

CR-sent
4-15-83

96449

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

96449

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Ohio Governor's Office of
Criminal Justice Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

STATE OF OHIO
Richard F. Celeste, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT
Alfred S. Dietzel, Director

Office of Criminal Justice Services
Statistical Analysis Center

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

96449

LAKE FARFAX
829-7625

May, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

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

LIST OF TABLES

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

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

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

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

COUNTY SHERIFFS' DEPARTMENTS	PATROL OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS
Butler	14	1
Franklin	48	1
Hamilton	40	5
Lorain	18	2
Lucas	21	3
Mahoning	13	1
Montgomery	28	3
Stark	9	2
Summit	8	1
TOTAL OFFICERS SURVEYED	199	19

PREFACE

This report has been prepared especially for sheriffs and administrative officers in Ohio's ten large sheriffs' departments, all of which serve county jurisdictions of over 250,000 people. It analyzes the responses of over two hundred officers from nine of those departments who participated in the state-wide task analysis study conducted in 1981-82 by the Office of Criminal Justice Services for the Ohio Peace Officer Training Council.* Because each of these officers responded to more than one thousand questions about their backgrounds, sources of information, equipment, types of investigation, tasks, and physical activities, there now exists a rich data base which sheriffs can use for decisions relating to hiring, training, planning--and especially in analyzing the propriety of departmental standards.

A total of 3,155 Ohio peace officers representing nearly 400 law enforcement agencies took part in this survey, the results of which are contained in a report issued in November, 1982. However, eight separate summaries (five for police jurisdictions, three for sheriffs' jurisdictions) like this one are also being published so that chief executive officers can see how their own departments compare with an aggregate profile of similarly-sized agencies throughout the State. It is hoped that this process will also allow mayors, city managers, county commissioners, and other local officials to see their law enforcement operations in better perspective.

Actually, the task analysis study is three studies in one. While the 199 "large county" deputies were responding to the survey in terms of frequency (of use or performance), 19 of their supervisors were responding to the same questions in terms of (1) the importance, and (2) the learning difficulty of those items. This, in effect, triples the amount of available information, and geometrically increases the ways in which that information can be studied. Not only can it be determined how frequently a task is performed, but that information can be further analyzed in light of its importance to the law enforcement function and the difficulty with which the task is learned.

Because of the tremendous amount of data generated by this study (over two hundred and sixty thousand pieces of information in the "large county" data base alone) no summary report can adequately capture all of the worthwhile data. This report, in fact, makes no attempt to do so. Rather, it is being published as a complement to the earlier state-wide report and as an indicator of the type and depth of the available data. To that end it is hoped that this brief report will arouse the interest of local law enforcement officials who will then make fuller use of the rich data base available through the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services.

* Cuyahoga County was excluded from the survey because those officers have only jail and civil processing duties.

OFFICER PROFILE

Of the 2,620 patrol officers who participated in the state-wide task analysis study, 199 were drawn from sheriff's departments in nine of Ohio's ten large counties.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON:
ACTUAL LAW ENFORCEMENT POPULATION
V.
SURVEY (RESPONSE) POPULATION

	% of Law Enforcement Population in Ohio	% of Population in Survey Response
MUNICIPALITIES.....	77.0%	77.3%
Largest City Police (over 100,000)	26.6%	28.6%
Large City Police (25,000-100,000)	16.2%	15.6%
Medium City Police (10,000-25,000)	14.1%	12.7%
Small City Police (2,500-10,000)	11.7%	13.1%
Smallest City Police (under-2,500)	8.4%	7.3%
COUNTIES.....	18.5%	17.2%
Large County Sheriffs (over 250,000)	9.2%	7.0%*
Medium County Sheriffs (100,000-250,000)	3.1%	3.8%
Small County Sheriffs (under 100,000)	6.2%	6.4%
SPECIAL AGENCIES.....	4.5%	4.9%
Private Police		.4%
Railroad Police		.8%
Jr./Sr. High School Security		.2%
College/University Police		1.5%
Dept. of Taxation		.1%
Port Authority Police		.1%
Special Constables		.1%
Park Rangers		1.1%
Mental Health Police		.8%
MISSING.....		.4%
TOTALS.....	100%	99.8%

* One large county sheriff's office, originally targeted for inclusion, was excluded after it was learned that those officers had only jail and civil processing duties.

While the task analysis study was aimed primarily at law enforcement duties, resources, physical activities, and other non-personal aspects of the job, a good deal of background information was also collected and is offered here as a basis for better understanding the people who perform the patrol function in Ohio's large counties. Wherever possible, these 199 officers will be compared to their peers throughout the remainder of the State.

