten PIRs completed during a 2 week period.

Officers at the experimental (Hollywood) site were given training on the ARS in June, 1990. The ARS was phased in one watch at a time. ARS staff support was available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week during the entire 6 month period. In December, 1990, patrol officers and supervisors at the Hollywood site completed the second General Information Questionnaire on overall job attitudes, and an Evaluation of the Automated PIR system. Patrol officers, supervisors and clerks completed Time Study Sheets for all automated PIRs completed during a 2 week period.

In addition, officers and supervisors completed the Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire evaluating their experiences with the ARS. Detectives completed the Hollywood Detective Division Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire. A random sample of 166 PIRs was drawn from a two week period in June and a two week period in December for both sites. Pairs of raters, one detective and one attorney in each pair, compared the handwritten PIRs from June with the automated and handwritten PIRs from December for completeness and accuracy, using the PIR Content Evaluation Form.

Sources of Information

The sources of information include the General Information Questionnaire, the Job Performance Rating, the Time Study Sheet of the Existing (or Automated) Reporting System, the Evaluation of the Existing (or Automated) PIR System, the Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire, the Hollywood Detective Division Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire, and the PIR Content Evaluation, all of which were self-administered questionnaires. The Los Angeles Police Department Preliminary Investigation Report, in its paper and software forms, was measured by the Time Study Sheet questionnaires and the PIR Content Evaluation questionnaire.

Sample

The sample consisted of patrol officers, first line supervisors, sargeants, lieutenants, and data entry clerks of the Hollywood and Wilshire divisions of the LAPD. Also included were the detectives of the Hollywood division, and prosecuting attorneys from the Office of the District Attorney.

In addition, the actual PIRs submitted during two week periods in June, 1990 and December, 1990 were used for the PIR Content Evaluation.

Response Rates

The study was not designed to draw on a representative sample, therefore, response rates do not apply.

Dates of Data Collection

Data were collected between April, 1990 and December, 1990.

Summary of Contents

Description of Variables

Following is a list of the instruments used and the topics covered in each:

General Information Questionnaire. Rank, assignment, watch, gender, age, years with LAPD, formal education, job morale, job demands, feelings at work, work activities, self esteem, computer anxiety, anxiety, role conflict and ambiguity, relationship with supervisor, commitment to LAPD.

Job Performance Rating. Officer and supervisor initiative, work efforts, depth of job knowledge, work quality, oral and written skills, capacity to learn, time utilization, overall performance.

Time Study Sheet of the Existing (or Automated) Reporting System. Investigation time, writing and editing time, travel time, approval and correction time, review time, errors by type, data input time, correction time, photocopy and distribution time, filing time, PACMIS reverification time.

Evaluation of the Existing (or Automated) PIR System. Ease of use, frustration with system, productivity loss due to system, system satisfaction.

Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire. Ease of use, typing skills, computer skills, preference for handwritten reports, occurrence of lost reports, changes in work efficiency, comfort with equipment, satisfaction with training, support for continued use department-wide.

Hollywood Detective Division Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire. Ease of use, task improvement, support for continued use, and preference for system.

PIR Content Evaluation. Quality of officer observations, organization and writing style, physical evidence, completeness of investigation, statements of victims, witnesses and suspects, and correct classification of offense.

Presence of Common Scales

The Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity subscales of the Caplan are used. (Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Jr., Van Harrison, R., & Pinneau, S. R., Jr. (1975) *Job Demands and Worker Health*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Publication No. (NIOSH) 75-160.)

Unit of Observation

The unit of observation is the individual responding to the questionnaire for the General Information Questionnaire, Job Performance Rating, Evaluation of the Existing (or Automated) PIR System, Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire, and Hollywood Detective Division Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire and PIR Content Evaluation.

The unit of observation is the PIR for the Time Study Sheet of the Existing (or Automated) Reporting System.

Geographic Coverage

The divisions surveyed were the Hollywood and Wilshire divisions of the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, California.

Evaluation

Data Quality

Checks for missing values indicate that there are quite a few variables with a large percentage of missing values. For complete information on missing and out-of-range values see Tables 1-4 for files JU.126W to JU.131W.

Data Limitations

The purpose of the study was to compare handwritten and automated PIRs. Unfortunately, there was no effective way of downloading the contents of automated PIRs to the department database, requiring that the automated PIRs be entered by hand by data entry clerks. This eliminated the possibility of evaluating a significant time-saving aspect of the ARS.

Reports and Publications

Mayes, B. T., Wiseman, R., & Barton, M. E. (1991). *Comparative analysis of the Los Angeles Police Department's Crime Report Writing Systems: A Research Report*. Unpublished manuscript. California State University, Fullerton, School of Business Administration and Economics.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR MACHINE-READABLE FILES

Available Formats

Machine-readable Archive files are available in both mainframe and microcomputer formats. Unless otherwise requested, files formatted for a mainframe computer are provided on a 9-track tape at a density of 6250 bpi, in EBCDIC recording mode with IBM Standard Labels. Files formatted for a microcomputer are provided in ASCII format on low- or high-density, 5¼" or 3½" diskettes, at the user's request.

File Structure

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Data File: | (1) JU.126W.DAT
(2): JU.127W.DAT
(3): JU.128W.DAT
(4): JU.129W.DAT
(5): JU.130W.DAT
(6): JU.131W.DAT |
| Unit: | (1) Individual system user.
(2) Individual PIR.
(3) Individual system user.
(4) Individual detective.
(5) Individual PIR rater.
(6) Individual patrol officer. |
| Variables: | (1) 57
(2) 35
(3) 23
(4) 13
(5) 103
(6) 177 |
| Cases: | (1) 139
(2) 281
(3) 354
(4) 35
(5) 37
(6) 738 |

Mainframe Orders

	Contents	LRECL	BLKSIZE	Feet of tape at 6250 bpi
File 1	Raw data, EBCDIC format	80	32720	1.2
File 2	Raw data, EBCDIC format	80	32720	2.0
File 3	Raw data, EBCDIC format	80	32720	1.7
File 4	Raw data, EBCDIC format	80	32720	1.1
File 5	Raw data, EBCDIC format	80	32720	1.2
File 6	Raw data, EBCDIC format	80	32720	11.3

Microcomputer Orders

Low-Density 5¼" Diskettes

	Contents	Diskette	File Name	Bytes
File 1	Data, ASCII format	1	JU126W.DAT	9730
File 2	Data, ASCII format	1	JU127W.DAT	68,283
File 3	Data, ASCII format	1	JU128W.DAT	41,418
File 4	Data, ASCII format	1	JU129W.DAT	525
File 5	Data, ASCII format	1	JU130W.DAT	9579
File 6	Data, compressed format	1	JU131W.EXE	84,293

Data file 6 is compressed; when uncompressed, it requires 722,502 bytes of disk space. Before you can use the file, you must "explode" it. To explode a file, place the diskette in the A: drive; then, from your C: drive, type the name of the compressed file, including its path. That is, type:

A:JU131W.EXE

File JU131W.EXE explodes to JU131W.DAT.

High-Density 5¼" and 3½" Diskettes

	Contents	Diskette	File Name	Bytes
File 1	Data, ASCII format	1	JU126W.DAT	9730
File 2	Data, ASCII format	1	JU127W.DAT	68,283
File 3	Data, ASCII format	1	JU128W.DAT	41,418
File 4	Data, ASCII format	1	JU129W.DAT	525
File 5	Data, ASCII format	1	JU130W.DAT	9579
File 6	Data, ASCII format	1	JU131W.DAT	722,502

Low-Density 3½" Diskettes

	Contents	Diskette	File Name	Bytes
File 1	Data, ASCII format	1	JU126W.DAT	9730
File 2	Data, ASCII format	1	JU127W.DAT	68,283
File 3	Data, ASCII format	1	JU128W.DAT	41,418
File 4	Data, ASCII format	1	JU129W.DAT	525
File 5	Data, ASCII format	1	JU130W.DAT	9579
File 6	Data, compressed format	2	JU131W.EXE	84,293

Data file 6 is compressed; when uncompressed, it requires 722,502 bytes of disk space. Before you can use the file, you must "explode" it. To explode a file, place the diskette in the A: drive; then, from your C: drive, type the name of the compressed file, including its path. That is, type:

A:JU131W.EXE

File JU131W.EXE explodes to JU131W.DAT.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This section presents information regarding the quality of the data in this Data Set. Tables 1 and 2 indicate the extent and location of out-of-range values, and Tables 3 and 4 summarize the incidence of missing data.

JU.126W

Number of Cases: 139

Number of Variables: 57

Table 1. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Out-of-Range Values

Percent of Cases with Out-of-Range Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Out-of-Range Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	139	100.0%
Total	139	100.0%

Table 3. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values

Percent of Cases with Missing Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Missing Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	6	10.5%
> 0% to 1% (1 to case)	25	43.9%
> 1% to 3% (2 to 4 cases)	22	38.6%
> 3% to 5% (5 to 6 cases)	1	1.7%
> 5% to 40% (7 to 55 cases)	0	0.0%
> 40% to 100% (56 to 139 cases)	3	5.3%
Total	57	100.0%

Table 4. List of Variables With Over 5% Missing Values (6 Missing Values or More)

Variable Name and Label	Number of Cases
SUPV1 ARS EASIER TO REVIEW AND APPROVE	116
SUPV2 ARS REPORTS LESS COMPLETE	116
SUPV3 ARS REPORTS FEWER ERRORS	116

Note. The variable names used in this table are taken from the JU.126W codebook.

JU.127W

Number of Cases: 281

Number of Variables: 35

Table 1. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Out-of-Range Values

Percent of Cases with Out-of-Range Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Out-of-Range Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	281	100.0%
Total	281	100.0%

Table 3. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values

Percent of Cases with Missing Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Missing Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	9	25.7%
> 0% to 1% (1 to 2 cases)	10	28.6%
> 1% to 3% (3 to 8 cases)	9	25.7%
> 3% to 5% (9 to 14 cases)	4	11.4%
> 5% to 10% (15 to 28 cases)	0	0.0%
> 10% to 20% (29 to 56 cases)	2	5.7%
> 20% to 40% (57 to 112 cases)	1	2.9%
> 40% to 100% (113 to 281 cases)	0	0.0%
Total	35	100.0%

Table 4. List of Variables With Over 5% Missing Values (14 Missing Values or More)

Variable Name and Label	Number of Cases
RCDWTCHA RECORDS CLERK WATCH	29
AVRCWTCA AVERAGE RECORDS CLERK WATCH	29
AVNCOPYA AVERAGE NUMBER OF COPIES MADE	60

Note. The variable names used in this table are taken from the JU.127W codebook.

JU.128W

Number of Cases: 354

Number of Variables: 23

Table 1. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Out-of-Range Values

Percent of Cases with Out-of-Range Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Out-of-Range Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	354	100.0%
Total	354	100.0%

Table 3. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values

Percent of Cases with Missing Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Missing Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	0	0.0%
> 0% to 1% (1 to 3 cases)	0	0.0%
> 1% to 3% (4 to 10 cases)	1	4.3%
> 3% to 20% (11 to 70 cases)	0	0.0%
> 20% to 40% (71 to 141 cases)	1	4.3%
> 40% to 100% (142 to 354 cases)	21	91.3%
Total	23	100.0%

Table 4. List of Variables With Over 5% Missing Values (17 Missing Values or More)

Variable Name and Label		Number Of Cases
DIV4D	DIVISION AT POST-TEST	138
EASED	EASE OF USE AT POST-TEST	144
FRUSTD	EXPERIENCED FRUSTRATION OR IRRITATION AT POST-TEST	144
TIMELOSD	TIME LOST DUE TO RS PROBLEMS AT POST-TEST	144
ERRORD	ERROR PRONENESS OF REPORTING SYSTEM AT POST-TEST	145
CORRCTD	CORRECTION EASE AT POST-TEST	145
HLPHRTD	HELP OR HURT JOB PERFORMANCE AT POST-TEST	143
SATD	SATISFACTION WITH REPORTING SYSTEM AT POST-TEST	145
RPTQLD	RS EFFECT ON REPORT QUALITY AT POST-TEST	146
TIMED	MINUTES EACH DAY DOING PIRS AT POST-TEST	153
DIVA	DIVISION	157
DATEA	DATE	157
EASEA	EASE OF USE	160
FRUSTA	EXPERIENCED FRUSTRATION OR IRRITATION	159
TIMELOSA	TIME LOST DUE TO RS PROBLEMS	159
ERRORA	ERROR PRONENESS OF RS	159
CORRCTA	CORRECTION EASE	163
HLPHRTA	HELP OR HURT JOB PERFORMANCE	162
SATA	SATISFACTION WITH RS	160
RPTQLA	RS EFFECT ON REPORT QUALITY	160
TIMEA	MINUTES EACH DAY DOING PIRS	169
CMMNTA	COMMENTS PROVIDED ON BACK	154

Note. The variable names used in this table are taken from the JU.128W codebook.

JU.129W

Number of Cases: 35

Number of Variables: 13

Table 1. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Out-of-Range Values

Percent of Cases with Out-of-Range Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Out-of-Range Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	1	7.7%
0% to 20% (1 to 7 cases)	0	0.0%
> 20% to 40% (8 to 14 cases)	7	53.8%
> 40% to 100% (15 to 35 cases)	5	38.5%
Total	13	100.0%

Table 2. List of Variables With Out-of-Range Values

Variable Name and Label	Out-of-Range Values	Number of Cases
FORMATOK REPORT FORMAT SUITABLE	0, 6, 7, 107, 624	22
SMALPRNT REPORT PRINT SHOULD BE LARGER	0, 6, 462, 4336, 4537, 48840, 49035, 49707, 49838, 49924	12
SPELCHK SPELL CHECK-IMPROVE QUALITY	6, 22, 72, 88, 105, 131, 147, 162, 163, 138273, 138840	14
GOBAKOK STOP LAPTOP OK BY ME	0, 6, 138273, 138300, 138312, 138477, 138565, 138706, 138840	15
ALLAUTO AUTOMATE ALL, CLEARANCE AND FILING WOULD IMPROVE	0, 6, 7, 8, 22, 43, 44, 55, 72, 77	11
IMPRVMT ARS REPORTS ARE AN IMPROVEMENT	0, 6, 24158, 24461, 43812	21

SUPTARS	SUPPORT DEPARTMENT WIDE ARS	0, 6, 138275, 138312, 138477, 138565, 138706 138840, 182926	14
TESTIFY	COMPUTER REPORT OK FOR TESTIFY	0, 6, 7, 306, 624,	23
ARSTFOK	ARS STAFF ENOUGH SUPPORT AND FEEDBACK	0, 6, 462, 1557, 4336, 48840, 49035, 49707, 49924	9
LESCMPLT	ARS REPORTS LESS COMPLETE	6, 22, 72, 77, 105, 131, 162, 163, 138275, 138312, 138840	14

Table 2. List of Variables With Out-of-Range Values, continued

Variable Name and Label		Out-of-Range Values	Number of Cases
FEWERR	ARS REPORTS FEWER ERRORS	0, 6	13
READABLE	ARS REPORTS EASIER TO READ	0, 6 138275, 138312, 138477, 138565, 138706 138840	16

Note. The variable names used in this table are taken from the JU.129W codebook.

Table 3. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values

Percent of Cases with Missing Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Missing Values	
	Number	Percent
0% to 10% (1 case)	0	0.0%
> 10% to 20% (4 to 7 cases)	1	7.7%
> 20% to 40% (8 to 14 cases)	11	84.6%
> 40% to 100% (15 to 35 cases)	1	7.7%
Total	13	100.0%

Table 4. List of Variables With Over 5% Missing Values (1 Missing Values or More)

Variable Name and Label	Number of Cases
FORMATOK REPORT FORMAT SUITABLE	9
SMALPRNT REPORT PRINT SHOULD BE LARGER	15
SPELCHK SPELL CHECK-IMPROVE QUALITY	14
CLRNFILE CLEARANCE AND FILING NOT IMPROVED	9
GOBAKOK STOP LAPTOP OK BY ME	9
ALLAUTO AUTOMATE ALL, CLEARANCE AND FILING WOULD IMPROVE	9
IMPRVMT ARS REPORTS ARE AN IMPROVEMENT	9
SUPTARS SUPPORT DEPARTMENT WIDE ARS	5
TESTIFY COMPUTER REPORT OK FOR TESTIFY	9
ARSTFOK ARS STAFF ENOUGH SUPPORT AND FEEDBACK	13
LESCMPLT ARS REPORTS LESS COMPLETE	13
FEWERR ARS REPORTS FEWER ERRORS	9
READABLE ARS REPORTS EASIER TO READ	9

Note. The variable names used in this table are taken from the JU.129W codebook.

JU.130W
 Number of Cases: 103
 Number of Variables: 37

Table 1. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Out-of-Range Values

Percent of Cases with Out-of-Range Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Out-of-Range Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	101	98.0%
> 0% to 1% (1 case)	0	0%
> 1% to 3% (2 to 3 cases)	2	2.0%
> 3% to 100% (4 to 103 cases)	0	0%
Total	103	100.0%

Table 2. List of Variables With Out-of-Range Values

Variable Name and Label	Out-of-Range Values	Number of Cases
BAOBSERV	4	27
BAEVIDNC	5	1

Note. The variable names used in this table are taken from the JU.130W codebook.

Table 3. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values

Percent of Cases with Missing Values			Distribution of Variables By Percent Missing Values	
			Number	Percent
	0%	(0 cases)	0	0.0%
>	0% to 1%	(1 to case)	1	2.7%
>	1% to 3%	(2 to 10 cases)	0	0.0%
>	10% to 20%	(11 to 20 cases)	34	91.9%
>	20% to 40%	(21 to 40 cases)	2	5.4%
>	40% to 100%	(41 to 103 cases)	0	0.0%
Total			37	100.0%

Table 4. List of Variables With Over 5% Missing Values (5 Missing Values or More)

Due to the large number of variables with over 5% missing values, this list is not included.

