



UAA Justice Center  
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

---

Scholarworks@UA — UAA Justice Center

---

October 1981

## Examination of Qualifying Criteria for Selection of Law Enforcement Personnel in Alaska: Final Report

Knowlton W. Johnson and Chloe Clark-Barry

---

### **Suggested citation**

Johnson, Knowlton W.; & Clark-Barry, Chloe. (1981). *Examination of Qualifying Criteria for Selection of Law Enforcement Personnel in Alaska: Final Report*. Report prepared for the Alaska Department of Public Safety. Anchorage, AK: Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.

### **Summary**

This report examines the "state of the art" in law enforcement selection practices, analyzes personnel selection methods in terms of their ability to evaluate candidate trainability and interpersonal skills in a fair and equitable manner, and offers options for developing a model selection system for the Alaska Department of Public Safety. The report's findings and recommendations are based on an extensive review of the literature; questionnaires and telephone surveys of law enforcement agencies in the U.S.A., Canada, Australia and New Zealand; and telephone conversations with authorities on the subject of police selection.

EXAMINATION OF  
QUALIFYING CRITERIA FOR  
SELECTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT  
PERSONNEL IN ALASKA:

FINAL REPORT



**JUSTICE CENTER**

**University of Alaska, Anchorage  
Anchorage, Alaska**

EXAMINATION OF QUALIFYING CRITERIA FOR  
SELECTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL IN ALASKA:  
FINAL REPORT

BY

Knowlton Johnson, Ph.D.  
Project Director

Chloe Clark-Berry  
Research Analyst

JUSTICE CENTER  
University of Alaska  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

JC 8103

October, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	4
Research Approach . . . . .	4
Literature Review and Mail Survey: Phase I . . . . .	5
Telephone Interview and Follow-up Questionnaire: Phase II . . . . .	8
Data Processing and Analysis: Phase III . . . . .	10
Construction of a Decision Making Framework: Phase IV . . . . .	11
III. STATE OF THE ART - PERSONNEL SELECTION PRACTICES IN LAW ENFORCEMENT . . . . .	13
Personnel Selection Philosophy . . . . .	14
Trends and Special Features in the Use of Selection Methods . . . . .	17
Written Testing Stage . . . . .	18
Oral Interviewing Stage . . . . .	23
Psychological Screening . . . . .	27
Physical Agility Testing and Background Investigation Stages . . . . .	31
Unique Selection Practices Not Covered Elsewhere . . . . .	35
Summary of Selection Trends and Special Features . . . . .	39
IV. SELECTION METHOD RATINGS BASED ON DPS CRITERIA . . . . .	42
V. OPTIONS FOR DEVELOPING A MODEL SELECTION SYSTEM . . . . .	50
Decisions About the Selection Process . . . . .	50

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Decisions About Selection Methods . . . . .	53
Stage I: Identifying Trainable Applicants . . . . .	53
Stage II: Establishing an Eligibility List . . . . .	56
Stage III: Assessing Candidate's Performance in Training . . . . .	63
Implementation Strategy . . . . .	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	70
APPENDIX A-1 . . . . .	82
APPENDIX A-2 . . . . .	88
APPENDIX A-3 . . . . .	96
APPENDIX B-1 . . . . .	105
APPENDIX B-2 . . . . .	122
APPENDIX C . . . . .	135
APPENDIX D . . . . .	138
APPENDIX E . . . . .	150
APPENDIX F . . . . .	174

## PREFACE

The selection of persons responsible for ensuring public safety, order and law enforcement services is an important decision. In this regard, the Alaska Department of Public Safety (DPS) contracted with the Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, to examine the "state of the art" in law enforcement selection practices and to offer viable suggestions for constructing a model selection system. This report presents the results of our research and options for redesigning DPS's existing system.

In establishing the "state of the art" in law enforcement selection practices, we relied on an extensive review of the literature, questionnaires and telephone surveys of law enforcement agencies in the U.S.A., Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In addition, we engaged in telephone conversations with noted authorities on the subject of police selection. The results of these data collecting efforts are presented in the form of personnel selection trends and special features which were found throughout the U.S.A. and other countries that participated in the project. We also conducted an analysis of the dominant selection methods being used elsewhere according to the extent to which they are designed to produce information on trainability and interpersonal skills in a fair and equitable manner. All results of the study were taken into consideration when we designed a general decision making framework for developing a model selection system. Particular selection devices are

suggested at each critical stage of the alternative selection process being proposed. Also, an implementation strategy is proposed that incorporates intensive evaluation and predictive validity components.