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

TABLE 2

OFFICERS' RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS

	Large Sheriff Departments	Balance of State
White	93%	89%
Black	6%	9%
Other	1%	2%
Male	99%	93%
Female	1%	7%

In terms of age, 68% of the large county deputies were under the age of 35 compared to 82% of the officers across the balance of the state.

Among the officers' acquired characteristics, educational achievement was notable for several reasons. Primary among these is the fact that most of the "large county" patrol officers have achieved more academically than the high school diploma required to become a peace officer in Ohio. At the present time 58% of the "large county" deputies surveyed have completed at least one year of post high school education.

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

	PRIOR TO JOINING		PRESENT	
	Nine Large Counties	Balance of State	Nine Large Counties	Balance of State
Less Than High School	2%	2%	2%	2%
High School	51%	44%	41%	38%
1-2 Years of College	33%	36%	35%	38%
3-4 Years of College	14%	16%	19%	20%
4 + Years of College	1%	1%	4%	2%

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

Three personal questions relating to job attitudes were also asked. Specifically, these addressed job interest, use of talents and training preparedness. While not an exhaustive list, these three areas are fundamentally important influences upon officer morale. The responses of the 199 "large county" deputies are contained in Tables 4-6.

TABLE 4
"MY JOB IS..."

	Number	Percent
Very Dull	1	.5%
Dull	2	1.0%
So So	10	5.0%
Interesting	87	44.0%
Very Interesting	99	50.0%
	199	100.5%

TABLE 5
"MY JOB UTILIZES MY TALENT..."

	Number	Percent
Not at All	3	2%
Very Little	12	6%
Fairly Well	59	30%
Quite Well	83	42%
Very Well	42	21%
	199	101%*

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

	Number	Percent
Not at All	5	2%
Somewhat	88	44%
Well	88	44%
Very Well	18	9%
	199	99%*

Based on these questions, the "large county" deputy can be portrayed as one who is quite interested in law enforcement work, satisfied that the job constructively utilizes his or her personal talents and, though to a lesser extent, comfortable with the degree to which their training prepared them for the actual duties they are called upon to perform. The responses of the officers did not differ significantly from those of other peace officers throughout Ohio in these areas.

Somewhat surprisingly, a large number of these relatively young deputies had already gained some law enforcement experience prior to taking their present assignments. Close to one-third indicated prior experience as security guards, while others had served as military police officers, police reservists, and a variety of related jobs. Only slight differences exist when comparing these officers to their balance-of-state counterparts as illustrated in Table 7.

* Differences due to rounding

TABLE 7
PRIOR LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE

	Nine Large Counties	Balance of State
Deputy Sheriff	14%	12%
Military Police	18%	14%
Municipal Police	16%	21%
Police Reserve	27%	24%
Security Guard	32%	29%
Other	7%	6%

Several "agency" characteristics also were isolated in the survey data. Not surprisingly, the data revealed that the size of an agency's jurisdictional population will often dictate operational practices within those agencies. A notable example is the assignment of patrol officers to patrol vehicles. Table 8 reflects the differences that exist in vehicle patrol between the nine large counties and the balance of state.

TABLE 8
TYPE OF PATROL
BY
TYPE OF JURISDICTION

	Nine Large Counties	Balance of State
1-Person Vehicle	93.0%	61.0%
2-Person Vehicle	1.0%	24.0%
Motorcycle	1.0%	.2%
Foot	0.0%	.4%
Foot and Vehicle	0.0%	7.0%
Other	5.0%	7.0%

The great differences noted in the types of patrol utilized by various agencies can probably be accounted for by the demands of geography (especially for sheriffs' patrol officers), increased danger to the officers in some urban areas and, in at least some circumstances, union demands.

The 199 "large county" officers did differ markedly from their "balance of state" peers in terms of work shifts, as is displayed in Table 9 below.

TABLE 9
WORK SHIFT: "LARGE COUNTY" DEPUTIES

	Nine Large Counties	Balance of State
Day	26%	38%
Afternoon	36%	28%
Midnight	25%	24%
Split Shift	4%	2%
Odd Shift	5%	6%
Other	4%	2%

There was almost no difference between the two groups when responding to the question about the number of times patrol officers are called upon to perform tasks of a higher rank, as illustrated in Table 10.

TABLE 10

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

	Large Counties	Balance of State
Never	20%	20%
Seldom	36%	32%
Occasionally	30%	33%
Frequently	9%	9%
Very Frequently	5%	6%
	100%	100%

COMPLAINT/INCIDENT SECTION

The complaint/incident section of the task analysis survey queried Ohio's peace officers to determine which complaints and incidents officers typically encountered in the course of their daily activities. The questions also gleaned the ways in which these incidents are most frequently handled. The scale below represents the categories officers could choose from when recording their responses.

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

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

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF OFFICERS NEVER ENCOUNTERING...