JU.131W
 Number of Cases: 738
 Number of Variables: 177

Table 1. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Out-of-Range Values

Percent of Cases with Out-of-Range Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Out-of-Range Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	177	100.0%
Total	177	100.0%

Table 3. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values

Percent of Cases with Missing Values	Distribution of Variables By Percent Missing Values	
	Number	Percent
0% (0 cases)	0	0.0%
> 0% to 1% (1 to 7 cases)	0	0.0%
> 1% to 3% (8 to 22 cases)	1	0.5%
> 3% to 40% (23 to 295 cases)	0	0.0%
> 40% to 100% (296 to 738 cases)	176	99.5%
Total	177	100.0%

Table 4. List of Variables With Over 5% Missing Values (36 Missing Values or More)

Variable Name and Label	Number of Cases
-------------------------	-----------------

Due to the large number of variables with over 5% missing values, this list is not included.

Appendix A

Original Instruments

General Information Questionnaire. (16 pages) Completed by patrol officers and supervisors. Assesses job morale and satisfaction.

Job Performance Rating (Supervisor Questionnaire). (5 pages) Job performance evaluations of patrol officers and first line supervisors, completed by sergeants and lieutenants.

Time Study Sheet of the Existing (or Automated) Reporting System. (9 pages) Determines the amount of time spent by officers, supervisors and records clerks during each function of writing an existing or automated preliminary investigation report system.

Evaluation of the Existing (or Automated) PIR System. (1 page) Officer evaluations of the existing or automated preliminary investigation report system.

Los Angeles Police Department Hollywood Division Automated Reporting System Evaluation. (6 pages) Officer and supervisor evaluations of automated reporting system use.

Los Angeles Police Department Hollywood Detective Division Automated Reporting System Evaluation. (3 pages) Detective evaluations of automated reporting system use.

Los Angeles Police Department Preliminary Investigation Report (PIR). (1 page) Form used in field investigations.

Automated Reporting System Project Evaluation of PIR Content Quality. (4 pages) Detective and attorney ratings of automated PIRs.

Appendix B

File Map

File Name	Data Derived From
JU126W.DAT	Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire
JU127W.DAT	Time Study Sheet of the Existing (or Automated) Reporting
JU128W.DAT	Evaluation of the Existing (or Automated) PIR System
JU129W.DAT	Hollywood Detective Division Automated Reporting System Use Questionnaire
JU130W.DAT	PIR Content Evaluation
JU131W.DAT	General Information Questionnaire; Evaluation of Existing (or Automated) PIR System; Supervisor Questionnaire; Time Study Sheets; and CAPLAN scores.

146237
P/2



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Data Resources Program

APRIL 1992

DATA SET JU.126.131

AUTOMATED REPORTING SYSTEM PILOT PROJECT

Lt. David Doan
Bronston T. Mayes, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force

Codebook

Prepared by
Sociometrics Corporation

CODEBOOK NOTES

1. The data are coded in ASCII format as raw data. Records of up to 80 columns are used to code the data. (See table below for specifics.) The codebook provides a short variable name for each variable, a longer descriptive label, the record number on which the variable is coded, the starting and ending column positions within the record, and the format used to code the variable. *Fw.d* refers to standard numeric format where *w* indicates the total number of columns used to code the variable, including any decimal points, and *d* indicates the number of positions to the right that are interpreted as decimals. String format *-Aw-* is used to read character data, in which *w* indicates the total column width of the character string.

File Number	Records per Case
JU126W.DAT	1
JU127W.DAT	4
JU128W.DAT	2
JU129W.DAT	1
JU130W.DAT	2
JU131W.DAT	13

2. The following acronyms are commonly used:

ARS Automated Reporting System
PIR Preliminary Investigation Report.
LAPD Los Angeles Police Department

Table of Contents

Codebook for JU126W.DAT	1
Codebook for JU127W.DAT	15
Codebook for JU128W.DAT	18
Codebook for JU129W.DAT	22
Codebook for JU130W.DAT	26
Codebook for JU131W.DAT	32

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

CODEBOOK FOR JU126W.DAT

NOTE: DATA IN THIS FILE WERE COLLECTED WITH THE AUTOMATED REPORTING SYSTEM USE QUESTIONNAIRE.

SN	SERIAL NUMBER	1	1	5	F5.0
----	---------------	---	---	---	------

(NOTE: THIS NUMBER WAS ENCRYPTED BY THE RESEARCHER USING AN ALGORITHM. WHEN ALLOTTED 6 COLUMNS, THIS VARIABLE PRODUCES THE ENCRYPTED VALUES. SOME OF THESE VALUES HAVE A FREQUENCY GREATER THAN 1; HOWEVER, THIS IS A RESULT OF THE ENCRYPTION. THERE IS A FREQUENCY OF 1 FOR ALL OF THE ORIGINAL SERIAL NUMBERS.)

TRBLCARY	LAPTOP TROUBLESOME TO CARRY	1	6	6	F1.0
----------	-----------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

RPTFORM	REPORT FORMAT IS SUITABLE	1	7	7	F1.0
---------	---------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

TYPEOK	COULD TYPE BEFORE LAPTOP	1	8	8	F1.0
--------	--------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
HNDCHORE	WRITTEN REPORTS NOT A CHORE	1	9	9	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
HANDOK	OK TO GO BACK TO HANDWRITTEN PIR	1	10	10	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
DAMAGE	CONCERN FOR DAMAGE OR THEFT	1	11	11	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
LONGER	COMPUTER REPORTS MORE TIME TO CORRECT	1	12	12	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
XFRPROB	PROBLEMS TRANSFERING REPORTS VIA DISK	1	13	13	F1.0

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

EASIER	LAPTOP EASIER FOR GOOD REPORT	1	14	14	F1.0
--------	-------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

TYPEGOOD	MY TYPING IS GOOD ENOUGH	1	15	15	F1.0
----------	--------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

OTHRSRID	OTHERS WANT TO RETURN TO OLD WAY	1	16	16	F1.0
----------	----------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

LOSTINFO	I LOST INFORMATION IN COMPUTER	1	17	17	F1.0
----------	--------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

CORRMORE	MORE REPORTS RETURNED FOR CORRECTION	1	18	18	F1.0
----------	--------------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

SCREEN	SCREEN EASY TO READ	1	19	19	F1.0
--------	---------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

DOUBTS	I HAD DOUBT LAPTOPS AN IMPROVEMENT	1	20	20	F1.0
--------	------------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
NOTLONG	LEARNED TO USE LAPTOP QUICKLY	1	21	21	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
HNDPREF	PREFER HAND WRITTEN REPORTS	1	22	22	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
TELXFR	PHONE EASIER THAN DISK TRANSFER	1	23	23	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
CONVENT	LAPTOP MORE CONVENIENT THAN NOTEBOOK	1	24	24	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

IMPVTYPE	MUCH EFFORT TO IMPROVE TYPING SKILLS	1	25	25	F1.0
----------	--------------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

NEWUSER	NEVER USED COMPUTER BEFORE	1	26	26	F1.0
---------	----------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

RESPNSBL	UNCOMFORTABLE WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR LAPTOP	1	27	27	F1.0
----------	--	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

COMPLETE	NOW MORE COMPLETE REPORTS	1	28	28	F1.0
----------	---------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AWKWARD	KEYBOARD IS AWKWARD TO USE	1	29	29	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
SPELCHK	SPELL CHECK FEATURE EASIER	1	30	30	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
SCRNDIFF	SCREEN DIFFICULT TO READ	1	31	31	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
RELIABLE	LAPTOPS PROVED TO BE RELIABLE	1	32	32	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	POSITION END	FORMAT
CRCTEASE	LAPTOP REPORTS EASIER TO CORRECT	1	33	33	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
LONGADPT	LONG TIME GETTING USED TO LAPTOP	1	34	34	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
HATEHAND	DISLIKED WRITING BY HAND	1	35	35	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
SCROLDIF	SCROLL FIELD DIFFICULTY	1	36	36	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
TRAINOK	TRAINING WAS ADEQUATE	1	37	37	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
LNGRNARR	PRODUCE LONGER NARRATIVE	1	38	38	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
TYPESLO	TROUBLE WITH SLOW TYPING	1	39	39	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
MOSTLIKE	MOST OFFICERS LIKE LAPTOPS	1	40	40	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
DIFSTORE	HARD TO STORE IN CAR	1	41	41	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
XSTRAIN	RECEIVED TOO MUCH ARS TRAINING	1	42	42	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
ONSCREEN	ON SCREEN HELP ALL I NEED	1	43	43	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
WRTREAD	MY HANDWRITING HARD TO READ	1	44	44	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
PRIOREXP	EXPERIENCED WITH COMPUTERS BEFORE LAPTOP	1	45	45	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
SCRUSFL	ON SCREEN HELP USEFUL	1	46	46	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
RPTORG	REPORTS BETTER ORGANIZED	1	47	47	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
SAVETIM	COMPUTER SAVES TIME	1	48	48	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
EASELOSS	COMPUTER FILES EASIER TO LOOSE	1	49	49	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
NOIMPRV	LAPTOPS NOT MUCH IMPROVEMENT	1	50	50	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
COMPAWK	COMPUTER AWKWARD IN FIELD	1	51	51	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
WINDOWS	POPOP WINDOWS EASY TO USE	1	52	52	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
GIMMICK	LAPTOPS GIMMICK OR FAD	1	53	53	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
DPTARSOK	SUPPORT FOR DEPT WIDE ARS	1	54	54	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	POSITION END	FORMAT
TESTIFY	ARS COMFORTABLE IN COURT	1	55	55	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
ENTERDIR	ENTER INFORMATION DIRECTLY-NO NOTES	1	56	56	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
ARSTFOK	ARS STAFF GAVE ENOUGH SUPPORT AND FEEDBACK	1	57	57	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
SUPV1	ARS EASIER TO REVIEW AND APPROVE	1	58	58	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
SUPV2	ARS REPORTS LESS COMPLETE	1	59	59	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
SUPV3	ARS REPORTS FEWER ERRORS	1	60	60	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
DIV5	DIVISION AT POST-TEST	1	61	68	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1.00				HOLLYWOOD

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

CODEBOOK FOR JU127W.DAT

NOTE: DATA IN THIS FILE WERE COLLECTED WITH THE *TIME STUDY SHEET OF THE EXISTING (OR AUTOMATED) REPORTING.*

NOTE: VARIABLE NAMES THAT INCLUDE "AVERAGE" ARE MEAN VALUES FOR THE VARIABLE ACROSS ALL PIRS SUBMITTED BY THAT OFFICER.

SN	OFFICER SERIAL NUMBER	1	1	5	F5.0
AVDIV2A	AVERAGE DIVISION	1	6	13	F8.2
DIV2A	DIVISION OF OFFICER	1	14	14	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HOLLYWOOD				
	2 WILSHIRE				
AVWATCHA	AVERAGE WATCH ASSIGNMENT	1	15	22	F8.2
WATCHA	WATCH OF OFFICER	1	23	23	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
DETAILA	DETAIL ASSIGNMENT	1	24	24	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 PATROL				
	2 U-CAR				
	3 STORM				
	4 DESK				
AVDETAIL	AVERAGE OF DETAILS	1	25	32	F8.2
SUPSNA	SUPERVISOR SERIAL NUMBER	1	33	37	F5.0

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AVSUPSNA	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR SN	1	38	45	F8.2
SUPWTCHA	SUPERVISOR WATCH	1	46	46	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
AVSUPWTA	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR WATCH	1	47	54	F8.2
NPIRSA	NUMBER OF PIRS SUBMITTED	1	55	61	F7.0
AVINVSTA	AVERAGE INVESTIGATION TIME	1	62	69	F8.2
AVWRITA	AVERAGE WRITING TIME	1	70	77	F8.2
AVTRAVA	AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME	2	1	8	F8.2
AVGAPRVA	AVERAGE APPROVAL TIME	2	9	16	F8.2
AVGRVWA	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR REVIEW TIME	2	17	24	F8.2
AVGTTLTA	AVERAGE OFFICER TOTAL TIME	2	25	32	F8.2
PCTERRSA	PERCENT OF PIRS WITH ERRORS	2	33	37	F5.1
AVMISSA	AVERAGE MISSING FIELD ERRORS	2	38	45	F8.2
AVINACA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF INNACURATE ENTRIES	2	46	53	F8.2
AVINCPLA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCOMPLETE ENTRIES	2	54	61	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AVUNRDA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF UNREADABLE ENTRIES	2	62	69	F8.2
AVSPELLA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF MISSPELLINGS	2	70	77	F8.2
AVTTLERA	AVERAGE TOTAL NUMBER OF ERRORS	3	1	8	F8.2
AVCRCTNA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF CORRECTIONS BY SUPERVISOR	3	9	16	F8.2
RCDWTCHA	RECORDS CLERK WATCH	3	17	17	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
AVRCWTCA	AVERAGE RECORDS CLERK WATCH	3	18	25	F8.2
AVINPUTA	AVERAGE CLERK INPUT TIME	3	26	33	F8.2
AVCRCTMA	AVERAGE CLERK CORRECTION TIME	3	34	41	F8.2
AVCPYTMA	AVERAGE CLERK COPY TIME	3	42	49	F8.2
AVFILETA	AVERAGE CLERK FILING TIME	3	50	57	F8.2
AVPACMSA	AVERAGE PACMIS REVERIFICATION TIME	3	58	65	F8.2
AVNCOPYA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF COPIES MADE	3	66	73	F8.2
AVTOTCLA	AVERAGE TOTAL CLERK TIME	4	1	8	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

CODEBOOK FOR JU128W.DAT

NOTE: DATA IN THE FILE WERE COLLECTED WITH THE EVALUATION OF THE EXISTING (OR AUTOMATED) PIR SYSTEM.

SN	SERIAL NUMBER	1	1	5	F5.0
----	---------------	---	---	---	------

Value Label

Missing Values: 99999

DIV4D	DIVISION AT POST-TEST	1	6	6	F1.0
-------	-----------------------	---	---	---	------

Value Label

1	HOLLYWOOD
2	WILSHIRE

EASED	EASE OF USE AT POST-TEST	1	7	7	F1.0
-------	--------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value Label

1	VERY DIFFICULT
5	VERY EASY

FRUSTD	EXPERIENCED FRUSTRATION OR IRRITATION AT POST-TEST	1	8	8	F1.0
--------	---	---	---	---	------

Value Label

1	NONE
5	A GREAT DEAL

TIMELOSD	TIME LOST DUE TO REPORTING SYSTEM PROBLEMS AT POST-TEST	1	9	9	F1.0
----------	--	---	---	---	------

Value Label

1	NONE
5	A GREAT DEAL

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
ERRORD	ERROR PRONENESS OF REPORTING SYSTEM AT POST-TEST	1	10	10	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 NOT AT ALL				
	5 VERY MUCH				
CORRCTD	CORRECTION EASE AT POST-TEST	1	11	11	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 VERY HARD				
	5 VERY EASY				
HLPHRTD	HELP OR HURT JOB PERFORMANCE AT POST-TEST	1	12	12	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HURT A LOT				
	4 NO EFFECT				
	7 HELPED A LOT				
SATD	SATISFACTION WITH REPORTING SYSTEM AT POST-TEST	1	13	13	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 VERY DISSATISFIED				
	4 NEUTRAL				
	7 VERY SATISFIED				
RPTQLD	REPORTING SYSTEM EFFECT ON REPORT QUALITY AT POST-TEST	1	14	14	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HURT A LOT				
	4 NO EFFECT				
	7 HELPED A LOT				
TIMED	MINUTES EACH DAY DOING PIRS AT POST-TEST	1	15	17	F3.0

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
DIVA	DIVISION	1	18	25	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 HOLLYWOOD				
	2.00 WILSHIRE				
DATEA	DATE	1	26	33	F8.2
EASEA	EASE OF USE	1	34	41	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 VERY DIFFICULT				
	5.00 VERY EASY				
FRUSTA	EXPERIENCED FRUSTRATION OR IRRITATION	1	42	49	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 NONE				
	5.00 A GREAT DEAL				
TIMELOSA	TIME LOST DUE TO REPORTING SYSTEM PROBLEMS	1	50	57	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 NONE				
	5.00 A GREAT DEAL				
ERRORA	ERROR PRONENESS OF REPORTING SYSTEM	1	58	65	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 NOT AT ALL				
	5.00 VERY MUCH				
CORRCTA	CORRECTION EASE	1	66	73	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 VERY HARD				
	5.00 VERY EASY				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
HLPHRTA	HELP OR HURT JOB PERFORMANCE	2	1	8	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 HURT A LOT				
	4.00 NO EFFECT				
	7.00 HELPED A LOT				
SATA	SATISFACTION WITH REPORTING SYSTEM	2	9	16	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 VERY DISSATISFIED				
	4.00 NEUTRAL				
	7.00 VERY SATISFIED				
RPTQLA	REPORTING SYSTEM EFFECT ON REPORT QUALITY	2	17	24	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 HURT A LOT				
	4.00 NO EFFECT				
	7.00 HELPED A LOT				
TIMEA	MINUTES EACH DAY DOING PIRS	2	25	32	F8.2
COMMNTA	COMMENTS PROVIDED ON BACK	2	33	40	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 COMMENTS ON QUESTION				
	9.00 NO COMMENTS PROVIDED				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

CODEBOOK FOR JU129W.DAT

NOTE: DATA IN THIS FILE WERE COLLECTED WITH THE HOLLYWOOD DETECTIVE DIVISION AUTOMATED REPORTING SYSTEM USE QUESTIONNAIRE.