The research team would like to express its appreciation to a number of people who assisted in the completion of this project. Special thanks are extended to William Nix (Commissioner), Walt Lawson (Director of Administrative Services), and Chet Cottengin (Personnel Officer) of the Alaska Department of Public Safety. Commissioner Nix and Mr. Lawson provided the necessary direction for our study. Mr. Cottengin assisted in the coordination of the operational aspects of the project. In addition, we would like to thank two justice students, Ralph Ray Gregory, who assisted in data collection, processing and analysis stages, and Verne Rupright, who was involved in the data collection stage. Both students made significant contributions to the study. We also appreciate the diligence of Justice Center staff members Phyl Booth, Darline Creen, Lois Hermansen and Denise Wike who worked on the project. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the Justice Center for providing additional financial assistance to the project and the University of Alaska Computer Network for providing computer time.

Knowlton Johnson, Ph.D.  
Chloe Clark-Berry

## Section 1

### INTRODUCTION

In recent years personnel selection in law enforcement has been increasingly recognized as complex, undefined and consequently, one of the most problematic areas of personnel management. In light of the many selection-related problems that are common to law enforcement agencies in general, the command staff of the Alaska Department of Public Safety (DPS) recently reviewed its situation and concluded that change was needed in the department's personnel selection process. It was envisioned that a new screening system for selecting State Trooper and Fish and Wildlife Protection Officer candidates could be designed to highlight trainability, interpersonal skills and fairness.

Trainability refers to an applicant's potential to be trained to perform law enforcement tasks and does not necessarily relate to a person's present skills level. The concept of trainability requires behavioral measures and can be based on past history, observation through simulation exercises or situational testing and observation of job performance. Interpersonal skills criteria relate to an applicant's ability or potential ability to effectively deal with the public, oftentimes under stressful circumstances. This criteria also requires behavioral measures which may take into consideration past behavior, simulated behavior and behavior in a work situation. Fairness implies that all applicants are given an equal chance to be selected for available law enforcement positions regardless of cultural background or sex. In order to have a fair and equitable personnel selection



system, it is necessary to empirically validate the selection methods, randomly select applicants, or employ some combination of the two considerations.

In connection with designing a new selection system, the DPS also concluded that it needed to know the "state of the art" about what other law enforcement agencies were doing in the area of personnel selection. While recruitment and pre-selection (i.e., establishing minimum requirements) were considered important, retrieval of information on the selection process was considered more critical. In this regard, the Justice Center of the University of Alaska, Anchorage, was contracted to assist in collecting and organizing information about various selection methods being used by other law enforcement agencies to produce unbiased data on two qualifying criteria--trainability and interpersonal skills. The report that follows highlights current trends and special selection features that the Justice Center found in law enforcement selection practices in the U.S.A. and several other countries where geographical and policing situations are similar to Alaska.

The report is organized into five sections. Sections I and II introduce the project and the research approach. We relied on an extensive review of the literature, mail questionnaires, and telephone surveys of law enforcement departments in the U.S.A., Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Additionally, we contacted a number of noted authorities on the subject of police selection. These sources provided the basis for our description of selection

trends and unique features that are presented in Section III. The results which describe what is happening in law enforcement selection focus on philosophies, processes and information gathering devices. Of particular interest are results about the unique practices that have been implemented in various departments.

In Section IV, we examine the usefulness of dominant selection methods used elsewhere, using criteria which are of interest to DPS. Following this analysis, we develop a framework for a model selection system which is presented in Section V. Special attention is given to the underlying philosophy for the model, a selection process configuration and viable information gathering methods. The appendices include supplemental information that provides details which may be useful to DPS.

## Section II

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

#### Research Approach

This section of the report details the methods and procedures used to examine qualifying criteria for use in law enforcement selection. The research approach focuses on establishing the "state of the art" in current law enforcement selection practices in order to provide the Alaska Department of Public Safety (DPS) with information for designing its personnel selection system. This entailed collecting data from the literature, other law enforcement agencies and noted authorities on law enforcement practices. To reflect specific considerations postulated by DPS administrators, special emphasis of the research focused on retrieval of information about the written test and oral interview as methods for determining qualified law enforcement recruits. Attention was given to qualifiers which demonstrate job-relatedness, validity, and fairness, as well as their applicability for use in selecting State Trooper and Fish and Wildlife Protection Officer candidates in Alaska.