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Never"
Curfew Violations	67%
Evictions	46%
False Fire Alarms	27%
Impersonating an Officer	46%
Motor Vehicle Hijacking	74%

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

TABLE 12

"LOG ONLY" RESPONSES FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Log Only"
Abandoned House	48%
Citizen Lockout	63%
Downed Wires	44%
Loud Party	46%
Perimeter Control at Fire	47%
Ruptured Water or Gas Line	32%

TABLE 13

"PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES
FOR SELECTED COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Preliminary Investigation Only"
Bad Check	60%
Credit Card Theft	60%
Motor Vehicle Theft	62%
Obscene Phone Call	55%
Robbery	59%

TABLE 14

"COMPLETE INVESTIGATION" RESPONSES
FOR COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS

Complaint/Incident	Percent of Deputies Responding "Complete Investigation"
Concealed Weapons	57%
Disorderly Public Conduct	71%
Drunk in Public	62%
Traffic Accident	74%
Traffic Offense	69%

EQUIPMENT

Experience dictates that various equipment items play a prominent role in the effective performance of an officer's duties. As such, the tables below report equipment items frequently and seldom used by deputies in the course of their work. It is worth noting that some items (i.e. shotgun, first aid kit, fire extinguisher), although infrequently used, are rated by supervisors as very important to the patrol function. Additionally, while some items reflect low importance or involve little learning difficulty, this may not actually be the case. The inclusion of a "never used" category in the importance and learning difficulty scales may have precluded a majority of supervisors from rating certain equipment items because they are never used.

TABLE 15

FREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS
(LARGE COUNTY)

	Percent of Deputies Using This Equipment Monthly Or More Often	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn to Operate
Automobile	99%	100%	84%
Body Armor	62%	84%	100%
Handcuffs	94%	95%	100%
Hand-Held Radio	96%	95%	100%
LEADS Terminal	67%	95%	16%
Spotlight	86%	84%	100%
Typewriter	67%	84%	32%

TABLE 16

INFREQUENTLY USED EQUIPMENT ITEMS
(LARGE COUNTY)

	Percent of Deputies Using This Equipment Monthly or More Often	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Equipment As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn to Operate
Blackjack	12%	32%	74%
Drug/Narcotics Kit	5%	63%	63%
Fingerprint Kit	9%	37%	21%
First Aid Kit	15%	84%	79%
Shotgun	30%	95%	68%

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

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

TABLE 17

MOST FREQUENTLY USED INFORMATION SOURCES
(LARGE COUNTY)

	Percent of Deputies Required to Read These Manuals	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Information As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Information As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn to Learn
Criminal Law Manual	48%	100%	42%
Department Manuals	84%	95%	74%
First Aid Manuals	27%	58%	84%
Interoffice Memos	69%	95%	95%
Ohio Criminal Code and Procedures	72%	100%	63%
Ohio Vehicle Code	66%	95%	68%
Training Bulletins	54%	84%	95%
Teletyped Messages	39%	95%	84%

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

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

	NEVER USED
FAA Bulletins	77%
Fish and Game Code	59%
Harbor Statutes	96%
Health Statutes	70%
Interstate Commerce Rules	81%
Legal Transcripts	60%

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

As one might expect, administrative tasks were performed less frequently by patrol officers. Tabled below are both some of the more often and also never performed administrative tasks including their corresponding importance and learning difficulty ratings. As previously mentioned, some supervisors could not rank the importance and learning difficulty of certain tasks because they responded "never used" in some areas.

TABLE 19
FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

	Percent of Deputy Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Attend Briefing	47%	68%	90%
Describe Person to Other Officer	82%	84%	79%
Estimate Property Values	46%	32%	53%
Exchange Information	80%	95%	100%
Notify Public Agencies	40%	42%	90%
Request Equipment Repair	62%	90%	100%
Request Verification	76%	84%	84%
Type Incident Reports	46%	63%	68%

TABLE 20

NEVER PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers <u>Never</u> Performing This Task	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Conduct Investigations	95%	21%*	26%*
Design Training Materials	87%	42%*	26%*
Interview Applicants	91%	37%*	37%*
Investigate and Report Background	91%	42%*	32%*
Participate in Planning	89%	26%*	32%*
Train Police Dogs	95%	5%*	5%*
Update Spot Maps	94%	21%*	53%*
Write Contract Specifications	95%	21%*	37%*
Write Policy Materials	94%	42%*	16%*

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to these tasks. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE

There were 24 "arrest, search and seizure" tasks identified in the survey; Table 21 reflects these frequency ratings as well as the importance and learning difficulty ratings provided by the 19 large county supervisors.