FORMATOK	REPORT FORMAT SUITABLE	1	1	1	F1.0
----------	------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

SMALPRNT	REPORT PRINT SHOULD BE LARGER	1	2	2	F1.0
----------	-------------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

SPELCHK	SPELL CHECK- IMPROVE QUALITY	1	3	3	F1.0
---------	------------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

CLRNFILE	CLEARANCE & FILING NOT IMPROVED	1	4	4	F1.0
----------	------------------------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
GOBAKOK	STOP LAPTOP OK BY ME	1	5	5	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
ALLAUTO	AUTOMATE ALL, CLEARANCE AND FILING WOULD IMPROVE	1	6	6	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
IMPRVMT	ARS REPORTS ARE AN IMPROVEMENT	1	7	7	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				
SUPTARS	SUPPORT DEPT WIDE ARS	1	8	8	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 STRONGLY DISAGREE				
	2 DISAGREE				
	3 NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE				
	4 AGREE				
	5 STRONGLY AGREE				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
TESTIFY	COMPUTER REPORT OK FOR TESTIFY	1	9	9	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
ARSTFOK	ARS TASK FORCE ENOUGH SUPPORT AND FEEDBACK	1	10	10	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
LESCMPLT	ARS REPORTS LESS COMPLETE	1	11	11	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE
FEWERR	ARS REPORTS FEWER ERRORS	1	12	12	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				STRONGLY DISAGREE
	2				DISAGREE
	3				NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
	4				AGREE
	5				STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

READABLE	ARS REPORTS EASIER TO READ	1	13	13	F1.0
----------	----------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
-------	-------

1	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2	DISAGREE
3	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
4	AGREE
5	STRONGLY AGREE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

CODEBOOK FOR JU130W.DAT

NOTE: DATA IN THIS FILE WERE COLLECTED WITH THE *PIR CONTENT EVALUATION*.

BARC#	RESEARCH CONTROL NUMBER	1	1	4	A4
BADIV	DIVISION	1	5	5	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HOLLYWOOD				
	2 WILSHIRE				
BARATER	RATERS NAME	1	6	6	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 BARRETT				
	2 BUCHER				
	3 GONZALES				
	4 PRESS				
BAMISS	NUMBER OF MISSING ENTRIES	1	7	7	F1.0
BAINNAC	NUMBER INACCURATE ENTRIES	1	8	8	F1.0
BAINCMPL	NUMBER OF INCOMPLETE ENTRIES	1	9	9	F1.0
BAMETHOD	METHOD OF WRITING	1	10	10	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HANDWRITTEN HOLLYWOOD				
	2 HANDWRITTEN WILSHIRE				
	3 AUTOMATED HOLLYWOOD				
	4 HANDWRITTEN WILSHIRE				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	POSITION END	FORMAT
BAOBSERV	WHAT THE OFFICER SAW	1	11	11	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				OBVIOUS OMISSIONS
	2				LIKELY OMISSIONS
	3				AMBIGUOUS
	5				COMPLETE
	6				NOT APPLICABLE
BASTYLE	ORGANIZATION AND WRITING STYLE	1	12	12	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				NOT READABLE
	2				FAILED TO SAY WHO DID WHAT
	3				DISORGANIZED
	4				SPELLING/GRAMMAR ERRORS
	5				NO ERRORS
BAEVIDNC	PHYSICAL EVIDENCE	1	13	13	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				SERIOUS PROBLEMS
	2				MINOR PROBLEMS
	3				NO PROBLEMS
	6				NOT APPLICABLE/MISSING
BAINVSTG	COMPLETENESS OF GENERAL INVESTIGATION	1	14	14	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				NO NARRATIVE
	2				SOME INFORMATION
	3				MOST INFORMATION
	4				ALL INFORMATION

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
BASTMTS	STATEMENTS FROM VICTIMS	1	15	15	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 NO STATEMENTS				
	2 SOME CONTACT NO FULL STATEMENTS				
	3 SOME CONTACT FULL STATEMENTS				
	4 ALL CONTACTED NO FULL STATEMENTS				
	5 ALL CONTACTED SOME FULL STATEMENTS				
	6 FULL STATEMENTS FROM ALL				
BACORPUS	CORPUS	1	16	16	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 NO CRIME STATED				
	2 SOME ELEMENTS PRESENT				
	3 OTHER CRIME THAN DESCRIBED				
	4 COMPLETE				
BADIST	OFFICER'S DISTRICT	1	17	18	F2.0
BANUMBER	NUMBER	1	19	23	F5.0
SN	OFFICER'S SERIAL NUMBER	1	24	28	F5.0
	Value Label				
	99999 MISSING				
BALENGTH	NUMBER OF WORDS IN THE NARRATIVE	1	29	31	F3.0
	Value Label				
	999 MISSING				
TOTLERS	TOTAL OF BOX ERRORS	1	32	39	F8.2
SN1	SERIAL NUMBER	1	40	47	F8.2
BARC2#	RESEARCH CONTROL NUMBER	1	48	51	A4

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
BADIV2	DIVISION	1	52	52	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				HOLLYWOOD
	2				WILSHIRE
BARATE2	RATERS NAME	1	53	53	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				B1
	2				B2
	3				G1
	4				P1
BAMISS2	NUMBER OF MISSING ENTRIES	1	54	54	F1.0
BAINNAC2	NUMBER INACCURATE ENTRIES	1	55	55	F1.0
BAINCMP2	NUMBER OF INCOMPLETE ENTRIES	1	56	56	F1.0
BAMETHO2	METHOD OF WRITING	1	57	57	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				HANDWRITTEN HOLLYWO
	2				HANDWRITTEN WILSHIR
	3				AUTOMATED HOLLYWOOD
	4				HANDWRITTEN WILSHIR
BAOBSER2	WHAT THE OFFICER SAW	1	58	58	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				OBVIOUS OMISSIONS
	2				LIKELY OMISSIONS
	3				AMBIGUOUS
	5				COMPLETE
	6				NOT APPLICABLE
	6				MISSING

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
BASTYLE2	ORGANIZATION AND WRITING STYLE	1	59	59	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				NOT READABLE
	2				FAILED TO SAY WHO DID WHAT
	3				DISORGANIZED
	4				SPELLING/GRAMMAR ERRORS
	5				NO ERRORS
BAEVIDN2	PHYSICAL EVIDENCE	1	60	60	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				SERIOUS PROBLEMS
	2				MINOR PROBLEMS
	3				NO PROBLEMS
	6				NOT APPLICABLE
	6				MISSING
BAINVST2	COMPLETENESS OF GENERAL INVESTIGATION	1	61	61	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				NO NARRATIVE
	2				SOME INFORMATION
	3				MOST INFORMATION
	4				ALL INFORMATION
BASTMTS2	STATEMENTS FROM VICTIMS	1	62	62	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				NO STATEMENTS
	2				SOME CONTACT NO FULL STATEMENTS
	3				SOME CONTACT FULL STATEMENTS
	4				ALL CONTACTED NO FULL STATEMENTS
	5				ALL CONTACTED SOME FULL STATEMENTS
	6				FULL STATEMENTS FROM ALL

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
BACORPU2	CORPUS	1	63	63	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				NO CRIME STATED
	2				SOME ELEMENTS PRESENT
	3				OTHER CRIME THAN DESCRIBED
	4				COMPLETE
BADIST2	DISTRICT	1	64	65	F2.0
BANUMBE2	NUMBER	1	66	70	F5.0
BALENGT2	NUMBER OF WORDS IN THE NARRATIVE	1	71	73	F3.0
	Value				Label
	999				MISSING
TOTLERS2	TOTAL OF BOX ERRORS	2	1	8	F8.2
SN2	SERIAL NUMBER	2	9	16	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

CODEBOOK FOR JU131W.DAT

NOTE: DATA FROM THIS FILE WERE DERIVED FROM THE GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE, THE EVALUATION OF THE EXISTING (OR AUTOMATED) PIR SYSTEM, THE SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE, THE TIME STUDY SHEETS, AND THE CAPLAN.

NOTE: REPEATED VARIABLES ARE DISTINGUISHED BY AN ENDING OF "A" OR "D." "A" DESIGNATES FIRST WAVE VARIABLES; "D" INDICATES SECOND WAVE VARIABLES.

NOTE: VARIABLES RANKA1 TO SN WERE DERIVED FROM THE GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE. SEE ORIGINAL INSTRUMENTS DOCUMENT.

RANKA1	RANK AT WAVE 1	1	1	1	F1.0
--------	----------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	P.O.1
2	P.O. II
3	P.O. III
4	P.O. III+1
5	SERGEANT
6	LIEUTENANT
8	RESERVE
9	MISSING

ASGMA2	ASSIGNMENT AT WAVE 1	1	2	2	F1.0
--------	----------------------	---	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	WATCH COMMANDER
2	ASSISTANT WATCH COMMANDER
3	FIELD SUPERVISOR
4	A-CAR
5	X-CAR
6	STORM
7	U-CAR
8	DESK OFFICER
9	MISSING

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
WATCHA3	WATCH AT WAVE 1	1	3	3	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 AM				
	2 MID-DAYS				
	3 DAYS				
	4 PM				
	5 MID-PM				
	9 MISSING				
SEXA4	SEX AT WAVE 1	1	4	4	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 MALE				
	2 FEMALE				
	9 MISSING				
AGEA5	AGE AT WAVE 1	1	5	6	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
JOBYRSA6	NUMBER OF YEARS ON JOB WAVE 1	1	7	8	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
JOBMOSA6	NUMBER OF MONTHS ON JOB PLUS YEARS WAVE 1	1	9	10	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
ORGYRSA7	NUMBER OF YEARS IN LAPD WAVE 1	1	11	12	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	POSITION END	FORMAT
ORGMOSA7	NUMBER OF MONTHS IN LAPD WAVE 1	1	13	14	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
EDUCA8	EDUCATION AT WAVE 1	1	15	16	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
DIVA9	DIVISION AT WAVE 1	1	17	17	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HOLLYWOOD				
	2 WILSHIRE				
	99 MISSING				
SN	SERIAL NUMBER	1	18	22	F5.0
	Value Label				
	99999 MISSING				

NOTE: VARIABLES ORGTENA TO JOBSATA WERE DERIVED FROM OTHER VARIABLES.

ORGTENA	ORGANIZATION TENURE= ((ORGYRSA7*12) + ORGMOSA7)/12	1	23	30	F8.2
JOBTENA	JOB TENURE = (JOBYRSA6*12) + JOBMOSA6)/12	1	31	38	F8.2
JOBSATA	JOB SATISFACTION (DERIVED FROM VARIABLES NOT INCLUDED IN THIS DATA SET)	1	39	46	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

NOTE: VARIABLES CAPCONFA TO ESTEEMA WERE DERIVED FROM THE ROLE CONFLICT AND ROLE AMBIGUITY SUBSCALES OF THE CAPLAN. SEE THE USER'S GUIDE SECTION: "COMMON SCALES" FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

CAPCONFA	ROLE CONFLICT CAPLAN	1	47	54	F8.2
CAPAMBGA	ROLE AMBIGUITY CAPLAN	1	55	62	F8.2
QTKWLDA	QUANTITATIVE WORKLOAD CAPLAN	1	63	70	F8.2
UNDERUTA	SKILL UNDERUTILIZATION CAPLAN	1	71	78	F8.2
CONTROLA	EXPERIENCED CONTROL	2	1	8	F8.2
DEPRESSA	DEPRESSION CAPLAN	2	9	16	F8.2
TRANXA	ANXIETY CAPLAN	2	17	24	F8.2
IRRITA	IRRITATION CAPLAN	2	25	32	F8.2
ESTEEMA	SELF ESTEEM CAPLAN	2	33	40	F8.2
COMPANXA	COMPUTER ANXIETY	2	41	48	F8.2

NOTE: VARIABLES LDRPERFA TO LDRGOALA WERE DERIVED FROM VALUES NOT INCLUDED IN THIS DATA SET.

LDRPERFA	LEADER PERFORMANCE EMPHASIS	2	49	56	F8.2
----------	-----------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
-------	-------

1	NEVER
2	SELDOM
3	SOMETIMES
4	USUALLY
5	ALWAYS

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
LDRCONSA	LEADER CONSIDERATION	2	57	64	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1 NEVER				
	2 SELDOM				
	3 SOMETIMES				
	4 USUALLY				
	5 ALWAYS				
LDRDECA	LEADER PARTICIPATION IN DECISIONS	2	65	72	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1 NEVER				
	2 SELDOM				
	3 SOMETIMES				
	4 USUALLY				
	5 ALWAYS				
LDRROLA	LEADER ROLE CLARIFICATION	2	73	80	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1 NEVER				
	2 SELDOM				
	3 SOMETIMES				
	4 USUALLY				
	5 ALWAYS				
LDRGOALA	LEADER GOAL SETTING	3	1	8	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1 NEVER				
	2 SELDOM				
	3 SOMETIMES				
	4 USUALLY				
	5 ALWAYS				
COMMITA	ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT	3	9	16	F8.2
NOTE: VARIABLES SUPSN3A TO OVERALLA WERE DERIVED FROM THE SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE.					
SUPSN3A	SUPERVISOR SERIAL NUMBER	3	17	21	F5.0

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
DIV3A	DIVISION	3	22	22	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				HOLLYWOOD
	2				WILSHIRE
RANK3A	OFFICER RANK	3	23	23	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				PO I
	2				PO II
	3				PO III
	4				PO III+1
	5				SERGEANT
	6				LIEUTENANT
	7				RESERVE
LENGTHA	TIME IN SUPERVISOR ROLE	3	24	24	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				LESS THAN 1 YEAR
	2				1 TO 3 YEARS
	3				3 TO 5 YEARS
	4				5 TO 10 YEARS
	5				MORE THAN 10 YEARS
INITA	DEGREE OF INITIATIVE	3	25	25	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
EFFORTA	AMOUNT OF EFFORT	3	26	26	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 UNACCEPTABLE				
	2 NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT				
	3 NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT				
	4 ACCEPTABLE				
	5 GOOD				
	6 VERY GOOD				
	7 EXCELLENT				
KNOWA	JOB KNOWLEDGE	3	27	27	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 UNACCEPTABLE				
	2 NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT				
	3 NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT				
	4 ACCEPTABLE				
	5 GOOD				
	6 VERY GOOD				
	7 EXCELLENT				
QUALA	WORK QUALITY	3	28	28	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 UNACCEPTABLE				
	2 NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT				
	3 NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT				
	4 ACCEPTABLE				
	5 GOOD				
	6 VERY GOOD				
	7 EXCELLENT				
ORALA	ORAL SKILLS	3	29	29	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 UNACCEPTABLE				
	2 NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT				
	3 NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT				
	4 ACCEPTABLE				
	5 GOOD				
	6 VERY GOOD				
	7 EXCELLENT				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
WRITEA	WRITING SKILL	3	30	30	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT
LEARNA	CAPACITY TO LEARN	3	31	31	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT
TIMEUSEA	TIME UTILIZATION	3	32	32	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				VERY WASTEFUL
	2				WASTEFUL
	3				ACCEPTABLE
	4				USES TIME WELL
	5				USES TIME VERY WELL
WKALONEA	WORKING INDEPENDENTLY	3	33	33	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				EXTREMELY DOUBTFUL
	2				DOUBTFUL
	3				SOMEWHAT DOUBTFUL
	4				50-50 CHANCE
	5				FAIRLY CONFIDENT
	6				CONFIDENT
	7				EXTREMELY CONFIDENT

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
OVERALLA	OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING	3	34	34	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 WORST				
	7 BEST				
NOTE: VARIABLES AVDIV2A TO AVTOTCLA ARE FROM THE TIME STUDY SHEETS. VARIABLE NAMES THAT INCLUDE "AVERAGE" ARE MEAN VALUES FOR THE VARIABLE ACROSS ALL PIRS SUBMITTED BY THAT OFFICER.					
AVDIV2A	AVERAGE DIVISION	3	35	42	F8.2
DIV2A	DIVISION OF OFFICER	3	43	43	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HOLLYWOOD				
	2 WILSHIRE				
AVWATCHA	AVERAGE WATCH ASSIGNMENT	3	44	51	F8.2
WATCHA	WATCH OF OFFICER	3	52	52	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
DETAILA	DETAIL ASSIGNMENT	3	53	53	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 PATROL				
	2 U-CAR				
	3 STORM				
	4 DESK				
AVDETAIL	AVERAGE OF DETAILS	3	54	61	F8.2
SUPSNA	SUPERVISOR SERIAL NUMBER	3	62	66	F5.0

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AVSUPSNA	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR SERIAL NUMEBER	3	67	74	F8.2
SUPWTCHA	SUPERVISOR WATCH	3	75	75	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
AVSUPWTA	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR WATCH	4	1	8	F8.2
NPIRSA	NUMBER OF PIRS SUBMITTED	4	9	15	F7.0
AVINVSTA	AVERAGE INVESTIGATION TIME	4	16	23	F8.2
AVWRITA	AVERAGE WRITING TIME	4	24	31	F8.2
AVTRAVA	AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME	4	32	39	F8.2
AVGAPRVA	AVERAGE APPROVAL TIME	4	40	47	F8.2
AVGRVWA	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR REVIEW TIME	4	48	55	F8.2
AVGTTLTA	AVERAGE OFFICER TOTAL TIME	4	56	63	F8.2
PCTERRSA	PERCENT OF PIRS WITH ERRORS	4	64	68	F5.1
AVMISSA	AVERAGE MISSING FIELD ERRORS	4	69	76	F8.2
AVINACA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF INNACURATE ENTRIES	5	1	8	F8.2
AVINCPLA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCOMPLETE ENTRIES	5	9	16	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AVUNRDA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF UNREADABLE ENTRIES	5	17	24	F8.2
AVSPELLA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF MISSPELLINGS	5	25	32	F8.2
AVTTLERA	AVERAGE TOTAL NUMBER OF ERRORS	5	33	40	F8.2
AVCRCTNA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF CORRECTIONS BY SUPERVISOR	5	41	48	F8.2
RCDWTCHA	RECORDS CLERK WATCH	5	49	49	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
AVRCWTCA	AVERAGE RECORDS CLERK WATCH	5	50	57	F8.2
AVINPUTA	AVERAGE CLERK INPUT TIME	5	58	65	F8.2
AVCRCTMA	AVERAGE CLERK CORRECTION TIME	5	66	73	F8.2
AVCPYTMA	AVERAGE CLERK COPY TIME	6	1	8	F8.2
AVFILETA	AVERAGE CLERK FILING TIME	6	9	16	F8.2
AVPACMSA	AVERAGE PACMIS REVERIFICATION TIME	6	17	24	F8.2
AVNCOPIA	AVERAGE NUMBER OF COPIES MADE	6	25	32	F8.2
AVTOTCLA	AVERAGE TOTAL CLERK TIME	6	33	40	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
DIVA	DIVISION	6	41	48	F8.2
	Value				Label
	1.00				HOLLYWOOD
	2.00				WILSHIRE

NOTE: VARIABLES DATEA TO COMMNTA WERE DERIVED FROM THE EVALUATION OF THE EXISTING PIR SYSTEM. SEE ORIGINAL INSTRUMENTS FOR DETAILS.