The research project was divided into four phases over a seven month period, commencing in March, 1981. Phase I focused on identifying law enforcement agencies that have been experimenting with different approaches and methods in personnel selection. We utilized the literature, noted police selection experts and the results of a preliminary mail survey. In Phase II, a detailed telephone interview and a follow-up questionnaire were constructed, pre-tested and administered to law enforcement agen-

cies in the U.S.A. and Canada. The third phase of the project consisted of a compilation and analysis of the literature and survey data. The final phase involved development of a decision making framework for the DPS to use in constructing its model personnel selection system. The research team worked closely with key DPS personnel during this phase of the project.

#### Literature Review and Mail Survey: Phase I

While the literature provided some assistance in establishing the "state of the art" in police selection, our research approach relied more heavily on information obtained directly from the personnel division of law enforcement agencies. Noted authorities in the police selection area supplemented our quest for information.

The first key activity of Phase I focused on literature retrieval. The research team used the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) as its primary source. Approximately 150 abstracts were reviewed, from which approximately 60 documents were retrieved for in-depth examination. Focus of the literature was divided into the following categories: written tests; oral interview; psychological screening; physical agility tests; background investigation/polygraph tests; medical examination; assessment centers; test validation; minority/female recruitment; and legislation/litigation dealing with selection practices and procedures. In addition to providing background material on the major issues of law enforcement selection practices, this material also identified law enforcement agencies for

inclusion in the study.

The second key activity of Phase I concerned retrieval of preliminary information from law enforcement departments through a mail questionnaire. We identified three target groups of departments. First, on a contract basis, the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) assisted in obtaining selection information from its 60-agency membership in the U.S.A. PERF administered a nine question survey to its constituency (municipal and county police departments) of which the entire membership responded.<sup>1</sup> The focus of the survey was two-fold: to identify those departments that have re-designed their selection process within the last 10 years; and to identify those departments that have participated in a personnel selection research study. The survey emphasized the following areas: written test; substitutes for the written test; oral interviews; selecting trainable candidates as opposed to qualified candidates; minorities and females; and selection systems for departments of public safety if different from police departments.

Using the PERF survey as a starting point, we constructed a more detailed questionnaire to retrieve data about selection

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A-1 for the PERF questionnaire and the list of departments surveyed.

practices in a second group of law enforcement agencies in other countries.<sup>2</sup> The 1980 membership list of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) was used to identify and contact departments in other countries where geographical and policing situations (enforcement in remote areas) are similar to Alaska.<sup>3</sup> The response rate of the international survey was as follows: 44 of 73 Canadian departments responded, 5 of 7 Australian departments and 1 of 1 New Zealand department responded.<sup>4</sup>

For a third group of U.S.A. state police departments, we constructed an in-depth questionnaire to replicate the information that was obtained from the two previously discussed groups, and additionally, to extract specific information about the written test and oral interview.<sup>5</sup> Of the 49 state police agencies surveyed, 36 responded.

In total, 190 mail survey questionnaires were disseminated to

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix A-2 for the International Survey questionnaire and the list of participating agencies. Emphasis was placed on obtaining information about the number of selection stages and the sequencing of these stages.

<sup>3</sup> "Directory of Law Enforcement and Related Organizations." The Police Chief, October 1980, p. 62-75.

<sup>4</sup> We feel that the Canadian response would have been even higher if the June 15, 1981 postal strike had not occurred. Several departments in the Scandinavian countries were sent questionnaires but did not respond.

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix A-3 for the state police questionnaire and a list of the departments that participated in the study.

departments in the U.S.A., Canada, Australia and New Zealand and 154 were returned, yielding a response rate of 81%. From this pool of 154 departments, we contacted, by way of telephone, those departments that had made changes in their selection system within the last ten years, particularly changes in the written test and oral interview. Concurrently, 14 additional departments (identified through the literature and resource experts) were considered for the telephone interview phase of the study. This data collection activity is described below.