TABLE 21

FIVE MOST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least <u>Once a Week</u>	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Arrest Persons with a Warrant	36%	95%	95%
Arrest Persons without a Warrant	49%	90%	68%
Conduct Field Search	48%	95%	79%
Conduct Frisk	63%	89%	95%
Handcuff Suspect	65%	95%	79%

At the other end of the spectrum, the five least often performed arrest/search and seizure tasks drew a decidedly mixed response from the supervisors. For example, "discharge firearm at person" had never been performed by three-fourths of the officers, yet elicited relatively high importance and difficulty ratings from the supervisors. In another direction, while three-fourths of the patrol officers had never requested bystanders to assist in an apprehension, one-third of the supervisors saw that task as having any real importance.

TABLE 22

FIVE LEAST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED
ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Who Have Never Performed This Task	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Discharge Firearm at Person	75%	68%	37%
Plan Strategy for Arrests	23%	84%	68%
Plan Strategy for Searches	53%	68%	53%
Request Bystanders to Assist in an Apprehension	75%	32%*	21%*
Secure Search Warrant	53%	61%	26%

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

PATROL FUNCTIONS

Sixty-nine patrol function tasks were identified in the survey. Because some of these were quite obscure (e.g., clean fire fighting equipment, flush fuel spills, etc.) only the five most frequently performed patrol functions are summarized here.

TABLE 23

FIVE MOST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED PATROL TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Week	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Check For Wants Via Leads	84%	95%	95%
Check Parks	87%	74%	95%
Check Parking Lots	90%	68%	100%
Check Patrol Equipment	85%	90%	100%
Inform Dispatcher of Status	96%	95%	95%

The patrol functions list also contained several tasks which were maintenance in nature (e.g., clean weapons, inspect cruiser, etc.). Because these are supplemental to, but not indicative of, patrol operations their ratings were not included in the calculating of the five most frequently performed tasks.

PATROL CONTACT

Although a patrol officer's primary function is law enforcement in a reactive sense, each day sees the average patrol officer in contact with the public outside of the strict law enforcement context. These contacts range from counseling juveniles to cultivating informants to establishing rapport with local citizens. And, while these contacts provide a vital and indispensable service to the community by dissolving most reactive situations, they also tend to flavor the often routine role of the patrol officer. For example, past findings indicate a direct relationship between the frequency with which patrol officers talk with people in the community and the level of interest in their jobs. Presented below are a few of the patrol contact functions dichotomized into high and low frequency categories with corresponding importance and learning difficulty ratings.

TABLE 24

FREQUENTLY PERFORMED PATROL CONTACT TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Advise Victims	88%	84%	74%
Fill Out Field Interrogation Card	80%	90%	84%
Give Street Directions	88%	63%	100%
Interview Suspicious Persons	87%	89%	58%
Investigate Suspicious Vehicles	89%	95%	74%
Mediate Family Disputes	83%	89%	26%
Stop Vehicle to Cite	83%	79%	74%
Warn Offenders	83%	68%	84%

TABLE 25

SELDOM PERFORMED PATROL CONTACT TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Accept Bond	1%	0%*	5%*
Communicate Over Strike Disturbances	2%	37%	32%
Explain Demonstration Permits	1%	37%*	37%*
Fight Vehicle Fires	2%	11%*	37%*
Search for Bombs	2%	47%	53%

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

CIVIL PROCESSES

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

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

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

TABLE 26
SELECTED CIVIL PROCESS TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task a <u>Few Times</u> a <u>Year or More Often</u>	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Evictions	18%	16%	16%
Pick Up Children in Custody Matters	31%	32%	50%
Record Disposition of Civil Papers	15%	26%	29%
Serve Civil Process Papers	43%	42%	44%
Serve Probate Orders	56%	37%	44%
Attach Property Under Court Order	7%	21%*	26%*
Post Probate Notices, Warnings, Sale of Property Notices, etc.	3%	16%*	11%*
Record Payments	1%	16%*	6%*
Review Return of Civil Papers	8%	26%*	22%*
Seize Property of Civil Claims	7%	16%*	17%*

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

DETENTION AND CUSTODY PROCEDURES

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

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

TABLE 27
SELECTED DETENTION AND CUSTODY PROCEDURES

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task a <u>Few Times</u> a <u>Year or More Often</u>	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Aid Prisoners to Contact Legal Counsel	21%	16%*	44%*
Answer Inquiries Concerning Prisoners	52%	63%*	50%*
Book Prisoners	43%	54%*	22%*
Check Weapons In and Out of Detention Facility	32%	53%*	44%*
Escort Prisoners	25%	32%*	33%*
Guard Prisoners	39%	37%*	44%*

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION

In the course of routine patrol work law enforcement officers have the opportunity to engage in criminal investigation. Below are ten of the criminal investigation activities most and least frequently engaged in by sheriffs' officers in the nine large counties.