DATEA	DATE	6	49	56	F8.2
-------	------	---	----	----	------

EASEA	EASE OF USE	6	57	64	F8.2
-------	-------------	---	----	----	------

	Value				Label
	1.00				VERY DIFFICULT
	5.00				VERY EASY

FRUSTA	EXPERIENCED FRUSTRATION OR IRRITATION	6	65	72	F8.2
--------	---------------------------------------	---	----	----	------

	Value				Label
	1.00				NONE
	5.00				A GREAT DEAL

TIMELOSA	TIME LOST DUE TO REPORTING SYSTEM PROBLEMS	6	73	80	F8.2
----------	--	---	----	----	------

	Value				Label
	1.00				NONE
	5.00				A GREAT DEAL

ERRORA	ERROR PRONENESS OF REPORTING SYSTEM	7	1	8	F8.2
--------	-------------------------------------	---	---	---	------

	Value				Label
	1.00				NOT AT ALL
	5.00				VERY MUCH

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
CORRCTA	CORRECTION EASE	7	9	16	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 VERY HARD				
	5.00 VERY EASY				
HLPHRTA	HELP OR HURT JOB PERFORMANCE	7	17	24	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 HURT A LOT				
	4.00 NO EFFECT				
	7.00 HELPED A LOT				
SATA	SATISFACTION WITH REPORTING SYSTEM	7	25	32	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 VERY DISSATISFIED				
	4.00 NEUTRAL				
	7.00 VERY SATISFIED				
RPTQLA	REPORTING SYSTEM EFFECT ON REPORT QUALITY	7	33	40	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 HURT A LOT				
	4.00 NO EFFECT				
	7.00 HELPED A LOT				
TIMEA	MINUTES EACH DAY DOING PIRS	7	41	48	F8.2
COMMNTA	COMMENTS PROVIDED ON BACK	7	49	56	F8.2
	Value Label				
	1.00 COMMENTS ON QUESTION				
	9.00 NO COMMENTS PROVIDED				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

NOTE: VARIABLES RANKD1 TO JOBSATD WERE DERIVED FROM THE GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE.

RANKD1	RANK AT WAVE 2	7	57	57	F1.0
--------	----------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	P.O.1
2	P.O. II
3	P.O. III
4	P.O. III+1
5	SERGEANT
6	LIEUTENANT
8	RESERVE
9	MISSING

ASGMD2	ASSIGNMENT AT WAVE 2	7	58	58	F1.0
--------	----------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	WATCH COMMANDER
2	ASST WATCH COMMANDER
3	FIELD SUPERVISOR
4	A-CAR
5	X-CAR
6	STORM
7	U-CAR
8	DESK OFFICER
9	MISSING

WATCHD3	WATCH AT WAVE 2	7	59	59	F1.0
---------	-----------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	AM
2	MID-DAYS
3	DAYS
4	PM
5	MID-PM
9	MISSING

SEXD4	SEX AT WAVE 2	7	60	60	F1.0
-------	---------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	MALE
2	FEMALE
99	MISSING

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AGED5	AGE AT WAVE 2	7	61	62	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
JOBYRSD6	NUMBER OF YEARS ON JOB WAVE 2	7	63	64	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
JOBMOSD6	NUMBER OF MONTHS ON JOB WAVE 2	7	65	66	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
ORGYRSD7	NUMBER OF YEARS IN LAPD WAVE 2	7	67	68	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
ORGMOSD7	NUMBER OF MONTHS IN LAPD WAVE 2	7	69	70	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
EDUCD8	EDUCATION AT WAVE 2	7	71	72	F2.0
	Value Label				
	99 MISSING				
DIVD9	DIVISION AT WAVE 2	7	73	73	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HOLLYWOOD				
	2 WILSHIRE				
	9 MISSING				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
ORGTEND	ORGANIZATION TENURE AT POST-TEST (IN YEARS) = ((ORGYRSD7*12) + ORGMOSD7)/12	8	1	8	F8.2
JOBTEND	JOB TENURE AT POST-TEST (IN YEARS) = ((JOBYRSD6*12) + JOBMOSD6)/12	8	9	16	F8.2
JOBSATD	JOB SATISFACTION AT POST-TEST (IN YEARS) (DERIVED FROM VARIABLES NOT INCLUDED IN THIS DATA SET)	8	17	24	F8.2
NOTE: CAPCONFD TO ESTEEMD WERE DERIVED FROM THE ROLE CONFLICT AND ROLE AMBIGUITY SUBSCALES OF THE CAPLAN. SEE USER'S GUIDE (SECTION: "COMMON SCALES") FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.					
CAPCONFD	ROLE CONFLICT CAPLAN	8	25	32	F8.2
CAPAMBGD	ROLE AMBIGUITY CAPLAN AT POST-TEST	8	33	40	F8.2
QTKWLLD	QUANTITATIVE WORKLOAD CAPLAN AT POST-TEST	8	41	48	F8.2
UNDERUTD	SKILL UNDERUTILIZATION CAPLAN AT POST-TEST	8	49	56	F8.2
CONTROLD	EXPERIENCED CONTROL AT POST-TEST	8	57	64	F8.2
DEPRESSD	DEPRESSION CAPLAN AT POST-TEST	8	65	72	F8.2
TRANXD	ANXIETY CAPLAN AT POST-TEST	8	73	80	F8.2
IRRITD	IRRITATION CAPLAN AT POST-TEST	9	1	8	F8.2
ESTEEMD	SELF ESTEEM CAPLAN AT POST-TEST	9	9	16	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
COMPANXD	COMPUTER ANXIETY AT POST-TEST	9	17	24	F8.2

NOTE: VARIABLES LDRPERFD TO COMMITD WERE DERIVED FROM VALUES NOT INCLUDED IN THIS DATA SET.

LDRPERFD	LEADER PERFORMANCE EMPHASIS AT POST-TEST	9	25	32	F8.2
----------	--	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
-------	-------

1	NEVER
2	SELDOM
3	SOMETIMES
4	USUALLY
5	ALWAYS

LDRCONSD	LEADER CONSIDERATION AT POST-TEST	9	33	40	F8.2
----------	-----------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
-------	-------

1	NEVER
2	SELDOM
3	SOMETIMES
4	USUALLY
5	ALWAYS

LDRDECD	LEADER PARTICIPATION IN DECISIONS AT POST-TEST	9	41	48	F8.2
---------	--	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
-------	-------

1	NEVER
2	SELDOM
3	SOMETIMES
4	USUALLY
5	ALWAYS

LDRROLD	LEADER ROLE CLARIFICATION AT POST-TEST	9	49	56	F8.2
---------	--	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
-------	-------

1	NEVER
2	SELDOM
3	SOMETIMES
4	USUALLY
5	ALWAYS

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
------------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-----	--------

LDRGOALD	LEADER GOAL SETTING AT POST-TEST	9	57	64	F8.2
----------	----------------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	NEVER
2	SELDOM
3	SOMETIMES
4	USUALLY
5	ALWAYS

COMMITD	ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AT POST-TEST	9	65	72	F8.2
---------	--	---	----	----	------

NOTE: VARIABLES SUPSN3D TO OVERALLD WERE DERIVED FROM THE SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE.

SUPSN3D	SUPERVISOR SERIAL NUMBER AT POST-TEST	9	73	77	F5.0
---------	---------------------------------------	---	----	----	------

DIV3D	DIVISION AT POST-TEST	9	78	78	F1.0
-------	-----------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	HOLLYWOOD
2	WILSHIRE

RANK3D	OFFICER RANK AT POST-TEST	9	79	79	F1.0
--------	---------------------------	---	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	PO I
2	PO II
3	PO III
4	PO III+1
5	SERGEANT
6	LIEUTENANT
7	RESERVE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	POSITION END	FORMAT
LENGTHD	TIME IN SUPERVISOR ROLE AT POST-TEST	9	80	80	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				LESS THAN 1 YEAR
	2				1 TO 3 YEARS
	3				3 TO 5 YEARS
	4				5 TO 10 YEARS
	5				MORE THAN 10 YEARS
INITD	DEGREE OF INITIATIVE AT POST-TEST	10	1	1	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT
EFFORTD	AMOUNT OF EFFORT AT POST-TEST	10	2	2	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT
KNOWD	JOB KNOWLEDGE AT POST-TEST	10	3	3	F1.0
	Value				
	Label				
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
QUALD	WORK QUALITY AT POST-TEST	10	4	4	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT
ORALD	ORAL SKILLS AT POST-TEST	10	5	5	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT
WRITED	WRITING SKILL AT POST-TEST	10	6	6	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT
LEARND	CAPACITY TO LEARN AT POST-TEST	10	7	7	F1.0
	Value				Label
	1				UNACCEPTABLE
	2				NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT
	3				NEEDS SOME IMPROVEMENT
	4				ACCEPTABLE
	5				GOOD
	6				VERY GOOD
	7				EXCELLENT

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
TIMEUSED	TIME UTILIZATION AT POST-TEST	10	8	8	F1.0

Value	Label
1	VERY WASTEFUL
2	WASTEFUL
3	ACCEPTABLE
4	USES TIME WELL
5	USES TIME VERY WELL

WKALONED	WORKING INDEPENDENTLY AT POST-TEST	10	9	9	F1.0
----------	------------------------------------	----	---	---	------

Value	Label
1	EXTREMELY DOUBTFUL
2	DOUBTFUL
3	SOMEWHAT DOUBTFUL
4	50-50 CHANCE
5	FAIRLY CONFIDENT
6	CONFIDENT
7	EXTREMELY CONFIDENT

OVERALLD	OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING AT POST-TEST	10	10	10	F1.0
----------	---	----	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	WORST
7	BEST

NOTE: NOTE: VARIABLES AVDIV2D TO AVTOTCLD ARE FROM THE TIME STUDY SHEETS. VARIABLE NAMES THAT INCLUDE "AVERAGE" ARE MEAN VALUES FOR THE VARIABLE ACROSS ALL PIRS SUBMITTED BY THAT OFFICER.

AVDIV2D	AVERAGE DIVISION AT POST-TEST	10	11	18	F8.2
---------	-------------------------------	----	----	----	------

DIV2D	DIVISION OF OFFICER AT POST-TEST	10	19	19	F1.0
-------	----------------------------------	----	----	----	------

Value	Label
1	HOLLYWOOD
2	WILSHIRE

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AVWATCHD	AVERAGE WATCH ASSIGNMENT AT POST-TEST	10	20	27	F8.2
WATCHD	WATCH OF OFFICER AT POST-TEST	10	28	28	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
DETAILD	DETAIL ASSIGNMENT AT POST-TEST	10	29	29	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 PATROL				
	2 U-CAR				
	3 STORM				
	4 DESK				
AVDETLD	AVERAGE OF DETAILS AT POST-TEST	10	30	37	F8.2
SUPSND	SUPERVISOR SERIAL NUMBER AT POST-TEST	10	38	42	F5.0
AVSUPSND	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR SERIAL NUMBER AT POST-TEST	10	43	50	F8.2
SUPWTCHD	SUPERVISOR WATCH AT POST-TEST	10	51	51	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
AVSUPWTD	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR WATCH AT POST-TEST	10	52	59	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
NPIRSD	NUMBER OF PIRS SUBMITTED AT POST-TEST	10	60	66	F7.0
AVINVSTD	AVERAGE INVESTIGATION TIME AT POST-TEST	10	67	74	F8.2
AVWRITD	AVERAGE WRITING TIME AT POST-TEST	11	1	8	F8.2
AVTRAVD	AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME AT POST-TEST	11	9	16	F8.2
AVGAPRVD	AVERAGE APPROVAL TIME AT POST-TEST	11	17	24	F8.2
AVGRVWD	AVERAGE SUPERVISOR REVIEW TIME AT POST-TEST	11	25	32	F8.2
AVGTTLTD	AVERAGE OFFICER TOTAL TIME AT POST-TEST	11	33	40	F8.2
PCTERRSD	PERCENT OF PIRS WITH ERRORS AT POST-TEST	11	41	45	F5.1
AVMISSD	AVERAGE MISSING FIELD ERRORS AT POST-TEST	11	46	53	F8.2
AVINACD	AVERAGE NUMBER OF INNACURATE ENTRIES AT POST-TEST	11	54	61	F8.2
AVINCPLD	AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCOMPLETE ENTRIES AT POST-TEST	11	62	69	F8.2
AVUNRDD	AVERAGE NUMBER OF UNREADABLE ENTRIES AT POST-TEST	11	70	77	F8.2
AVSPELLD	AVERAGE NUMBER OF MISSPELLINGS AT POST-TEST	12	1	8	F8.2
AVTTLERD	AVERAGE TOTAL NUMBER OF ERRORS AT POST-TEST	12	9	16	F8.2

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
AVCRCTND	AVERAGE NUMBER OF CORRECTIONS BY SUPERVISOR AT POST-TEST	12	17	24	F8.2
RCDWTCHD	RECORDS CLERK WATCH	12	25	25	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 DAY				
	2 MID-DAY				
	3 PM				
	4 MID-PM				
	5 AM				
AVRCWTCD	AVERAGE RECORDS WATCH	12	26	33	F8.2
AVINPUTD	AVERAGE CLERK INPUT TIME AT POST-TEST	12	34	41	F8.2
AVCRCTMD	AVERAGE CLERK CORRECTION TIME AT POST-TEST	12	42	49	F8.2
AVCPYTMD	AVERAGE CLERK COPY TIME AT POST-TEST	12	50	57	F8.2
AVFILETD	AVERAGE CLERK FILING TIME AT POST-TEST	12	58	65	F8.2
AVPACMSD	AVERAGE PACMIS REVERIFICATION TIME AT POST-TEST	12	66	73	F8.2
AVNCOPYD	AVERAGE NUMBER OF COPIES MADE AT POST-TEST	13	1	8	F8.2
AVTOTCLD	AVERAGE TOTAL CLERK TIME AT POST-TEST	13	9	16	F8.2
DIV5D	DIVISION LAST DEPLOYMENT	13	17	17	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 HOLLYWOOD				
	2 WILSHIRE				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
WATCH5D	WATCH LAST DEPLOYMENT	13	18	18	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 AM				
	2 MID-DAYS				
	3 DAYS				
	4 PM				
	5 MID-PM				
RANK5D	RANK LAST DEPLOYMENT	13	19	19	F1.0
	Value Label				
	1 PO I				
	2 PO II				
	3 PO III				
	4 PO III+1				
	5 SERGEANT				
	6 LIEUTENANT				
	8 RESERVE				
SN5D	SERIAL NUMBER LAST DEPLOYMENT	13	20	24	F5.0
TRNDATE	TRAINING DATE	13	25	30	F6.0
TRNORDER	ORDER OF TRAINING	13	31	32	F2.0
WATCH	WATCH	13	33	33	F1.0
RANK	RANK	13	34	34	F1.0

CODEBOOK NOTES

1. The data are coded in ASCII format as raw data. Twenty-nine records of up to 80 columns are used to code the data. The codebook provides a short variable name for each variable, a longer descriptive label, the record number on which the variable is coded, the starting and ending column positions within the record, and the format used to code the variable. *Fw.d* refers to standard numeric format where *w* indicates the total number of columns used to code the variable, including any decimal points, and *d* indicates the number of positions to the right that are interpreted as decimals. String format *-Aw-* is used to read character data, in which *w* indicates the total column width of the character string.