Telephone Interview and Follow-Up Questionnaire: Phase II

Phase two of the study focused on data collection by means of a telephone interview and follow-up questionnaire.<sup>6</sup> A 20-25 minute interview schedule was constructed to elicit detailed information in the following areas:<sup>7</sup>

- type and sequence of each selection method employed;
- changes made to each method and the reasons for and impact of such change;
- challenges to individual methods and the disposition of each;
- author, date and type of validation studies performed;
- composition of the written test or alternative method used;
- basic departmental characteristics.

---

<sup>6</sup> Additional personnel assisted in this phase of the study. These included one Justice Center staff person and two senior level justice students.

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix B-1 for the telephone interview and list of agencies that participated in this phase of the study.

Four trained interviewers conducted telephone interviews with representatives of 85 U.S.A. departments and 5 Canadian departments.<sup>8</sup> In many instances, the person interviewed was the same person who responded to the preliminary questionnaire. In other cases, the interview was conducted with a department psychologist, recruiter, personnel officer or civil service personnel.

The sub-group of agencies that responded to the telephone interview and the larger sample that completed the mail survey are as follows: 32 of the 36 state police departments responded; 51 of the 72 municipal and county departments responded; and 5 of the 44 international departments responded.<sup>9</sup> The size of the departments that participated in the telephone interview phase of the study varied from 67 sworn personnel to over 10,000 officers. The median was 621 officers with only two agencies being under 100 sworn persons and only 13 being under 200 in strength. Eighty-nine percent of the agencies interviewed were police departments, 11% were public safety departments.

A follow-up questionnaire was sent to each of the U.S.A. and Canadian departments that responded to the telephone interview.

---

<sup>8</sup> Instrument construction entailed numerous work sessions with the interviewers who participated in question construction and role playing exercises. Additionally, pre-tests were conducted using three Alaskan departments. These were the Anchorage Police Department, the Kenai Police Department, and the Soldotna Police Department.

<sup>9</sup> Restricted funds and time limited our inquiry of international agencies to those having made unique changes in their selection system that were not uncovered in U.S.A. departments.



This additional information was intended to provide a better understanding of the data obtained in the telephone interview.<sup>10</sup> Additionally, respondents were asked in the follow-up to provide any information that was not available during the telephone interview, and to provide copies of materials which could be of use to the DPS in the construction of its model selection system. Due to the limited response rate (39%) and time constraints, this information was not analyzed. If sufficient numbers of questionnaires are returned, the data will be analyzed and disseminated in the future.

Data Processing and Analysis: Phase III

The third phase of the study involved data coding, editing and analysis. One hundred and fifty-three data elements were assigned numerical values and keypunched on IBM cards for computer analysis. Open-ended questions, designed to allow the respondent an opportunity to provide explanation, were content analyzed for purposes of highlighting unique selection practices.

The analysis was descriptive with univariate, bivariate,<sup>11</sup> and content analysis results being used to identify trends and special features in connection with law enforcement selection practices in the U.S.A. and other countries. When comparisons

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix B-2 for the follow-up questionnaire.

<sup>11</sup> The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) which is available at the University of Alaska, Anchorage was used in conducting the computer analysis.

were made between the U.S.A. and international departments, we based our analysis on data collected from the 85 U.S.A. departments by way of telephone interviews and the data collected from the 44 international departments by way of mail survey questionnaires. When reference is made to the total sample, we report results based on 129 departments. Telephone interview data that were collected from the 5 Canadian departments were useful in an analysis of differences between the U.S.A. departments and Canadian departments, and in identifying special selection features in Canada.

#### Construction of a Decision Making Framework: Phase IV

This fourth and final phase of the study was most critical and required close collaboration with the Alaska Department of Public Safety. Upon completion of the data analysis, the results were summarized for use in work sessions involving the research team and DPS staff personnel. Three tasks were accomplished in these sessions. First, the summary results were reviewed and discussed in detail. Second, major selection methods that were found being used in the 129 U.S.A. and international departments were examined in relation to the three key considerations that were of interest to the DPS (i.e., trainability, interpersonal skills and fairness). Additionally, cost and litigation potential of each method were also examined. A rating scale of poor, fair, good and excellent was used to evaluate the usefulness of selection methods in determining the trainability, interpersonal skills of, and the fairness to applicants. The selection methods examined were the written test, oral interview, background inves-

tigation, physical agility test, psychological screening, assessment center simulation, observation in the training academy and observation in a field training program.