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

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Determine Whether Incidents Are Criminal Or Civil Matters	84%	84%	61%
Interview Complainants, Witnesses, etc.	83%	95%	56%
Package Evidence or Personal Property	54%	79%	78%
Tag Evidence and Confiscated Properties	70%	90%	83%
Take Statements of Witnesses	77%	95%	71%
Cast Impressions at Crime Scene	4%	42%*	33%*
Organize and Conduct Station House Line-Ups	2%	42%*	44%
Prepare Paperwork to File Extradition Warrants	2%	32%*	11%*
Use of Polygraph Results to Interrogate Suspect or Witness	3%	37%*	6%*
Witness Autopsies	4%	21%*	28%*

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

COURT PROCEDURES

Either as a result of their patrol duties or in addition to them, patrol officers sometimes find themselves engaging in court-related procedures. Listed below are those court activities in which officers are most and least likely to engage.

TABLE 29
FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST
OFTEN PERFORMED COURT PROCEDURE TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Confer with Prosecutor Prior to Testimony in Case	62%	95%	78%
Discuss Cases with Prosecutors Following Legal Proceedings	37%	79%	83%
Present Evidence in Legal Proceedings	40%	79%	61%
Review Reports and Notes for Court Testimony	54%	84%	61%
Testify in Criminal Cases	62%	90%	61%
Assemble Potential Juror List	2%	11%*	22%*
Attend Bail Hearings	2%	21%*	28%*
Mail Jury Duty Notices	1%	11%*	6%*
Testify in Civil Cases	1%	26%	44%
Testify in Liquor Board Hearings	1%	36%	61%

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

Law enforcement officers in Ohio's largest counties, as elsewhere, are called upon to investigate traffic accidents. The following is a list of accident-related activities which do and do not consume the patrol officer's time.

TABLE 30

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC ACCIDENT TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Determine Factors Contributing to an Accident	76%	84%	39%
Determine Violations in a Traffic Accident	78%	90%	56%
Diagram Accident Scenes	77%	84%	44%
Interview Persons Involved in Traffic Accidents	77%	90%	78%
Issue Citations in Traffic Accidents	74%	74%	89%
Calculate Vehicle Speed Using Mathematical Formulas	6%	32%*	0%*
Interview Tow Truck Operators for Relevant Accident Information	21%	26%	56%
Photograph Accident Scenes	13%	58%	44%
Review Accidents with Accident Investigators	19%	58%	72%
Take Coordinate Measures of Accident Scenes	29%	68%	50%

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

TRAFFIC PATROL

Much of an officer's time on the job is spent on traffic patrol looking for violators and ensuring that traffic is flowing safely and smoothly.

TABLE 31

FIVE MOST AND FIVE LEAST OFTEN PERFORMED TRAFFIC PATROL TASKS

	Percent of Patrol Officers Performing This Task at Least Once a Month	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Important" or "Very Important"	Percent of Supervisors Rating This Task As "Very Easy" or "Rather Easy" to Learn
Assist Stranded Motorist	81%	74%	100%
Explain Legal Procedures to Traffic Violators	73%	68%	72%
Follow Suspect Vehicle to Observe Traffic Violations	77%	84%	72%
Inspect Operator's License	85%	84%	94%
Issue Verbal Warnings to Traffic Violators	85%	68%	100%
Count Traffic Flow Using Automatic Devices	1%	0%*	22%*
Direct Pedestrian Traffic	3%	21%*	83%
Move Disabled Vehicles with Patrol Car	1%	0%*	39%*
Operate Videotape Equipment	1%	16%*	17%*
Plan Traffic Detours	2%	42%*	39%

* At least 30% of the supervisors responded "never encountered" to this task. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these responses.

PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

Because of its implications for the validation of entry-level strength and agility requirements, this section perhaps will be of greatest interest not only to sheriffs, but also to prospective recruits. Listed below are seven selected routine physical activities performed monthly or more frequently by patrol officers in nine large county agencies.

TABLE 32
PERFORMANCE FREQUENCY FOR SEVEN SELECTED
PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

	<u>Monthly or More Often</u>	<u>Never</u>
Climb Obstacles	35%	2%
Jump Over Obstacles	20%	6%
Lift Heavy Objects or Persons	20%	7%
Physically Push Movable Object	25%	4%
Run After Suspects	13%	3%
Run Up Stairs	18%	8%
Subdue Persons Resisting Arrest	16%	3%

The remaining 19 tables of this report, and their corresponding narratives, describe in minute detail the most strenuous physical activity of the previous five work shifts undertaken by 120 of the "large county" patrol officers. The remaining 77 officers indicated no such activity for that time frame. As will become evident the task analysis study went to tedious lengths to measure these activities in feet, inches, pounds, etc. This was done because most departmental standards, especially physical standards, are measured in those same units.