2. Following are values for month variables.

VALUE	LABEL
0	STILL IN
1	JANUARY
2	FEBRUARY
3	MARCH
4	APRIL
5	MAY
6	JUNE
7	JULY
8	AUGUST
9	SEPTEMBER
10	OCTOBER
11	NOVEMBER
12	DECEMBER
98	NO DIAGNOSIS, EVER
99	MISSING

3. Following are values for day variables.

VALUE	LABEL
0	STILL IN
98	NO DIAGNOSIS, EVER
99	MISSING OR NO INFORMATION

4. Following are values for year variables

VALUE	LABEL
0	STILL IN
98	NO DIAGNOSIS, EVER
99	MISSING OR NO INFORMATION

5. Following are legal status values.

VALUE	LABEL
1	VOLUNTARY
2	INVOLUNTARY
3	COMPETENCY EVALUATION
4	TRANSFER PRISON-JAIL
5	NOT GUILTY - INSANITY
6	INCOMPETENT FOR TRIAL
9	NO INFORMATION
11	MISSING
12	MISSING
99	MISSING

6. Following are values for diagnosis values

VALUE	LABEL
0	NONE GIVEN
26950	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
28950	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
28890	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29000	PRIMARY DEGENERATIVE DEMENTIA, SENILE ONSET, UNCOMPLICATED
29013	PRIMARY DEGENERATIVE DEMENTIA, PRESENILE ONSET, WITH DEPRESSION
29100	ALCOHOL WITHDRAWAL DELIRIUM
29110	ALCOHOL AMNESTIC DISORDER
29120	DEMENTIA ASSOCIATED WITH ALCOHOLISM
29122	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29130	ALCOHOL HALLUCINOSIS
29140	ALCOHOL INDUCED ORGANIC MENTAL DISORDER, IDIOSYNCRATIC INTOXICATION
29150	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29160	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29180	ALCOHOL INDUCED ORGANIC MENTAL DISORDER, WITHDRAWAL
29190	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29191	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29200	DEMENTIA ASSOCIATED WITH ALCOHOLISM, WITHDRAWAL
29210	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29300	ORGANIC BRAIN SYNDROME, DELIRIUM
29310	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29320	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29350	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29381	ORGANIC BRAIN SYNDROME, ORGANIC DELUSIONAL SYNDROME
29390	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29400	ORGANIC BRAIN SYNDROME, AMNESTIC SYNDROME
29430	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)

6. Following are values for diagnosis values, continued

VALUE	LABEL
29480	ORGANIC BRAIN SYNDROME, ATYPICAL OR MIXED ORGANIC BRAIN SYNDROME
29500	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29510	SCHIZOPHRENIA, DISORGANIZED, SUBCHRONIC
29512	SCHIZOPHRENIA, DISORGANIZED, CHRONIC
29513	SCHIZOPHRENIA, DISORGANIZED, SUBCHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29514	SCHIZOPHRENIA, DISORGANIZED, CHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29515	SCHIZOPHRENIA, DISORGANIZED, IN REMISSION
29520	SCHIZOPHRENIA, CATATONIC, SUBCHRONIC
29522	SCHIZOPHRENIA, CATATONIC, CHRONIC
29523	SCHIZOPHRENIA, CATATONIC, SUBCHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29524	SCHIZOPHRENIA, CATATONIC, CHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29530	SCHIZOPHRENIA, PARANOID, UNSPECIFIED
29531	SCHIZOPHRENIA, PARANOID, SUBCHRONIC
29532	SCHIZOPHRENIA, PARANOID, CHRONIC
29533	SCHIZOPHRENIA, PARANOID, SUBCHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29534	SCHIZOPHRENIA, PARANOID, CHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29535	SCHIZOPHRENIA, PARANOID, IN REMISSION
29536	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29540	SCHIZOPHRENIFORM DISORDER
29546	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29550	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29560	SCHIZOPHRENIA, RESIDUAL, UNSPECIFIED
29561	SCHIZOPHRENIA, RESIDUAL, SUBCHRONIC
29562	SCHIZOPHRENIA, RESIDUAL, CHRONIC
29564	SCHIZOPHRENIA, RESIDUAL, CHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29565	SCHIZOPHRENIA, RESIDUAL, IN REMISSION
29570	SCHIZOAFFECTIVE DISORDER
29573	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29574	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29590	SCHIZOPHRENIA, UNDIFFERENTIATED, UNSPECIFIED
29591	SCHIZOPHRENIA, UNDIFFERENTIATED, SUBCHRONIC
29592	SCHIZOPHRENIA, UNDIFFERENTIATED, CHRONIC
29593	SCHIZOPHRENIA, UNDIFFERENTIATED, SUBCHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29594	SCHIZOPHRENIA, UNDIFFERENTIATED, CHRONIC WITH ACUTE EXACERBATION
29595	SCHIZOPHRENIA, UNDIFFERENTIATED, IN REMISSION
29599	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29600	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29610	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29620	MAJOR DEPRESSION, SINGLE EPISODE, UNSPECIFIED

6. Following are values for diagnosis values, continued

VALUE	LABEL
29623	MAJOR DEPRESSION, SINGLE EPISODE, WITH MELANCHOLIA
29625	MAJOR DEPRESSION, SINGLE EPISODE, IN PARTIAL REMISSION
29630	MAJOR DEPRESSION, RECURRENT, UNSPECIFIED
29633	MAJOR DEPRESSION, RECURRENT, WITH MELANCHOLIA
29634	MAJOR DEPRESSION, RECURRENT, WITH PSYCHOTIC FEATURES
29636	MAJOR DEPRESSION, RECURRENT, IN REMISSION
29640	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MANIC, UNSPECIFIED
29642	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MANIC, WITHOUT PSYCHOTIC FEATURES
29644	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MANIC, WITH PSYCHOTIC FEATURES
29646	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MANIC,
29647	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MANIC,
29650	BIPOLAR DISORDER, DEPRESSED, UNSPECIFIED
29652	BIPOLAR DISORDER, DEPRESSED, WITHOUT PSYCHOTIC FEATURES
29654	BIPOLAR DISORDER, DEPRESSED, WITH PSYCHOTIC FEATURES
29660	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MIXED, UNSPECIFIED
29664	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MIXED, WITH PSYCHOTIC FEATURES
29666	BIPOLAR DISORDER, MIXED, IN REMISSION
29670	ATYPICAL BIPOLAR DISORDER
29682	ATYPICAL DEPRESSION
29690	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29700	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29710	PARANOIA
29790	ATYPICAL PARANOID DISORDER
29800	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29830	ACUTE PARANOID DISORDER
29890	ATYPICAL PSYCHOSIS
29892	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29899	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
29900	INFANTILE AUTISM
30000	POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER, ATYPICAL ANXIETY DISORDER
30007	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30010	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30016	FACTITIOUS DISORDER WITH PSYCHOLOGICAL SYMPTOMS
30029	SIMPLE PHOBIA
30030	OBSESSIVE COMPULSIVE DISORDER
30040	DYSTHYMIC DISORDER (OR DEPRESSIVE NEUROSIS)
30070	HYPOCHONDRIASIS
30080	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30090	UNSPECIFIED MENTAL DISORDER (NONPSYCHOTIC)

6. Following are values for diagnosis values, continued

VALUE	LABEL
30099	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30100	PERSONALITY DISORDER, PARANOID
30106	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30110	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30120	PERSONALITY DISORDER, SCHIZOID
30130	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30140	PERSONALITY DISORDER, COMPULSIVE
30170	PERSONALITY DISORDER, ANTISOCIAL
30176	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30178	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30180	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30180	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30190	PERSONALITY DISORDER, NOS
30181	PERSONALITY DISORDER, NARCISSISTIC
30182	PERSONALITY DISORDER, AVOIDANT
30183	PERSONALITY DISORDER, BORDERLINE
30184	PERSONALITY DISORDER, PASSIVE-AGGRESSIVE
30189	PERSONALITY DISORDER, ATYPICAL, MIXED OR OTHER PERSONALITY DISORDER
30190	PERSONALITY DISORDER, NOS
30199	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
302	OTHER PSYCOSEXUAL DISORDERS, EGO-DYSTONIC HOMOSEXUALITY
30220	PEDOPHILIA
30240	EXHIBITIONISM
30271	PSYCOSEXUAL DYSFUNCTIONS, INHIBITED SEXUAL DESIRE
30280	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30290	ATYPICAL PARAPHILIA
303	ALCOHOL INTOXICATION
30300	ALCOHOL INTOXICATION
30310	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30317	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30320	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30326	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30327	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30328	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30390	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, ALCOHOLISM
30391	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30392	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30393	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30400	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, OPIOID DEPENDENCE, UNSPECIFIED
30410	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, BARBITURATE OR SIMILARLY ACTING SEDATIVE OR HYPNOTIC DEPENDENCE, UNSPECIFIED
30420	COCAINE DEPENDENCE
30430	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, CANNABIS DEPENDENCE, UNSPECIFIED

6. Following are values for diagnosis values, continued

VALUE	LABEL
30450	HALLUCINOGEN DEPENDENCE
30460	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, OTHER SPECIFIED SUBSTANCE DEPENDENCE, UNSPECIFIED
30470	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, DEPENDENCE ON COMBINATION OF OPIOID AND OTHER NON-ALCOHOLIC SUBSTANCE, UNSPECIFIED
30480	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, DEPENDENCE ON COMBINATION OF SUBSTANCES, EXCLUDING OPIOIDS AND ALCOHOL, UNSPECIFIED
30490	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, UNSPECIFIED SUBSTANCE DEPENDENCE, UNSPECIFIED
30499	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30500	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, ALCOHOL ABUSE UNSPECIFIED
30501	SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS, ALCOHOL ABUSE CONTINUOUS
30502	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30520	ORGANIC MENTAL DISORDERS, CANNABIS INTOXICATION
30521	SUBSTANCE ABUSE DISORDERS, CANNABIS ABUSE CONTINUOUS
30530	ORGANIC MENTAL DISORDERS, HALLUCINOGEN HALLUCINOSIS
30560	ORGANIC MENTAL DISORDERS, COCAINE INTOXICATION
30590	ORGANIC MENTAL DISORDERS, PCP, CAFFEINE OR OTHER INTOXICATION
30591	PCP OR SIMILARLY ACTING ARYLCYCLOHEXYLAMINE ABUSE, CONTINUOUS
30593	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30720	TIC DISORDER, NOS
30730	ATYPICAL STEROTYPED MOVEMENT DISORDER
30737	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30800	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30840	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30900	ADJUSTMENT DISORDER, WITH DEPRESSED MOOD
30910	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30913	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30914	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
30924	ADJUSTMENT DISORDER, WITH ANXIOUS MOOD
30928	ADJUSTMENT DISORDER, WITH MIXED EMOTIONAL FEATURES
30940	ADJUSTMENT DISORDER, WITH MIXED DISTRUBANCE OF EMOTIONS AND CONDUCT
30960	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31110	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31170	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31199	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31234	DISORDERS OF IMPULSE CONTROL NOT ELSEWHERE CLASSIFIED, INTERMITTENT EXPLOSIVE BEHAVIOR

6. Following are values for diagnosis values, continued

VALUE	LABEL
31299	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31500	DEVELOPMENTAL READING DISORDER
31570	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31590	ATYPICAL SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDER
31600	PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING PHYSICAL CONDITION
31610	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31700	MILD MENTAL RETARDATION
31800	MODERATE MENTAL RETARDATION
31801	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31899	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
31900	UNSPECIFIED MENTAL RETARDATION
6520	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
7109	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
79990	DIAGNOSIS OR CONDITION DEFERRED ON AXIS I OR AXIS II
79991	(NO LABEL PROVIDED)
88888	NOT APPLICABLE
99999	DIAGNOSED, NO INFORMATION

7. Following are values for incarceration variables.

VALUE	LABEL
1	NEW SENTENCE
2	RETURN FROM MENTAL HEALTH
3	PAROLE VIOLATION
4	RETURN COURT ORDER
5	RETURN ABSCONDING
6	RETURN CONDITION RELEASE
9	NO INFORMATION

8. Following are values for arrest variables.

VALUE	LABEL
1	PRIOR
2	ASSUMED PRIOR
3	TARGET
4	ASSUMED TARGET
5	SUBSEQUENT
6	ASSUMED SUBSEQUENT
7	OUT OF STATE
9	MISSING OR NO INFORMATION

9. Following are values for charge code variables.

VALUE	LABEL
1	MURDER
2	MANSLAUGHTER, CRIMINAL
3	ATTEMPTED MURDER, ATT
5	RAPE
6	ATTEMPTED RAPE
7	ASSAULT
9	OTHER VIOLENT CRIMES
10	KIDNAPPING
11	ARSON
12	ROBBERY
19	OTHER POTENTIALLY VIOLENT
20	CRIMINAL POSSESSION
21	MENANCING
22	RECKLESS ENDANGERMENT
23	ABORTION
24	FAMILIES AND CHILDREN
25	COERCION
26	UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT
27	HARASSMENT, VERBAL ASSAULT
29	OTHER CRIMES AGAINST
40	SODOMY
41	SEXUAL ABUSE
42	SEXUAL MISCONDUCT
43	INCEST
44	LEWD AND LASCIVIOUS
45	OTHER SEX CRIMES
50	BURGLARY
51	CRIMINAL MISCHIEF
52	CRIMINAL TRESPASSING
53	LARCENY (GRAND PETTY)
54	AUTO THEFT, JOY RIDING
55	THEFT, SHOPLIFTING, PI
56	POSSESSION OF STOLEN
57	FORGERY AND COUNTERFEITING
58	FRAUD (DECEPTIVE PRACTICES)
59	FORGED CHECK, BA
60	BRIBERY
61	CONSPIRACY
62	OBSTRUCTING GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL
69	OTHER PROPERTY CRIME
70	DRUG, SELLING DANGEROUS
71	DRUG, POSSESSION DANGEROUS
79	OTHER DRUG CRIMES
80	PAROLE VIOLATION
81	PROBATION VIOLATION
82	DRIVING WHILE UNDER THE INFLUENCE
83	PUBLIC INTOXICATION,
84	ESCAPE, BAIL JUMPING
85	GAMBLING

9. Following are values for charge code variables, continued.

VALUE	LABEL
86	CRIMINAL NUISANCE
87	DISORDERLY CONDUCT, B
88	LOITERING, VAGRANCY
89	INDECENT EXPOSURE
90	TRAFFIC INFRACTION
91	PROSTITUTION
97	OTHER MINOR OFFENSES
99	MISSING OR INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
ID	STUDY ID NUMBER	1	1	5	F5.0
	VALUE LABEL				
	99999 MISSING				
MADMHT	MONTH OF HOSPITAL TARGET ADMISSION	1	6	7	F2.0
	(SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #2 FOR VALUE LABELS.)				
DADMHT	DAY OF HOSPITAL TARGET ADMISSION	1	8	9	F2.0
	(SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #3 FOR VALUE LABELS.)				
YADMHT	YEAR OF HOSPITAL TARGET ADMISSION	1	10	11	F2.0
	(SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #4 FOR VALUE LABELS.)				
DAYSINHT	NUMBER OF DAYS DURING TARGET HOSPITALIZATION	1	12	15	F4.0
	(SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #3 FOR VALUE LABELS.)				
LST	LEGAL STATUS, TARGET ADMISSION, HOSPITALIZATION	1	16	16	F1.0
	VALUE LABEL				
	1 VOLUNTARY				
	2 INVOLUNTARY				
	3 COMPETENCY EVAL				
	4 TRANSFER PRISON-JAIL				
	5 NOT GUILTY - INSANITY				
	6 INCOMPETENT FOR TRIAL				
	9 MISSING OR NO INFORMATION				
MRELHT	MONTH OF TARGET RELEASE, HOSPITAL	1	17	18	F2.0
	(SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #2 FOR VALUE LABELS.)				
DRELHT	DAY OF TARGET RELEASE, HOSPITAL	1	19	20	F2.0
	(SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #3 FOR VALUE LABELS.)				
YRELHT	YEAR OF TARGET RELEASE, HOSPITAL	1	21	22	F2.0
	(SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #4 FOR VALUE LABELS.)				

VARIABLE NAME	LABEL	RECORD NUM	POSITION START	END	FORMAT
MADMIT	MONTH OF ADMISSION, TARGET INCARCERATION (SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #2 FOR VALUE LABELS.)	1	23	24	F2.0
DADMIT	DAY OF ADMISSION, TARGET INCARCERATION (SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #3 FOR VALUE LABELS.)	1	25	26	F2.0
YADMIT	YEAR OF ADMISSION, TARGET INCARCERATION (SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #4 FOR VALUE LABELS.)	1	27	28	F2.0
INCT	TYPE OF TARGET INCARCERATION	1	29	29	F1.0
	VALUE LABEL				
	1 NEW SENTENCE				
	2 RETURN HOSPITAL				
	3 PAROLE VIOLATION				
	4 RETURN COURT ORDER				
	5 RETURN ABSCONDING				
	6 RETURN CONDITION RELEASE				
	9 MISSING OR NO INFORMATION				
MRELIT	MONTH OF RELEASE, TARGET INCARCERATION (SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #2 FOR VALUE LABELS.)	1	30	31	F2.0
DRELIT	DAY OF RELEASE, TARGET INCARCERATION (SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #3 FOR VALUE LABELS.)	1	32	33	F2.0
YRELIT	YEAR OF RELEASE, TARGET INCARCERATION (SEE CODEBOOK NOTE #4 FOR VALUE LABELS.)	1	34	35	F2.0
SAMPLE	SAMPLE GROUP	1	36	36	F1.0
	VALUE LABEL				
	1 PRISONERS				
	2 PATIENTS				
	9 MISSING				



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Data Resources Program

FEBRUARY 1992

DATA SET JU.126.131

Automated Reporting System Pilot Project

Lt. David Doan
Bronston T. Mayes, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Police Department ARS Task Force

Original Instruments

Prepared by
Sociometrics Corporation

Table of Contents

<i>General Information Questionnaire.</i> Completed by patrol officers and supervisors. Assesses job morale and satisfaction.	1
<i>Job Performance Rating (Supervisor Questionnaire).</i> Job performance evaluations of patrol officers and first line supervisors, completed by sergeants and lieutenants.	17
<i>Time Study Sheet of the Existing (or Automated) Reporting System.</i> Determines the amount of time spent by officers, supervisors and records clerks during each function of writing an existing or automated preliminary investigation report system.	22
<i>Evaluation of the Automated PIR System.</i> Officer evaluations of the existing or automated preliminary investigation report system.	30
<i>Evaluation of the Existing PIR System.</i> Officer evaluations of the existing or automated preliminary investigation report system.	31
<i>Los Angeles Police Department Hollywood Division Automated Reporting System Evaluation.</i> Officer and supervisor evaluations of automated reporting system use.	32
<i>Los Angeles Police Department Hollywood Detective Division Automated Reporting System Evaluation.</i> Detective evaluations of automated reporting system use.	38
<i>Los Angeles Police Department Preliminary Investigation Report (PIR).</i> Form used in field investigations.	41
<i>Automated Reporting System Project Evaluation of PIR Content Quality.</i> Detective and attorney ratings of automated PIRs.	42

Los Angeles Police Department

Crime Reporting System Study 1990

General Information Questionnaire

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
EMPLOYEE SURVEY

DATE: _____

INSTRUCTIONS

With the support of a federal research grant the LAPD is evaluating portions of its crime reporting system. The purpose of this research is to determine how the Preliminary Investigation Report (PIR) system can be improved. Your division has been selected to participate in this study and you are being asked to provide several kinds of information concerning your reactions to the police environment as you see it. No-one in the LAPD will be given access to your information in a raw form that will allow you to be identified as the source. Your responses to questions will be grouped with those of other division employees to provide an overall picture of various police job features that may be related to the reporting system in use.