A third task completed in the work sessions was a discussion of how each selection method could be combined or orchestrated to produce data for assessing (in a fair and equitable manner) trainability and interpersonal skills of applicants. Those work sessions provided a basis for the research team to develop options for the model selection system which is presented in Section V of this report.

Section III  
STATE OF THE ART  
PERSONNEL SELECTION PRACTICES IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

The "state of the art" in current selection practices is presented in this section through a series of trends and special features uncovered in the literature review, the questionnaires and telephone surveys. The analysis addresses two general issues in personnel selection: the underlying philosophy of law enforcement selection practices; and, the application of various selection methods in law enforcement. In regard to each of these issues, we will present survey results that describe the trends and unique selection practices found among the study departments. Literature will be introduced in footnotes that highlight a particular trend or that provide reference material for further inquiry.

It should be reiterated that the purpose of this study was to uncover what is going on in the law enforcement selection area, not to explain why departments use particular selection methods. Further, we were only able to determine the impact of selection methods in general by a subjective evaluation given by persons being interviewed which is reported elsewhere.<sup>12</sup> We found that evaluation research is not being emphasized in the selection area.

---

<sup>12</sup> See Appendix C for a discussion of these results.

## Personnel Selection Philosophy

An analysis of the literature pointed to a general philosophy underlying personnel selection in law enforcement. We found that the screening process has incorporated a negative approach to "weed out" unqualified or "undesirable" applicants from the system. While the trend appears to be shifting somewhat in recent years toward "positive selection"--screening into the system those individuals who possess the special characteristics and qualifications to effectively perform the police role--the number of departments making strides in that direction is still relatively few.<sup>13</sup>

In our survey, we examined the general selection philosophy by collecting data on three methods of scoring applicants. A negative selection approach was viewed as indicative of the use of a multiple or successive hurdle method while positive selection was characterized by how departments used the composite scoring and/or preference point methods. The multiple hurdle scoring approach usually means rejection from the process if the applicant fails a particular stage. Therefore, an applicant must successfully complete each stage of the selection process in

---

<sup>13</sup> Several authors have discussed the preponderance of a screen-out selection philosophy and the lack of emphasis on a screen-in approach. See the following works for such discussions. Stinchcomb, James D. "Law Enforcement Personnel Development." Modern Police Administration (ed.) Schultz, Donald O. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company, 1979, p. 22.

Territo, Leonard; Swanson, C.R. Chamelin, Neil D. The Police Selection Process. Indianapolis: Bobs-Merrill Educational Publishers, 1977, Chapter 1.

order to continue through the sequence.<sup>14</sup> The composite method permits the applicant to complete each stage of the process and then the total scores are ranked. If there are no pass/fail stages, and all data about an applicant is considered in the total score for all stages of the selection process, then the use of a composite score method reflects a positive selection philosophy. If the composite score method is used only for those applicants who successfully exceed a designated cutoff on one or more stages, then the use of this method represents only a modification of the multiple hurdle approach, and therefore still characterizes a negative selection philosophy.

Preference points are bonus points for having positive qualities, experiences or skills that are designated by the department or are required by law (e.g., veteran points). This method of scoring may be used in conjunction with a negative selection approach or a positive selection approach.

In regard to the multiple hurdle approach, we found 78% of the U.S.A. departments reporting that an applicant could not fail any stage of the selection process and still be considered for employment. Thirteen percent of the departments indicated that the applicant was allowed to repeat a particular stage if he or

---

<sup>14</sup> For a discussion of the hurdle approach, see Cascio, Wayne F. and Real, Leslie J. "The Civil Service Exam has been passed: Now What?" Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques, Spielberger, Charles, ed. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Pub. Corp. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979, p. 115.

she failed,<sup>15</sup> and 9% were found to allow an applicant to fail at least one stage and still be considered for employment. While we were unable to determine the exact number of departments that used a composite scoring method, it was apparent from discussions with the interviewers that no departments indicated having a pure composite scoring method in which an applicant's final score was a composite of all stages regardless of his or her score at any given stage. Several U.S.A. departments did, however, report forming a composite score for an applicant which was based on data from two to three selection stages, but usually only after the score for each stage exceeded the cutoff. Two of the five Canadian departments that were interviewed also indicated that a point system was being implemented at the National and Provincial levels which used a composite scoring method after an initial pass/fail stage.