TABLE 33

ACTIVITY STATUS FOR LAST FIVE WORK SHIFTS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Activity	77	39%
Activity Without Resistance	67	34%
Activity With Resistance	53	27%
TOTAL	197	100%

During the course of patrol work, officers periodically have to run, either in pursuit of suspects or to assist in other emergency situations. Below are the distances run by "large county" patrol officers during what they described as the "most strenuous physical activity of their last five work shifts."

TABLE 34

RUNNING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 24 yards	41	64%
25 to 49 yards	6	9%
50 to 74 yards	5	8%
75 to 99 yards	2	3%
100 yards and over	10	16%
TOTAL	64	100%

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

TABLE 35
OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE RUNNING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ditch	4	6%
Fence or Wall	5	8%
Shrubs	5	8%
Stairs	8	13%
Vehicle	6	10%
2 of the above	14	22%
3 of the above	10	16%
Other	<u>10</u>	<u>16%</u>
TOTAL	62	99%*

Not often do officers find themselves crawling. One seasoned police veteran suggested this is because officers do not want to ruin their uniforms. Below are the distances Ohio's "large county" deputies crawled during their last five work shifts.

TABLE 36
CRAWLING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 3 feet	9	69%
4 to 6 feet	1	8%
10 to 12 feet	2	15%
13 feet and over	<u>1</u>	<u>8%</u>
TOTAL	13	100%

* Differences due to rounding.

The typical deputy officer in Ohio does not engage in the stunts that characterize law enforcement work as depicted on television. Still, some of the officers from the large county forces did jump in the course of performing their duties. Following are the distances jumped by the task analysis respondents.

TABLE 37
JUMPING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 3 feet	27	64%
4 to 6 feet	14	33%
7 to 9 feet	<u>1</u>	<u>2%</u>
TOTAL	42	99%*

As with the officers who ran, the ones who jumped also encountered obstacles. The table below reflects the numbers of patrol officers having to cope with each type of obstacle.

TABLE 38
OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE JUMPING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ditch	11	22%
Fence	4	8%
Shrubs	4	8%
Stairs	4	8%
Vehicle	5	10%
2 of the above	10	20%
3 of the above	7	14%
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>12%</u>
TOTAL	51	102%*

* Differences due to rounding.

Climbing is yet another activity which, while not consuming much of an officer's time, can make the job more difficult when it is necessary. The kinds of obstacles officers encounter can have important training implications. For example, if most of the obstacles did not have handholds or footholds, then training sessions would have to emphasize climbing techniques designed to help officers surmount these barriers. Below are some of the objects the officers were forced to climb.

TABLE 39
OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED WHILE CLIMBING

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Embankment	5	12%
Fence	17	41%
Ladder	4	10%
Stairs	10	24%
Other	5	12%
TOTAL	41	99%*

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

TABLE 40
OBSTACLES WITH HANDHOLDS AND FOOTHOLDS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Foothold	3	13%
Handhold	13	56%
Solid	7	30%
TOTAL	23	99%*

* Differences due to rounding.

Those readers concerned with officers who climb may be interested in knowing how far the latter were forced to climb. Below is a list of the distances for the "large county" deputy respondents.

TABLE 41
CLIMBING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
5 feet or less	11	29%
6 to 10 feet	17	45%
11 to 20 feet	6	16%
21 feet and over	4	10%
TOTAL	38	100%

Pushing is another activity which most lay persons probably do not see officers do. Yet some of the task analysis respondents did, in fact, have to push objects during their last five work shifts.

TABLE 42
PUSHING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	22	56%
20 to 39 feet	10	26%
40 to 59 feet	6	15%
60 to 79 feet	1	2%
TOTAL	39	99%*

The weight of an object to be pushed certainly influences the ease or difficulty with which the task is completed. Here are the weight ranges for objects pushed by deputies from the "large county" departments.

* Differences due to rounding.

TABLE 43
PUSHING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	1	2%
50 to 99 pounds	3	8%
150 to 199 pounds	5	13%
200 pounds and over	<u>30</u>	<u>77%</u>
TOTAL	<u>39</u>	<u>100%</u>

It is evident from the table above that a plurality of officers pushed extremely heavy objects. Some of this can be explained by the fact that 30 of the officers indicated they had pushed a vehicle. Many of the rest may have pushed people, trash dumpsters, or other heavy objects. The majority of those pushing admitted receiving some assistance; most, however, revealed that speed was not required, suggesting that most situations were not of an emergency nature.

Some of the officers also found themselves pulling objects while performing their patrol duties. A breakdown of the distances the officers pulled objects is provided in the following table.