Over the next few months you will be approached by researchers from California State University, Fullerton, to obtain various kinds of information related to this project. In order to allow them to match your responses across time, you will be asked to put your Serial Number on the data collection forms. This Serial Number will be used only for research purposes and it will never be disclosed with the information you provide. Because your anonymity and confidentiality are assured, be candid in responding to questions asked.

The attached questionnaire contains items intended to reflect a number of impressions you may have about your work, the LAPD, and the role you play in the division. You will also be asked to respond to questions about your feelings related to work. Be sure to answer every item even though some may appear similar to others in the questionnaire; this is necessary to remove as much measurement error as possible.

If you have any questions about the meaning of any of the items in the questionnaire, please ask the California State University employee who is administering this questionnaire. Work quickly; your first impression after reading the item is usually the most accurate indicator of your true feelings. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

If you have any questions concerning this study you may contact Dr. Tom Mayes at California State University, Fullerton, 714-773-2435.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
EMPLOYEE SURVEY

GENERAL INFORMATION

The following information is needed to allow coding of the questionnaire and to aid in data analysis. Circle the appropriate answer for each item.

1. What is your rank in the LAPD? Circle one:

- (6) Lieutenant
- (5) Sergeant
- (4) P.O. III + 1
- (3) P.O. III
- (2) P.O. II
- (1) P.O. I

Rank A1

2. What is your assignment? Circle one:

- (1) Watch Commander
- (2) Assistant Watch Commander
- (3) Field Supervisor
- (4) A-Car
- (5) X-Car
- (6) Storm
- (7) U-Car
- (8) Desk Officer

ASGMTA2

3. What watch do you currently work?

- (1) AM's
- (2) Mid-Days
- (3) Days
- (4) PM's
- (5) Mid-PM's

WATCHA

4. What is your sex? Circle one:

- (1) Male
- (2) Female

SEXA4

5. What is your age? _____ *AGEA5*

6. How long have you been in your current assignment?

JOBYR SA6 Years, *JOBMOSA6* Months

7. How long have you been working for LAPD?

ORGYR SA7 Years, *ORMOSA7* Months

8. How many years of formal education have you completed? Please circle the appropriate number below:

EDUCA8

- 12 High School
- 13 14 15 16 College
- 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Graduate/Professional

9. What is your division? Circle one:

- (1) Hollywood
- (2) Wilshire

DIVA9

10. What is your Serial Number ? _____

SN

Your Serial Number will only be used by the research team at California State University, Fullerton, to match your responses to other questionnaires. By contract, no one in the LAPD will see your answers.

YOUR PRESENT JOB

Think about the type of work you do in your job in the LAPD.

Circle the number that best applies, using the scale below the item.

11. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the type of job you now have, what would you decide?

Decide Without
Hesitation To
Take the Same
Type of Job
1

Have Some
Second
Thoughts
2

Decide Definitely
Not to Take
This Type of Job
3

12. If you were free right now to go into any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be?

Take the Same
Type of Job
As Now Have
1

Take A
Different
Type of Job
2

Not Want
To Work
3

13. If a friend of yours told you he was interested in working in a job like yours, what would you tell him?

Strongly
Recommend it
1

Have Doubts About
Recommending it
2

Advise Him
Against it
3

14. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?

Very Satisfied
1

Somewhat Satisfied
2

Not Too Satisfied
3

Not at All Satisfied
4

JOB DEMANDS

Conflicts can occur in any job. For example, someone may ask you to do your work in a way which is different from what you think is best or you may find that it is difficult to satisfy everyone. How often do you face problems in your work like the ones listed below? Mark your answer by circling a number next to each item, based on the scale below.

- 1 = Rarely or Never
 2 = Sometimes
 3 = Fairly Often
 4 = Very Often

- | <u>R</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>V</u> | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 15. Persons equal to you in rank and authority ask you to do things which conflict. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 16. People in a good position to see if you do what they ask give you things to do which conflict with one another. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 17. People whose requests should be met give you things to do which conflict with other work you have to do. |

FEELINGS AT WORK

Here are some items about how you may feel. When you think about yourself and your job overall, how much of the time do you feel this way?

Using the following scale, circle the appropriate number to the left of each item.

- 1 = Never or a Little of the Time
 2 = Some of the Time
 3 = A Good Part of the Time
 4 = Most of the Time

- | <u>N</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>M</u> | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 18. I feel sad. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 19. I feel unhappy. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20. I feel good. |
| | 2 | 3 | 4 | 21. I feel depressed. |
| - | 2 | 3 | 4 | 22. I feel blue. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 23. I feel cheerful. |

- 1 = Never or a Little of the Time
 2 = Some of the Time
 3 = A Good Part of the Time
 4 = Most of the Time

- | <u>N</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>M</u> | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25. I feel jittery. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 26. I feel calm. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 27. I feel fidgety. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 28. I get angry. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 29. I get aggravated. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 30. I get irritated or annoyed. |

WORK ACTIVITIES

The next few items are concerned with various aspects of your work activities. Indicate how much of each aspect you have on your job based on the following scale.

How much of each aspect do you find on your job?

- 1 = Hardly Any
 2 = A Little
 3 = Some
 4 = A Lot
 5 = A Great Deal

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>HA</u> | <u>AL</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>L</u> | <u>GD</u> | |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 31. How much slowdown in the pace of work do you experience? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 32. How much time do you have to think and contemplate? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 33. How much workload do you have? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 34. What quantity of work do others expect you do? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 35. How much time do you have to do all your work? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 36. How many projects, assignments, or tasks do you have? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 37. How many lulls between heavy workload periods do you have? |

DESCRIBING YOURSELF

Listed below are a number of statements about what people might feel about themselves and other aspects of life. Mark each item based on the following scale.

How much do you agree with each statement?

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
 2 = Disagree
 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
 4 = Agree
 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each item.

<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>	
1	2	3	4	5	38. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
1	2	3	4	5	39. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
1	2	3	4	5	40. I certainly feel useless at times.
1	2	3	4	5	41. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
1	2	3	4	5	42. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
1	2	3	4	5	43. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
1	2	3	4	5	44. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
1	2	3	4	5	45. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
1	2	3	4	5	46. At times I think I am no good at all.
1	2	3	4	5	47. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

THOUGHTS ABOUT COMPUTERS

Use the following scale to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Work quickly, but be sure to consider each item individually.

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle one for each statement:

<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>	
1	2	3	4	5	48. Computers can save people a lot of work.
1	2	3	4	5	49. It takes a good math background to learn to use a computer.
1	2	3	4	5	50. Computer languages are difficult to learn.
1	2	3	4	5	51. It takes a logical mind to learn to program computer.
1	2	3	4	5	52. You need to know how to use a computer to get a good job.
1	2	3	4	5	53. I would like to own a home computer.
1	2	3	4	5	54. Everyone will own a computer 5 years from now.
1	2	3	4	5	55. In the future, there will still be jobs that don't require computer skills.
1	2	3	4	5	56. Computers create new jobs for people.
1	2	3	4	5	57. The power in society will soon belong to people who know how to use computers.
1	2	3	4	5	58. Five years from now everyone will need to know how to operate a computer.

EXPERIENCES

The following items refer to things and experiences that may cause anxiety or apprehension. For each item, use the following scale to indicate how anxious (nervous) each one would make you at this point in your life. Work quickly but be sure to consider each item individually.

- 1 = Not at All
 2 = A Little
 3 = A Fair Amount
 4 = Much
 5 = Very Much

How much anxiety (nervousness) does the experience cause you?

Circle one number for each item.

- | <u>N</u> | <u>L</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>V</u> | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 59. Thinking about taking a class in a computer language (e.g. BASIC, Pascal, COBOL, etc.). |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 60. Being around people who are "into" computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 61. Applying for a job that requires some computer training. |
| | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 62. Sitting in front of a home computer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 63. Watching a movie about an intelligent computer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 64. Looking at a computer printout. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 65. Getting "error" messages from the computer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 66. Using a typewriter. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 67. Visiting a computer store. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 68. Being refused information because the "computer is down". |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 69. Learning to write computer programs. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 70. Talking to a computer programmer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 71. Erasing or deleting material from a computer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 72. Taking a class about the uses of computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 73. Watching or listening to news programs about the increasing role of computers in society. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 74. Learning computer terminology. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 75. Attending a workshop on the uses of computers. |

- 1 = Not at All
 2 = A Little
 3 = A Fair Amount
 4 = Much
 5 = Very Much

How much anxiety (nervousness) does the experience cause you?

Circle one number for each item.

- | <u>N</u> | <u>L</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>V</u> | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 76. Watching someone working at a computer terminal. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 77. Thinking about prepackaged (software packages) programs for a computer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 78. Looking at a high speed computer printer. |

PERSONAL INFLUENCE

The next series of questions asks how much influence you now have in each of several areas. By influence we mean the degree to which you control what is done by others at work and have freedom to determine what you do yourself at work. Use this scale:

- 1 = Very Little
 2 = Little
 3 = A Moderate Amount
 4 = Much
 5 = Very Much

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>VL</u> | <u>L</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>VM</u> | |
|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 79. How much influence do you have over the variety of tasks you perform? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 80. How much influence do you have over the availability of tools and equipment you need to do your work? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 81. How much influence do you have over the order in which you perform tasks at work? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 82. How much influence do you have over the amount of work you do? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 83. How much influence do you have over the <u>pace</u> of your work, that is, how fast or slow you work? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 84. How much influence do you have over the quality of the work you do? |

- 1 = Very Little
 2 = Little
 3 = A Moderate Amount
 4 = Much
 5 = Very Much

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>VL</u> | <u>L</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>VM</u> | |
|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 85. How much influence do you have over the arrangement of your work area? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 86. How much influence do you have over the decisions concerning which individuals in your work unit do which tasks? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 87. How much influence do you have over the hours or schedule that you work? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 88. How much influence do you have over the decisions as to when things will be done in your work unit? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 89. How much do you influence the policies, procedures, and performance in your unit? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 90. How much influence do you have over the availability of materials you need to do your work? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91. How much influence do you have over the training of other workers in your unit? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 92. How much influence do you have over the arrangement of desks and other work equipment in your unit? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 93. To what extent can you do your work ahead and take a short rest break during work hours? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 94. In general how much influence do you have over work and work-related factors? |

ROLE ISSUES

These questions deal with different aspects of work. Indicate how often these aspects appear in your job, using this scale:

- 1 = Hardly, Rarely
 2 = Occasionally
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Fairly Often
 5 = Very Often

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>H</u> | <u>O</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>V</u> | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 95. How often are you clear on what your job responsibilities are? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 96. How often can you predict what others will expect of you on the job? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 97. How much of the time are your work objectives well defined? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 98. How often are you clear about what others expect of you on the job? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99. How often does your job let you use the skills and knowledge you learned in school? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 100. How often are you given a chance to do the things you do best? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 101. How often can you use skills from your previous experience and training? |

DESCRIBE YOUR SUPERVISOR

Instructions: For each item select the answer that best describes your supervisor's behavior. Mark your answers based on this scale:

- 1 = Never (Not at all)
 2 = Seldom (To a limited extent)
 3 = Sometimes (To a moderate extent)
 4 = Usually (To a considerable extent)
 5 = Always (To a very great extent)
 N/A = Don't know or not applicable

Circle a number next to each item.

<u>N</u>	<u>Se</u>	<u>So</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	102.	My supervisor ^{LDR PERFA} emphasizes the importance of achieving a high level of performance.
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	103.	My supervisor is friendly and easy to approach. LDR CONSA
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	104.	My supervisor consults with subordinates before making major decisions. LDR DECA
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	105.	My supervisor lets subordinates know what is expected of them. LDR ROLA
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	106.	My supervisor sets clear and specific performance goals for subordinates. LDR GOA
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	107.	My supervisor encourages subordinates to do high quality work.
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	108.	My supervisor is sympathetic and supportive when a subordinate is upset about something.
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	109.	My supervisor asks subordinates for their opinions and advice before making an important decision.
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	110.	My supervisor clarifies and explains the rules, policies, and standard procedures that subordinates are supposed to observe.
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	111.	My supervisor meets with individual subordinates to jointly establish goals and objectives for each important aspect of the subordinate's job.
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	112.	My supervisor pushes for increased productivity and efficiency.
1	2	3	4	5	N/A	113.	My supervisor makes subordinates feel at ease when talking with them.

- 1 = Never (Not at all)
 2 = Seldom (To a limited extent)
 3 = Sometimes (To a moderate extent)
 4 = Usually (To a considerable extent)
 5 = Always (To a very great extent)
 N/A = Don't know or not applicable

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>N</u> | <u>Se</u> | <u>So</u> | <u>U</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 114. My supervisor allows subordinates to participate in making work-related decisions. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 115. My supervisor explains each subordinate's duties and job responsibilities. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 116. My supervisor sets performance goals that are challenging but attainable. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 117. My supervisor tries to keep subordinates working at their maximum level of performance. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 118. My supervisor shows consideration for the needs and feelings of subordinates. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 119. My supervisor allows subordinates to have substantial influence in the making of decisions. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 120. My supervisor tells subordinates his/her priorities regarding which tasks, duties, and objectives are most important. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 121. My supervisor tries to establish mutually acceptable performance goals with each subordinate. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 122. My supervisor checks closely on the performance of subordinates to see if it is adequate. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 123. My supervisor tries to be fair and objective in the way she/he treats subordinates. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 124. My supervisor follows the advice of subordinates when making decisions about work assignments and procedures. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 125. My supervisor checks to see if subordinates understand what they are expected to do. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 126. My supervisor tries to measure how much progress is made by subordinates toward the attainment of their performance goals. |

- 1 = Never (Not at all)
 2 = Seldom (To a limited extent)
 3 = Sometimes (To a moderate extent)
 4 = Usually (To a considerable extent)
 5 = Always (To a very great extent)
 N/A = Don't know or not applicable

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>N</u> | <u>Se</u> | <u>So</u> | <u>U</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 127. | My supervisor tries to eliminate unnecessary costs and wasted resources in my work unit. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 128. | My supervisor shows a personal interest in the welfare of subordinates. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 129. | My supervisor gets subordinate approval on important matters before going ahead. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 130. | My supervisor makes sure subordinates agree with him/her about work duties and responsibilities. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | 131. | My supervisor provides subordinates with feedback about how well they are performing each aspect of their jobs. |

FEELINGS ABOUT THE LAPD

Below are statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about their work organization. Regarding your own feelings about the LAPD, indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Use the following scale:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
 2 = Moderately Disagree
 3 = Slightly Disagree
 4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
 5 = Slightly Agree
 6 = Moderately Agree
 7 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>StD</u> | <u>MD</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>SA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>StA</u> | |
|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 132. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the LAPD be successful. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 133. I talk up the LAPD to my friends as a great organization to work for. |

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
 2 = Moderately Disagree
 3 = Slightly Disagree
 4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
 5 = Slightly Agree
 6 = Moderately Agree
 7 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each item.

- | <u>StD</u> | <u>MD</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>SA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>StA</u> | |
|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 134. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for the LAPD. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 135. I find that my values and the LAPD's values are very similar. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 136. I am proud to tell others that I am part of the LAPD. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 137. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work were similar. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 138. The LAPD really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 139. Often, I find it difficult to agree with the LAPD's policies on important matters relating to its employees. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 140. I really care about the fate of the LAPD. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 141. I feel very little loyalty to the LAPD. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 142. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave the LAPD. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 143. I am extremely glad that I chose the LAPD to work for, over other organizations I was considering at the time I joined. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 144. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with the LAPD indefinitely. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 145. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 146. Deciding to work for the LAPD was a definite mistake on my part. |

THIS IS THE END. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Los Angeles Police Department

Crime Reporting System Study 1990

Supervisor Questionnaire

LAPD Crime Reporting System Study

Introduction and Instructions for Supervisors

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the PIR reporting system. Of interest is the relationship between the reporting system and job performance.

This questionnaire asks you to evaluate each of your subordinates in terms of several aspects of the job. This is strictly a research undertaking and the identity of the respondents will remain anonymous. The questionnaire should be answered during normal duty hours. This booklet contains ten (10) sets of rating forms separated by colored paper. Use one set for each of your subordinates. Be sure to write your serial number and your subordinate's serial number on the first page of each rating.

Since the statistical relationship which will be analyzed hinges on your assessment of your subordinate's performance, be sure to consider your answers carefully. Complete the questionnaire(s) based on your knowledge of the subordinate. There should be no need for you to research records such as the employee's Official Personal Folder.

Do not feel constrained by past official performance evaluations in answering the questionnaire. In this study, the rating you assign will not be reviewed in the same light as those on a performance evaluation. Since this is a research undertaking, the ratings will have no impact on the employee(s) involved, nor will the employee see your ratings.

Please complete the questionnaires and mail the whole booklet within ten days of receipt to:

Dr. Tom Mayes
Department of Management
School of Business Administration & Economics
California State University, Fullerton
Fullerton, CA 92634
714-773-2435

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

JOB PERFORMANCE RATING
(RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY)

Supervisor's Serial # SUPSN 3A

Date _____

Subordinate's Serial # _____
(Person being rated)

Division DIV 3A

Subordinate's Rank RANK 3A

Serial Numbers will only be used by the research team at California State University, Fullerton, to match your responses to other questionnaires. By contract, no one in the LAPD will see the information you provide.

1. How long have you been the supervisor for the individual you are rating?

LENGTH

- a. less than one year
- b. at least one year but not more than three years
- c. at least three years but not more than five years
- d. at least five years but not more than ten years
- e. more than ten years

2. Which of the following expressions best describes your assessment of the level of initiative exhibited by this employee?