The survey showed that 85% of the U.S.A. departments awarded preference or points to applicants based on the following criteria: veteran (52%); prior police experience (14%); college degree or coursework (10%); police cadet (5%); and other special skills (e.g., pilots) (4%). In most departments, preference points were awarded in the initial stage and in a few departments, an applicant was allowed to bypass certain stages if he or

---

<sup>15</sup> The physical agility test was most frequently mentioned as a test which could be repeated, but must be passed on the second attempt. One department noted that an applicant could fail the psychological test, and in such cases, a different battery was then administered at the applicant's own expense.

she had a college degree, prior police experience or had been through a departmental cadet program.

It is apparent, from the results presented above, that the traditional negative selection is the most common philosophy underlying personnel selection in law enforcement. Although use of this approach may be the most cost-effective method of condensing the applicant pool, it may not be the fairest or most beneficial approach for two reasons. First, the written test, which is usually administered in the first stage in most U.S.A. departments, may not be an accurate method of assessing an applicant's potential skills and abilities important to on-the-job performance. Second, it remains unknown how candidates who have failed the initial screening might have performed on other, more job-related tests further along in the sequence. For these reasons, the chances of losing potentially good police officers (based on questionable criteria) is great. As such, the traditional selection approach, while eliminating certain candidates, does not always eliminate those who are unqualified and may also unnecessarily and unfairly eliminate those applicants who are or could become qualified through training.<sup>16</sup>

#### Trends and Special Features in the Use of Selection Methods

The personnel selection process in law enforcement is defined by a number of stages that begin after recruitment and pre-

---

<sup>16</sup> McCreedy, Kenneth R. "Selection Practices and the Police Role." The Police Chief. 1974, Vol. 41, No. 7, July, p. 41.



selection (i.e., evaluation of minimum requirements) activities have been completed. We found that the selection process of 95% of the 129 survey departments was comprised of 5-8 stages. Six departments reported having only three stages and two departments indicated having 10 stages. Within each stage, one or more selection methods or devices are used to collect information about applicants.

Presented below are the survey results that depict particular use of selection methods in the five most common selection stages. These stages include the written test, oral interview, psychological screening, background investigation, and the physical agility test. Additionally, we discuss several unique selection features that were found in some departments. These include assessment center simulation, observation in the academy and field training program, demonstration schools and a lottery approach.

#### Written Testing Stage

In the written testing stage of the typical law enforcement selection process, applicants are asked to respond to a pencil and paper test that addresses cognitive abilities in two ways. One testing approach focuses on assessing an applicant's present ability in areas like vocabulary, math, reading comprehension, abstract reasoning and situational reasoning. Another testing approach relies on standardized intelligence tests that are designed to measure an applicant's cognitive potential. The written testing stage was found in most U.S.A. law enforcement

departments (93%) and in a majority of international departments (82%). It was commonly the first stage in U.S.A. departments (78%); however, in other countries surveyed, only 48% of the departments reported it as the first stage in the selection process.

In the last 10 years, the use of written tests which measure cognitive ability and general intelligence has become the subject of increased debate<sup>17</sup> and litigation.<sup>18</sup> A major complaint from applicants, administrators and the courts is that more often than not, the written test does not measure an applicant's potential for performance in the law enforcement field (i.e., lack of predictive validity). Moreover, the traditionally used tests have been found to be culturally biased against minority group members and lacking in job-relatedness. Our survey highlighted this pattern of concern in that, of the 47 U.S.A. departments whose selection process had been challenged, 26 were because of complaints against the written test.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Eisenberg, Terry and Murray, James. "Selection." Police Personnel Administration. Glenn O. Stahl, ed., Chapter 5, Police Foundation. 1974, p. 77.

<sup>18</sup> See Appendix D for additional information about the types of challenges and results.

<sup>19</sup> In contrast, we found through the five telephone interviews with Canadian departments that it was unusual for litigation to be brought against the use of the written test or other selection methods being used in law enforcement.

Efforts to rectify past deficiencies have resulted in a variety of changes being made in the written test by police and civil service departments in the last 10 years. Eighty-nine percent of the U.S.A. departments surveyed noted having made at least one change in the written test stage of the selection process, the following being most often mentioned:

- modification of current test content;
- modification of scoring method;
- development or substitution of new test;
- validation of existing test; and
- deletion of test or substitution of alternative method.