TABLE 44
PULLING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	19	83%
20 to 39 feet	1	4%
40 to 59 feet	1	4%
60 to 79 feet	1	4%
80 feet and over	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>
TOTAL	<u>23</u>	<u>99%*</u>

It is evident that the vast majority of officers claiming to have pulled objects did so for relatively short distances. Even more important might be the weight of the objects pulled.

TABLE 45
PULLING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	2	9%
50 to 99 pounds	2	9%
100 to 149 pounds	4	17%
150 to 199 pounds	8	35%
200 pounds and over	<u>7</u>	<u>30%</u>
TOTAL	<u>23</u>	<u>100%</u>

Since 82% of the officers pulled objects weighing in excess of 100 pounds it might suggest that persons were the objects pulled. In fact, almost two-thirds of the officers pulled persons. And 42% of these officers received assistance in their pulling encounter. However, 44% of those pulling claimed that speed was required, perhaps suggesting that the officers may have been pulling intoxicated persons.

* Differences due to rounding.

The last standard physical activity to be considered is lifting. Again, the layman often does not see officers doing this. As can be seen in the following table, over three-fourths of those officers engaging in lifting did so to heights of under five feet.

TABLE 46
LIFTING (HEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 foot	4	12%
2 feet	14	42%
3 feet	6	18%
4 feet	4	12%
5 feet and over	5	15%
TOTAL	33	99%*

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

TABLE 47
CARRYING (DISTANCES)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 19 feet	19	61%
20 to 39 feet	1	3%
40 to 59 feet	4	13%
60 to 79 feet	2	6%
80 feet and over	5	16%
TOTAL	31	99%*

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

* Difference due to rounding.

TABLE 48
LIFTING (WEIGHTS)

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 to 49 pounds	4	12%
50 to 99 pounds	6	19%
100 to 149 pounds	7	22%
150 to 199 pounds	10	31%
200 pounds and over	5	16%
TOTAL	32	100%

Over one-half (59%) of these patrol officers carried people. And, almost one-half, (47%) of them got some assistance.

As could be expected, a number of the officers engaging in physical activities met resistance (27%). The majority (80%) of these officers had to contend with only one suspect, with another 11% being forced to grapple with two. In 90% of the cases the suspects were males.

One frustrating conclusion pointed out by the data is that reasoning with resistive suspects is difficult in most cases. Over three-fourths (78%) of the officers were unable to reason with their suspects. The task analysis respondents were given the opportunity to describe why they were unable to reason with their suspects.

TABLE 49
CAUSES OF INABILITY TO REASON WITH SUSPECTS

	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Drug or alcohol influence	34	62%
Emotionally or mentally upset	13	24%
Mental State Unknown	6	11%
No Opportunity to Reason	2	4%
TOTAL	55	101%*

* Percentage exceeds 100% due to rounding.

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

TABLE 50

TYPES OF RESISTANCE

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Barricade	8	(15%)	45	(85%)
Hit/Kick	26	(49%)	27	(51%)
Passive Resistance	10	(19%)	42	(81%)
Pulled Away	38	(72%)	15	(28%)
Ran Away	30	(57%)	23	(43%)
Special Tactics	5	(10%)	46	(90%)
Threw Object	6	(12%)	45	(88%)
Weapon	11	(22%)	40	(78%)
Wrestled	40	(74%)	14	(26%)

By far the vast majority (90%) of officers encountering resistance issued verbal orders to their suspects. Over one-fourth (26%) of the officers saw their suspects submit to these orders.

In some cases, it was necessary for officers to use force to subdue the suspects. Table 50 lists the various degrees of force used by deputies in subduing resisting arrestees.

TABLE 51

TYPES OF FORCE USED TO SUBDUE SUBJECTS

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Chemical Agent	1	(2%)	50	(98%)
Discharge Firearm	1	(2%)	50	(98%)
Display Firearm	12	(24%)	39	(76%)
Handcuffs with Assistance	28	(53%)	25	(47%)
Handcuffs without Assistance	28	(54%)	24	(46%)
Hit/Kick	17	(33%)	35	(67%)
Restraining Holds	38	(72%)	15	(28%)
Wrestled	41	(77%)	12	(23%)
Nightstick/Blackjack	8	(15%)	44	(85%)
Other Force	1	(2%)	41	(98%)