INITIA

- a. excellent
- b. very good
- c. good
- d. acceptable
- e. need for some improvement
- f. need for substantial improvement
- g. unacceptable

3. How would you describe the work efforts of this employee?

EFFORTA

- a. excellent
- b. very good
- c. good
- d. acceptable
- e. need for some improvement
- f. need for substantial improvement
- g. unacceptable

4. Which of the following expressions best describes your assessment of the depth of this individual's job knowledge?

KNOWA

- a. excellent
- b. very good
- c. good
- d. acceptable
- e. need for some improvement
- f. need for substantial improvement
- g. unacceptable

5. How would you describe the quality of this individual's work?

QUALA

- a. excellent
- b. very good
- c. good
- d. acceptable
- e. need for some improvement
- f. need for substantial improvement
- g. unacceptable

6. How would you describe the oral communication skills of the employee?

ORALA

- a. excellent
- b. very good
- c. good
- d. acceptable
- e. need for some improvement
- f. need for substantial improvement
- g. unacceptable

7. How would you describe the written communication skills of this individual?

WRITEA

- a. excellent
- b. very good
- c. good
- d. acceptable
- e. need for some improvement
- f. need for substantial improvement
- g. unacceptable

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
TIME STUDY OF THE AUTOMATED PIR REPORTING SYSTEM

OFFICER'S FUNCTIONS AND FORM COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSES OF STUDY: To determine the amount of time spent by officers during each function of writing an automated PIR.

OFFICER'S FUNCTIONS

- A. **INVESTIGATION TIME:** Time used to interview the person reporting (PR) and other involved persons, collect crime information and evidence (if any), and take notes. Investigation time begins at the time information is first obtained from any involved person, and stops when writing on the PIR begins.
- B. **WRITING AND EDITING TIME:** The time used to acutally enter all information on the laptop computer regarding a PIR. This includes any time needed to refer to guides such as the Department Manual, Report Writing, Reporting District Code Book, Notebook Dividers, etc..
- C. **TRAVEL TIME:** Travel time to the station or to a meeting with a supervisor in the field for the sole purpose of report writing, approval, or corrections (does not apply to STORM, or desk).
- D. **APPROVAL AND CORRECTION TIME:** The time used to get approval from a supervisor and make corrections if automated report is kicked back. This time block starts at the moment an officer turns in a report to a supervisor and stops when an officer completes correcting errors.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FORM COMPLETION

- 1. Record the start and stop time while you are completing the PIR. Do not wait, as you may not remember the exact time. (Note: Only two start and stop times can be entered. Therefore, if you are interrupted more than once you must consolidate the time spent after the first interruption into the 24nd block).
- 2. If investigation and writing the PIR occur at the same time, fill out B ONLY, plus C and D if required.
- 3. Do NOT write in shaded areas of the form.
- 4. Complete the OFFICERS block ONLY.
- 5. Use the twenty-four hour clock (military time) for start/stop. State time in ONE MINUTE INCREMENTS.
- 6. Write in victim's last name, and crime title.
- 7. Write in the computer report number. (i.e. 00038)
- 8. Write any comments on the back of the form.
- 9. Place the form in the assistant watch commander's in box loading the PIR to the station system.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
TIME STUDY OF THE AUTOMATED PIR REPORTING SYSTEM

SUPERVISOR'S FUNCTIONS AND FORM COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE OF STUDY: To determine the amount of time spent by supervisors reviewing and approving automated PIRs. (Including time spent making any corrections.)

SUPERVISOR'S FUNCTIONS

REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIME: The time required to review and approve an automated PIR. It is recognized that supervisors review reports of varying complexity and length, completed by officers with varying experience, therefore they cannot control the time necessary for review. This time also includes corrections made by a supervisor, time for notifying the officer, and explaining any corrections to be made or other concerns regarding the report.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FORM COMPLETION

1. Record the start and stop time while reviewing the PIR (Note: Only two start and stop times can be entered. Therefore, if you are interrupted more than once you must consolidate the time spent after the first interruption into the 2nd block.)
2. Do NOT write in shaded areas.
3. Complete the SUPERVISORS block ONLY.
4. Use the twenty-four hour clock (military time) for start/stop. State time in ONE MINUTE INCREMENTS.
5. Note the types of errors and record the number of each type in the blank spaces provided (missing entry, inaccurate entry, incomplete entry, unreadable/illegible entry, spelling errors).
6. Write any comments on the back of the form.
7. Attach the form to the printout of the PIR and turn both in to records (Out basket).

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
TIME STUDY OF THE AUTOMATED PIR REPORT SYSTEM

RECORDS UNIT FUNCTIONS AND FORM COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE OF STUDY: To determine the amount of time spent by records personnel during each PIR processing function.

RECORDS PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

- A. **DATA INPUT TIME:** The time to input data into all necessary fields, look up MO and other codes in the PACMIS code book, write DR #, message #, (✓) on the original PIR, and verification of data input.
- B. **CORRECTION TIME:** The time to get PIRs corrected. This includes time by records personnel to locate the supervisor to get the report corrected.
- C. **PHOTOCOPY AND DISTRIBUTION TIME:** The time it takes to photocopy PIRs and distribute copies to various entities. This includes time for checking the PIR Distribution Guide, stamping and initialing the back of the records file copy, stamping the front of the PIR to indicate RECORDS COPY, and placing this copy in a file box.
- D. **FILING TIME:** The time it takes to file area records copies, including the completion of the folders themselves.
- E. **PACMIS REVERIFICATION TIME:** The time it takes to retrieve a PIR from the area file, audit the PIR data against PACMIS data, and time to correct any errors discovered.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FORM COMPLETION

- 1. Write the DR # of the PIR in the DR # box in the top right corner of the form and complete the RECORDS UNIT block.
- 2. Do NOT write in shaded areas.
- 3. Record the start and stop times while performing each function. (Note: Only two start and stop times can be entered. Therefore, if you are interrupted more than once you must consolidate the time spent after the first interruption into the 2nd block).
- 4. Use the twenty-four hour clock only (military time) for start/stop. State time in ONE MINUTE INCREMENTS.
- 5. Check the types of errors and record the number of each error type in the spaces provided (Missing entry, Incorrect Code, Incomplete, Other).
- 6. Record the number of copies you made.
- 7. Write any comments on the back of the form.
- 8. Place the form and a Xerox copy of the automated report in a box the Automated Reporting System Task Force.

TIME STUDY SHEET OF THE AUTOMATED PIR REPORTING SYSTEM

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT, HOLLYWOOD DIVISION

DR #:

PLEASE WRITE YOUR COMMENTS, IF ANY, ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

COMPUTER REPORT #

VICTIM LAST NAME:

CRIME TITLE:

CIRCLE DETAIL: PATROL U-CAR STORM ^{DETAILA} DESK

SERIAL #: SN

OFFICER FUNCTIONS

START

STOP

FOR ARSIF ONLY

WATCH: WATCHA

A. INVESTIGATION TIME

DATE:

B. WRITING AND EDITING TIME

C. TRAVEL TIME

D. APPROVAL AND CORRECTION TIME

OFFICERS

SUPERVISOR FUNCTION

START

STOP

FOR ARSIF ONLY

SERIAL #: SWPSNA

REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIME

WATCH: SWPNTCHA

DATE:

ERRORS IN THE PIR? NO YES (Circle)

OF ERRORS BY TYPE: (Put numbers in spaces)

- Missing Entry (Field left blank)
- Inaccurate Entry (Wrong#, code, name, c)
- Incomplete Entry (Some elements missing)
- Unreadable/Illegible Entry
- Spelling Errors

OF CORRECTIONS YOU MADE -----

SUPERVISORS

RECORDS FUNCTIONS

START

STOP

FOR ARSIF ONLY

SERIAL #:

A. DATA INPUT TIME

WATCH:

B. CORRECTION TIME

DATE:

C. PHOTOCOPY AND DISTRIBUTION TIME

NUMBER OF COPIES MADE FOR DISTRIBUTION AND STORAGE:

D. FILING TIME

E. PACMIS REVERIFICATION TIME

RECORDS UNIT

ERRORS IN PACMIS DATA DURING REVERIFICATION? NO YES (Circle)

NUMBER & TYPE: (Put # in blank)

- Missing Entry
- Incorrect Code
- Incomplete (Some element (s) missing)
- Other

NUMBER OF ERRORS -----

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
TIME STUDY OF THE EXISTING PIR REPORTING SYSTEM

OFFICER'S FUNCTIONS AND FORM COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE OF STUDY: To determine the amount of time spent by officers during each function of writing the PIR.

OFFICER'S FUNCTIONS

- A. **INVESTIGATION TIME:** Time used to interview the person reporting (PR) and other involved persons, collect crime information and evidence (if any), and take notes. Investigation time begins at the time information is first obtained from any involved person, and stops when writing on the PIR begins.
- B. **WRITING AND EDITING TIME:** The time used to actually write down all information on the PIR. This includes any time needed to refer to guides such as the Department Manual, Report Writing Manual, Reporting District Code Book, Notebook Dividers, etc..
- C. **TRAVEL TIME:** Travel time to the station or to a meeting with a supervisor in the field for the sole purpose of report writing, approval, or corrections (does not apply to STORM, or desk).
- D. **APPROVAL AND CORRECTION TIME:** The time used to get approval from a supervisor and make corrections if report is kicked back. This time block starts at the moment an officer turns in a report to a supervisor and stops when an officer completes correcting errors.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FORM COMPLETION

1. Record the start and stop time while you are completing the PIR. Do not wait, as you may not remember the exact time. (Note: Only two start and stop times can be entered. Therefore, if you are interrupted more than once you must consolidate the time spent after the first interruption into the 2nd block).
2. If investigation and writing the PIR occur at the same time, fill out B ONLY, plus C and D if required.
3. Do NOT write in shaded areas of the form.
4. Complete the OFFICERS block ONLY.
5. Use the twenty-four hour clock (military time) for start/stop. State time in ONE MINUTE INCREMENTS.
6. Write any comments on the back of the form.
7. Attach form to PIR and turn both in to a supervisor upon completion.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
TIME STUDY OF THE EXISTING PIR REPORTING SYSTEM

SUPERVISOR'S FUNCTIONS AND FORM COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE OF STUDY: To determine the amount of time spent by supervisors reviewing and approving PIRs. (This includes time spent making any corrections.)

SUPERVISOR'S FUNCTIONS

REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIME: The time required to review and approve a PIR. It is recognized that supervisors review reports of varying complexity and length, completed by officers with varying experience, therefore they cannot control the time necessary for review. This time also includes corrections made by a supervisor, time for notifying the officer, and explaining any corrections to be made or other concerns regarding the report.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FORM COMPLETION

1. Record the start and stop time while reviewing the PIR (Note: Only two start and stop times can be entered. Therefore, if you are interrupted more than once you must consolidate the time spent after the first interruption into the 2nd block.)
2. Do NOT write in shaded areas.
3. Complete the SUPERVISORS block ONLY.
4. Use the twenty-four hour clock (military time) for start/stop.
State time in ONE MINUTE INCREMENTS.
5. Note the types of errors and record the number of each type in the blank spaces provided (missing entry, inaccurate entry, incomplete entry, unreadable/illegible entry, spelling errors).
6. Write any comments on the back of the form.
7. Attach form to PIR and turn both in to records (Out basket).

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
TIME STUDY OF THE EXISTING PIR REPORT SYSTEM

RECORDS UNIT FUNCTIONS AND FORM COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE OF STUDY: To determine the amount of time spent by records personnel during each PIR processing function.

RECORDS PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

- A. DATA INPUT TIME: The time to input data into all necessary fields, look up MO and other codes in the PACMIS code book, write DR #, message #, (✓) on the original PIR, and verification of data input.
- B. CORRECTION TIME: The time to get PIRs corrected. This includes time by records personnel to locate the supervisor to get the report corrected.
- C. PHOTOCOPY AND DISTRIBUTION TIME: The time it takes to photocopy PIRs and distribute copies to various entities. This includes time for checking the PIR Distribution Guide, stamping and initialing the back of the records file copy, stamping the front of the PIR to indicate RECORDS COPY, and placing this copy in a file box.
- D. FILING TIME: The time it takes to file area records copies, including the completion of the folders themselves.
- E. PACMIS REVERIFICATION TIME: The time it takes to retrieve a PIR from the area file, audit the PIR data against PACMIS data, and time to correct any errors discovered.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FORM COMPLETION

1. Write the DR# of the PIR in the DR # box in the top right corner of the form and complete the RECORDS UNIT block.
2. Do NOT write in shaded areas.
3. Record the start and stop times while performing each function. (Note: Only two start and stop times can be entered. Therefore, if you are interrupted more than once you must consolidate the time spent after the first interruption into the 2nd block).
4. Use the twenty-four hour clock only (military time) for start/stop. State time in ONE MINUTE INCREMENTS.
5. Check the types of errors and record the number of each error type in the spaces provided (Missing entry, Incorrect Code, Incomplete, Other).
6. Record the number of copies you made.
7. Write any comments on the back of the form.

TIME STUDY SHEET OF THE EXISTING PIR REPORTING SYSTEM

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT, WILSHIRE DIVISION

DR #:

PLEASE WRITE YOUR COMMENTS, IF ANY, ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

	CIRCLE DETAIL: PATROL	U-CAR	STORM	DESK	
OFFICERS	OFFICER FUNCTIONS	START	STOP	FOR ARSIF	
	A. INVESTIGATION TIME				SERIAL #:
	B. WRITING AND EDITING TIME				WATCH:
	C. TRAVEL TIME				DATE:
	D. APPROVAL AND CORRECTION TIME				

	SUPERVISOR FUNCTION	START	STOP	FOR ARSIF ONLY	
SUPERVISORS	REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIME				SERIAL #:
					WATCH:
					DATE:
ERRORS IN THE PIR? NO YES # OF ERRORS BY TYPE:					
(Circle)		(Put numbers in spaces) --- Missing Entry (Field left blank)			
		--- Inaccurate Entry (Wrong#, code, name,			
		--- Incomplete Entry (Some elements missin			
		--- Unreadable/Illegible Entry			
		--- Spelling Errors			
# OF CORRECTIONS YOU MADE _____					

	RECORDS FUNCTIONS	START	STOP	FOR ARSIF ONLY	
RECORDS UNIT	A. DATA INPUT TIME				SERIAL #:
	B. CORRECTION TIME				WATCH:
	C. PHOTOCOPY AND DISTRIBUTION TIME				DATE:
	D. FILING TIME				NUMBER OF COPIES MADE FOR DISTRIBUTION AND STORAGE: _____
	E. PACMIS REVERIFICATION TIME				
ERRORS IN PACMIS DATA DURING REVERIFICATION? NO YES		NUMBER & TYPE :			
(Circle)		(Put # in blank) --- Missing Entry			
		--- Incorrect Code			
		--- Incomplete (Some element (s) missing)			
		--- Other			
NUMBER OF ERRORS _____					

EVALUATION OF THE AUTOMATED PIR
SYSTEM

Serial# _____
Division _____
Date _____

Your Serial Number will only be used by the research team at California State University, Fullerton, to match your responses to other questionnaires. By law and contract, no one in the LAPD will see your survey.

Think back on the reports you have written with the laptop computer during this PIR collection period. Circle a number next to each question to indicate your opinion of the automated PIR reporting system.

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. How <u>easy</u> was the system to use? | Very
easy
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Very
diffi-
cult | |
| 2. How much frustration or irri-
tation did the system cause you? | None
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | A great
deal | |
| 3. How much productive time was
lost dealing with reporting
system problems? | None
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | A great
deal | |
| 4. How error prone is this
reporting system? | Not at
all
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Very
much | |
| 5. How easy is it to make
corrections to reports
written with this system? | Very
hard
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Very
easy | |
| 6. How much did this system
<u>help</u> or <u>hurt</u> your job
performance? | Hurt
a lot
1 | 2 | 3 | No
effect
4 | 5 | 6 | Helped
a lot
7 |
| 7. Overall, how satisfied are you
with this crime reporting system? | Very
dissatis-
fied
1 | 2 | 3 | Neu-
tral
4 | 5 | 6 | Very
satis-
fied
7 |
| 8. What effect did this system
have on the quality of your
reports? | Hurt
a lot
1 | 2 | 3 | No
effect
4 | 5 | 6 | Helped
a lot
7 |
| 9. How many minutes each day do you usually spend writing
and correcting your PIR's? (Fill in the blank) | | | | | | | _____ Min./Day |

10. Report any problems you had with the automated PIR reporting system:

Check here and write your comments or suggestions on the reverse.

EVALUATION OF THE EXISTING PIR SYSTEM

Serial# _____
 Division _____
 Date _____

Your Serial Number will only be used by the research team at California State University, Fullerton, to match your responses to other questionnaires. By law and contract, no one in the LAPD will see your survey.

Think back on the reports you have written during this PIR collection period. Circle a number next to each question to indicate your opinion of the current PIR reporting system.

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|-----------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | Very easy | | | | | Very difficult | |
| 1. How <u>easy</u> was the system to use? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| <i>EASEA</i> | | | | | | | |
| | None | | | | | A great deal | |
| 2. How much frustration or irritation did the system cause you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| <i>FRUSTA</i> | | | | | | | |
| | None | | | | | A great deal | |
| 3. How much productive time was lost dealing with reporting system problems? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| <i>TIMELOSA</i> | | | | | | | |
| | Not at all | | | | | Very much | |
| 4. How error prone is this reporting system? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| <i>ERRORA</i> | | | | | | | |
| | Very hard | | | | | Very easy | |
| 5. How easy is it to make corrections to reports written with this system? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| <i>CRRCTA</i> | | | | | | | |
| | Hurt a lot | | | No effect | | Helped a lot | |
| 6. How much did this system <u>help</u> or <u>hurt</u> your job performance? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| <i>ALPHRTA</i> | | | | | | | |
| | Very dissatisfied | | | Neutral | | | Very satisfied |
| 7. Overall, how satisfied are you with this crime reporting system? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| <i>SATA</i> | | | | | | | |
| | Hurt a lot | | | No effect | | | Helped a lot |
| 8. What effect did this system have on the quality of your reports? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| <i>RPTQLA</i> | | | | | | | |

9. How many minutes each day do you usually spend writing and correcting your PIR's? (Fill in the blank) TIMEA Min./D

10. Report any problems you had with the PIR reporting system: COMMNTA

Check here and write your comments or suggestions on the reverse.