OTHER SAC PUBLICATIONS

- March 1983 Use of Force By Ohio Peace Officers. An analysis of the use of force by Ohio law enforcers during the performance of routine patrol work. Examined are personal defense tactics as well as non-lethal and lethal force.
- March 1983 The Ohio Statistical Analysis Center: A User's Profile. This administrative report highlights SAC's setting and function in Ohio government, the federal SAC network, and the field of criminal justice. It profiles SAC's structure, research priorities, information users, and similarities to other state and territorial SACs.
- March 1983 OCJS Research Requests and Responses: An Analysis. An analysis of 346 research data requests received and responded to by SAC in 1982, as well as the nearly 1,000 requests received to date, by type and source of request.
- Spring, 1983 The following series of eight reports are modular summaries, each about 40 pages in length, profiling the results from each of the jurisdiction levels (based on populations) represented in 1981-82 Ohio Law Enforcement Task Analysis Survey. These reports highlight the frequency of task performance, equipment usage, physical activities, as well as other facets of the peace officer's job. Also included are supervisors' assessments of importance and learning difficulty.
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Cities Serving Over 100,000 People: A Task Analysis.
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Cities Serving 25,000-100,000 People: A Task Analysis.
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Cities Serving 10,000-25,000 People: A Task Analysis.
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Municipalities Serving 2,500-10,000 People: A Task Analysis.
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Municipalities Serving Under 2,500 People: A Task Analysis
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Counties Serving Over 250,000 People: A Task Analysis.
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Counties Serving 100,000-250,000 People: A Task Analysis. (forthcoming)
- Law Enforcement In Ohio Counties Serving Under 100,000 People: A Task Analysis. (forthcoming)

- November 1982 Survey of Ohio Citizen Attitudes Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice. the third annual report of this series, this study focusing on attitudes toward law enforcement officers, public crime-fear levels, handgun ownership, and the informational resources which mold public opinion in this area.
- October 1982 Peace Officers Task Analysis Study: The Ohio Report. A two-and-one-half year study involving a survey of 3,155 Ohio peace officers in some 400 law enforcement agencies concerning the types of investigation, equipment, informational resources, tasks and physical activities associated with law enforcement in Ohio.
- May 1982 OCJS Research Requests and Responses: An Analysis. An analysis of 308 research data requests received and responded to by SAC in 1981, as well as the 625 total requests received to date, by type and source of request.
- April 1982 Fact and Fiction Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice in Ohio (1979-1982 data). A look at twenty-five popularly-believed myths about crime and criminal justice in the State, accompanied by appropriate factual data.
- July 1981 Ohio Citizen Attitudes: Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice (Report #2, 1980 data). The second in a series of reports concerning Ohioans' attitudes and opinions about contemporary issues affecting law enforcement, courts, corrections, juvenile justice, crime prevention, and criminal law.
- June 1981 A Stability Profile of Ohio Law Enforcement Trainees: 1974-1979 (1981 records). A brief analysis of some 125 Ohio Law Enforcement Officers who completed mandated training between 1974 and 1979. The randomly selected group was analyzed in terms of turnover, advancement, and moves to other law enforcement agencies.
- May 1981 A Directory of Ohio Criminal Justice Agencies (1981 data). An inventory of several thousand criminal justice (and related) agencies in Ohio, by type and county.
- April 1981 Property Crime Victimization: The Ohio Experience (1978 data). A profile of property crime in Ohio highlighting the characteristics of victims, offenders, and the crimes themselves; based on results of the annual National Crime Survey victimization studies in Ohio.

March 1981	<u>Profiles in Ohio Law Enforcement: Technical Assistance, Budgets, and Benefits (1979 data).</u> The second report emanating from the 1979 SAC survey of 82 sheriffs' departments and 182 police departments in Ohio; discusses technical assistance needs and capabilities among these agencies, as well as budgets and fringe benefits.
December 1980	<u>The Need for Criminal Justice Research: OCJS Requests and Responses (1978-1980).</u> An analysis of some 300 research requests received and responded to by the OCJS SAC Unit between 1978 and 1980, by type, request source, and time of response.
September 1980	<u>State of the States Report: Statistical Analysis Centers (Emphasis Ohio) (1980 data).</u> An analysis of the criminal justice statistical analysis centers located in virtually every state and several territories.
September 1980	<u>Survey of Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys: Report (1979 data).</u> An operational overview of 46 county prosecutors' offices.
September 1980	<u>In Support of Criminal Justice: Money and Manpower (1977 data).</u> Analysis of employment and expenditures within Ohio's criminal justice system, by type of component (police, courts, corrections, etc.), and type of jurisdiction (county, city, township and state).
June 1980	<u>Concerning Crime and Criminal Justice: Attitudes Among Ohio's Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police (1979 data).</u> Opinions and attitudes of 82 Ohio sheriffs and 182 chiefs of police, analyzed by jurisdictional size.
May 1980	<u>Ohio Citizen Attitudes: A Survey of Public Opinion on Crime and Criminal Justice (1979 data).</u> An analysis of public opinion and attitudes on a wide range of issues concerning law enforcement, courts, corrections, juvenile justice, crime prevention, and other areas of crime and criminal justice.

END