**Los Angeles Police Department
Hollywood Division**

**Crime Reporting System
Study
1990**

Automated Reporting System Evaluation

Serial # _____

Date _____

Hollywood Division

AUTOMATED REPORTING SYSTEM USE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your Serial Number will only be used by the research team at California State University, Fullerton, to match your responses to other questionnaires. By law and contract, no one in the LAPD will see your survey.

This questionnaire seeks several different kinds of information concerning the implementation of laptop computer technology in the Los Angeles Police Department. Since you were a daily user of such equipment, you are in a position to provide invaluable assistance by sharing the insights and experience you have acquired. Please give us your honest and candid judgment. Thank you.

Please read each statement carefully. Then decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement, and how strongly. Finally, circle the appropriate number next to the item based on this scale:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. The laptop computer is troublesome to carry around during the shift. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. The laptop computer's report format is suitable for my needs. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. I could type fairly well before we started using laptop computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. I didn't think hand-writing reports was much of a chore. |

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. If the Department wanted to discontinue the use of laptop computers and go back to hand-written reports, it would be OK with me. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. I am concerned about laptop computers being damaged or stolen. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Computer-entered reports take longer to correct than hand-written reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. I had problems transferring reports via <u>disk</u> from laptops to the station system. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9. Laptop computers have made it easier for me to produce a good report. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10. My typing is good enough to allow me to use the desktop and laptop computers easily. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11. I think a lot of my fellow officers would like to get rid of the laptop computers and just hand-write reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12. There have been instances when I have lost information because of a problem with my laptop computer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 13. My reports are returned to me for correction more often than before we used laptop computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 14. The screen on the laptop computer is easy to read. |

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
 2 = Disagree
 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
 4 = Agree
 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 15. Before we got laptop computers, I doubted whether they would be much of an improvement over writing reports by hand. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 16. It did not take me long to learn how to use laptop computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 17. If given a choice, I would write reports by hand. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 18. Telephone transfer of reports to the station system is easier than disk transfer. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 19. The laptop computer is more convenient to carry than a notebook and reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 20. I had to invest a lot of effort in improving my typing skills in order to be able to use laptop computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 21. Other than the MDT or the NECS terminal, I had never used a computer before the laptops were issued during this pilot project. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 22. Having responsibility for such an expensive and delicate piece of equipment makes me uncomfortable. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 23. I produce a more complete report now than I did before we got laptop computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 24. The laptop computer's keyboard is awkward to use. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 25. A spell-check feature would make it easier for me to write my reports. |

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 26. The screen on the laptop computer is often difficult to read. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 27. Laptop computers have proven to be a reliable piece of equipment. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 28. Computer-entered reports are easier to correct than hand-written reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 29. It took me a long time to get used to using the laptop computer to write reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 30. I disliked having to write reports by hand. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 31. The scrolling fields were difficult to use. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 32. I received enough training in the use of the computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 33. I produce a longer narrative now than I did before we started using laptop computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 34. I have trouble using the laptop computer easily because I don't type fast. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 35. Most of the officers I know like having the laptop computers. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 36. It is difficult to find a place to store the computer in my patrol car. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 37. I received too much training in the use of the automated reporting system computers. |

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 38. The on-screen help features provide all the assistance I need to operate the laptop. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 39. I know that my handwriting is hard to read. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 40. I had some experience with computers before we started using laptop computers in this pilot project. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 41. I found the on-screen help features useful. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 42. The reports I produce on laptop computers are better organized than the ones I wrote by hand. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 43. Entering reports by computer saves me time. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 44. Computer files are easier to lose than paper documents. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 45. The laptop computers are not much of an improvement over writing our reports by hand. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 46. The laptop computer is awkward to use in the field. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 47. The pop-up windows are easy to use. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 48. Laptop computers are a gimmick or fad. They won't be around too long. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 49. I would support a department-wide automated reporting system. |

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 50. I would be comfortable using a computer generated report to testify in court. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 51. I often enter information directly into the laptop computer without taking notes. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 52. The Automated Reporting System Task Force provided adequate support and feedback throughout this pilot project. |

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS SHALL BE COMPLETED BY SUPERVISORS ONLY

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 53. Compared to hand-written reports the automated system reports were easier to review and approve. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 54. Automated system reports were <u>less</u> complete than hand-written reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 55. Automated system reports had fewer errors than hand-written reports. |

**Los Angeles Police Department
Hollywood Detective Division**

**Crime Reporting System
Study
1990**

Automated Reporting System Evaluation

Hollywood Detective Division

AUTOMATED REPORTING SYSTEM USE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your responses to this questionnaire will only be used by the research team at California State University, Fullerton, to evaluate the laptop computers recently used in the Hollywood Division. By law and contract, no one in the LAPD will see your survey.

This questionnaire seeks several different kinds of information concerning the implementation of laptop computer technology in the Los Angeles Police Department. Since you were a daily user of computer generated reports, you are in a position to provide invaluable assistance by sharing the insights and experience you have acquired. Please give us your honest and candid judgment. Thank you.

Please read each statement carefully. Then decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement, and how strongly. Finally, circle the appropriate number next to the item based on this scale:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. The laptop computer's report format is suitable for my needs. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. The automated system reports would be easier to use if the print was larger. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. A spell-check feature in the automated reporting system computers would improve the quality of reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. The automated reports I received during the pilot project did <u>not</u> improve my crime clearance and filing rate. |

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral or doesn't apply
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Circle a number next to each statement.

- | <u>SD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>SA</u> | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. If the Department wanted to discontinue the use of laptop computers and go back to hand-written reports, it would be OK with me. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. If all of my paperwork (including that sent to prosecutors) was automated, my crime clearance and filing rate would improve. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Reports generated by the automated system are an improvement over hand-written reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. I would support a department-wide automated reporting system. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9. I would be comfortable using a computer generated report to testify in court. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10. The Automated Reporting System Task Force provided adequate support and feedback throughout this pilot project. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11. Automated system reports were <u>less</u> complete than hand-written reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12. Automated system reports had fewer errors than hand-written reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 13. I find the automated system reports easier to read than hand-written reports. |
| 14. Report any problems you had with the automated PIR reporting system. | | | | | |

_____ Check here and write your comments or suggestions on the reverse.

Los Angeles Police Department
PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION of

COMBINO EVID. REPORT
 MULTIPLE DRG ON THIS REPORT

SHOTS FIRED

PRELIMINARY CASE SCREENING

- SUSPECT / VEHICLE NOT SEEN
- PRINTS OR OTHER EVIDENCE NOT PRESENT
- MO NOT DISTINCT
- PROPERTY LOSS LESS THAN \$5000
- NO SERIOUS INJURY TO VICTIM
- ONLY ONE VICTIM INVOLVED

VICTIM

LAST NAME, FIRST, MIDDLE (FIRM IF BUSINESS)		SEX	DESC	AGE	DOB
ADDRESS		ZIP		PHONE	
R -					
B -					
DR. LIC. NO. (IF NONE, OTHER ID & NO.)	FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN (IF APPLICABLE)	OCCUPATION			

USE OF FORCE

PREMISES (SPECIFIC TYPE)

ENTRY 459/BPV	POINT OF ENTRY	POINT OF EXIT	LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE	SAME AS V'S	<input type="checkbox"/> RES.	<input type="checkbox"/> BUS.	R.D.	PRINTS BY PREL. INV. ATTEMPT Y N	OBTAINED Y N	
<input type="checkbox"/> FRONT	METHOD	DATE & TIME OF OCCURRENCE	DATE & TIME REPORTED TO PD	TYPE PROPERTY STOLEN / LOST / DAMAGED			<input type="checkbox"/> 3.4 GIVEN	STOLEN / LOST	RECOVERED	EST. DAMAGED ARSON / VAND
<input type="checkbox"/> REAR							\$	\$	\$	
<input type="checkbox"/> SIDE	INSTRUMENT / TOOL									
<input type="checkbox"/> ROOF										
<input type="checkbox"/> FLOOR										
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER										

NARCOTICS STOLEN - MARC. DIV.

VICT'S VEH. (IF INVOLVED) - YEAR, MAKE, TYPE, COLOR, LIC. NO. NOTIFICATIONS (PERSON & DIVISION) CONNECTED REPORTS (TYPE & DR)

MO IF LONG FORM, LIST UNIQUE ACTIONS. IF SHORT FORM, DESCRIBE SUSPECT'S ACTIONS IN BRIEF PHRASES, INCLUDING WEAPON USED. DO NOT REPEAT ABOVE INFO. BUT CLARIFY REPORT AS NECESSARY. IF ANY OF THE MISSING ITEMS ARE POTENTIALLY IDENTIFIABLE, ITEMIZE AND DESCRIBE ALL ITEMS MISSING IN THIS INCIDENT IN THE NARRATIVE.

DSD (GAS) / CRASH

MOTIVATED BY HATRED / PREJUDICE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

REPORTING EMPLOYEE(S)	INITIALS, LAST NAME	SERIAL NO.	DIV. / DETAIL	PERSON REPORTING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SIGNATURE	OR RECEIVED BY PHONE <input type="checkbox"/>
NOTE: IF SHORT FORM AND VICTIM / PR ARE NOT THE SAME, ENTER PR INFORMATION IN INVOLVED PERSONS SECTION.						

FIREARM STOLEN / LOST - DHD & RB) CRIME / PROPERTY TT SPVR.

Complete below sections if any Preliminary Case Screening boxes are not checked.

SUSP'S VEHICLE	YEAR	MAKE	MODEL	TYPE	Interior	Exterior	Body	Windows
					COLOR:	1 CUSTOM WHEELS 2 PAINTED INSCRIPT. 3 LEVEL ALTERED 4 RUST / PRIMER 5 CUSTOM PAINT 6 VINYL TOP	1 DAMAGE 5 RIGHT 2 MODIFIED 6 FRONT 3 STICKER 7 REAR 4 LEFT	1 DAMAGE 5 RIGHT 2 CUST TINT 6 FRONT 3 CURTAINS 7 REAR 4 LEFT
COLOR (S)	VEH. LIC. NO.	STATE	1 BUCKET SEATS 2 DAMAGED INSIDE					

SEX	DESC.	HAIR	EYES	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	AGE	CLOTHING	NAME, ADDRESS, DOB, IF KNOWN; NAME, BKG. NO., CHARGE, IF ARRESTED.
-----	-------	------	------	--------	--------	-----	----------	--

S-1	PERSONAL ODDITIES (UNUSUAL FEATURES, SCARS, TATTOOS, ETC.)	Weapon (VERBAL THREATS, BODILY FORCE, SIMULATED GUN, ETC. IF KNIFE OR GUN, DESCRIBE FULLY)
-----	--	--

S-2		
-----	--	--

INVOLVED PERSONS

W - WITNESS R - PERSON RPTG. S - PERSON SECURING (459) D - PERSON DISCOVERING (459) P - PARENT
CP - CONTACT PERSON (DOMESTIC VIOLENCE)

NAME	SEX	DESC	DOB	ADDRESS	CITY	ZIP	PHONE
DR. LIC. NO. (IF NONE, LIST OTHER ID & NO.)	FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN (IF APPLICABLE)						

COMBINED EVID. RPT.	USE THIS SECTION IN LIEU OF PROPERTY REPORT IF NO GUN AND NO MORE THAN THREE ITEMS OF EVIDENCE	LOC. EVID. BKD.	10.10 GIVEN? Y N	Preliminary Drug Test	SUPV./INV. OFCR. TESTING	SER. NO.	WITNESS OFCR.	SER NO
ITEM	QUAN	ARTICLE	SERIAL NO./TYPE TEST OF DRUG	BRAND / DRUG WEIGHT, UNITS	MODEL NO./DRUG TEST RESULT	MISC.		

NARRATIVE 1) LIST ADDL SUSPS., & INVOLVED PERSONS. 2) RECONSTRUCT OCCURRENCE, INCL ALL ELEMENTS OF CORPUS DELECTI. 3) IF NOT USING EVID. CONTINUATION FORM, DESCRIBE EVIDENCE INCLUDE PRINTS, STATE LOCATION FOUND AND BY WHOM. GIVE DISPOSITION. 4) SUMMARIZE OTHER DETAILS, INCL WHEN & WHERE PERSONS WITH NO PHONE CAN BE LOCATED. 5) INDICATE TYPE OF TRANSLATOR NEEDED FOR ANY INVOLVED PERSON. 6) LIST ITEMS MISSING.

VICTIM INDEMNIFICATION INFORMATION (IF APPLICABLE)	IS ANY OF THE VICTIM'S PROPERTY MARKED WITH AN OWNER APPLIED IDENTIFICATION NUMBER? IF "YES" EXPLAIN IN NARRATIVE. YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---

APPROVAL AND REVIEW	SUPERVISOR APPROVING	SERIAL NO.	DETECTIVE SUPERVISOR REVIEWING	SERIAL NO.
	DATE & TIME REPRODUCED	CLERK	Category _____	

PIR Research Control # (Eg. 1A01)

BARC#

BADIV

Division
(Circle one)

1. Hollywood
2. Wilshire

Rater (Name)

~~BADIV~~ BARATER

Automated Reporting System Project
Evaluation of PIR Content Quality

The information you provide is strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. No one in the LAPD will see your ratings in a form that will allow you to be identified. Your name is being requested for data coding and analysis only.

RATING OF "BOX" ENTRIES

Number of Errors: BAMISS Missing Entry (Field left blank)
(Put numbers in spaces) BAINNA Inaccurate Entry
BAINCMP Incomplete Entry

RATING OF NARRATIVE

METHOD OF WRITING (Circle one number) 1. Hand-written form
2. Automated form

OBSERVATIONS: WHAT THE OFFICER SAW (Circle One Response)

N/A Not applicable for this case

- 1. Obvious omissions
- 2. Likely omissions
- 3. Observations reported are ambiguous or not fully described
- 4. Observations complete and fully described

ORGANIZATION AND WRITING STYLE (Circle One Response)

- 1. Not readable, hard to analyze
- 2. Readable, but failed to say who did what
- 3. States who did what, but is disorganized
- 4. States who did what, is organized, has spelling/grammar errors
- 5. Excellent content, organization, no errors

BAOBSERV

BASTYLE

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE (Circle One Response)

BAEVIDNC

N/A Not applicable for this case

1. Serious evidence problems
2. Minor evidence problems
3. No indication of evidence problems

COMPLETENESS OF GENERAL INVESTIGATION (Circle One Response)

BAINVSTG

1. No narrative
2. Some information provided
3. Most information needed is present
4. All information desired is present

STATEMENTS FROM VICTIMS, WITNESSES, SUSPECTS (Circle One response)

BA STMTS

1. No statements
2. Some parties contacted; no full statements
3. Some parties contacted; full statements
4. All parties contacted; no full statements
5. All parties contacted; some full statements
6. Full statements form all, or reasons why not

CORPUS (Circle One Response)

BA CORPUS

1. No crime stated
2. Some elements present but can't file
3. Crime other than one designated is supported
4. Complete listing of elements, no additions needed; full support for filing

Evaluation of PIR Content
LAPD ARS Project 1990

DESCRIPTION OF RATING FACTORS

OBSERVATIONS: WHAT THE OFFICER SAW

Personal observations at the scene of the crime should be included in the PIR to supplement witness statements. While specific to the crime being reported, observations might include:

Complete information on the medical condition of the victim (stitches, observable injuries, loss of consciousness, etc.)

Indications of drug or alcohol influence by victim or witnesses

for car thefts include observations of the car (smashed window, punched ignition, stereo missing, slide hammer on floorboard

ORGANIZATION AND WRITING STYLE

The narrative should have a logical flow from facts to supportable conclusions. Names of suspects, witnesses, officers should be used throughout to describe who did what in the incident. Examples of organization/style errors are:

Narrative is not legible

Presence of spelling or grammatical errors

Use of the passive voice ("The defendant was observed")

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

When physical evidence is obtained it must be reported in such a way that the chain of evidence is not threatened. Examples of desired features are:

If prints are taken state who took them

For physical evidence, where was it found? Who found it?
Who transmitted it? Who booked it?

COMPLETENESS OF GENERAL INVESTIGATION

There should be a minimal basic investigation conducted at the scene of the crime. There should be follow-up action taken in specific instances. Examples of this category are:

Specification of connection reports

Spelling out observations rather than simply writing conclusions

Verification of offered defenses (if at work, find out where the subject works, address, phone number, supervisor's name)

Look for items suggested by facts (Guns or knives mentioned by witness; where did the officer look? Who was asked about it?)

For suspect interviews indicate whether procedure was inside or outside Miranda constraints

STATEMENTS FROM VICTIMS, WITNESSES, SUSPECTS

This information should establish the identity and usual whereabouts of each party to a crime. Statements should be in such detail that crime elements can be identified or guidance is provided for additional investigation. Examples in this category are:

State the apparent motive for the crime

Where defendant makes a statement in conflict with the victim, include victim's response to this information

Interview each witness and provide a statement form each in the narrative

Include statements from all parties-victims, witnesses, suspects

CORPUS

The report must include sufficient information about the elements of a crime to allow correct classification of the offense. Some examples are:

The stated M.O. or narrative should be consistent with the crime classification used

Car burglaries should include whether the car was locked