Notably, 58% of the departments that indicated having made changes in the written testing stage did so because of being challenged or the potential for being challenged.

The kind of changes being made in the written testing stage has been to make the tests more job-related,<sup>20</sup> usually through an expensive validation process. We found that 58% of the U.S.A. departments reported having the written test validated, which was often conducted by an outside consulting firm or University.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> For a detailed discussion of job-related tests, see Schacter, Hindy Lauer. "Job-Related Examinations for Police: Two Developments." Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1979, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 87.

<sup>21</sup> These validation studies focused on content, construct, and concurrent validity checks. Of the validation studies we were able to retrieve, none addresses the issue of predictive validity.

This validation process usually incorporated an extensive job analysis of the knowledge, skills and abilities determined to be most representative or predictive of actual job performance.<sup>22</sup>

Efforts have also been made to develop and validate written tests in the U.S.A. that can be transported and administered in multiple jurisdictions. For example, the Educational Testing Service (ETS), in conjunction with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), and International Personnel Management Association (IPMA) have developed a multijurisdictional examination for entry-level police officers.<sup>23</sup> Although the U.S.A. survey results did not discover any particular test being widely used among departments in different jurisdictions, we did note that within certain states (e.g., Texas and California) the same examination is administered to different department's applicants for entry-level police work.

A few U.S. departments (7 of the 85 surveyed) either have eliminated the traditional, cognitive-based written test or have found options to this selection device. The particular options noted are as follows:

---

<sup>22</sup> It is worth noting that while test validation activity was not uncommon, there was no report of a systematic follow-up evaluation of changes being made in the written testing stage.

<sup>23</sup> Rosenfeld, Michael and Thornton, Richard. Co-Principal Investigators. Development and Validation of Multi-jurisdictional Police Examination. Center for Occupational And Professional Assessment. ETS. Princeton, NJ: 1976.

- use of oral interview in place of the written test;
- use of a written test based upon life experience and self analysis;
- use of a questionnaire filled out with application form;
- use of psychological tests in place of the written test;
- waiver of the written test for applicants with a college degree or prior police experience; and
- use of the assessment center approach in place of the written test.

In summary, the trends and special features that were uncovered in connection with the written testing stage are as follows:

- The written test is an established personnel selection method in the U.S.A. and in the international departments surveyed;
- The written testing stage usually introduces applicants to the selection process in the U.S.A., whereas in Canadian law enforcement agencies, less than one-half used the written testing stage first in the process;
- The written test has been the most frequently challenged method of selecting law enforcement officers in the U.S.A.;
- There has been widespread change in the written testing stage in the U.S.A., mostly toward making tests more job-related;
- Change in the written testing stage in the U.S.A. has been primarily because of court action or the potential for court action;
- U.S.A. law enforcement agencies have increasingly validated the written test being used, which was often completed by an outside consulting firm or university;
- There was no single multi-jurisdictional test found being used on a widescale basis in the U.S.A.; however, several states have begun to standardize the written testing stage;
- Special features of the written testing stage found in the U.S.A. and international departments include: replacement of the written test with an assessment center approach or a questionnaire which was filled out with the application

form; and, waiver of the written test for applicants with a college degree or prior police experience.

#### Oral Interviewing Stage

Among the departments surveyed, the oral interview ranked second only to the written test in the U.S.A. as one of the most commonly used techniques (88%), and ranked first in the other survey countries as the most frequently used selection method (91%). While Canada and the U.S.A. relied heavily on the oral interview, these countries sequenced this stage differently. Nearly one-half of the Canadian departments surveyed (49%) introduced applicants to the oral testing stage at either the first or second stage in the process. In the U.S.A., a majority of the departments placed this stage at or near the end of the process. Another noticeable difference between the application of the oral interview in these two countries was that in Canada we found some departments using a one-person interview in the initial screening stage; whereas, in the U.S.A., the oral interview was predominantly conducted by a board at the end of the process. In most U.S.A. and Canadian departments, there was a single oral interviewing stage; however, in 14% of the departments surveyed, two oral interviews were conducted at different stages of the selection process and 6% of the departments reported creating three different oral interviewing stages.

There has been a considerable amount of change noted in the oral interviewing stage of the U.S.A. departments during the last 10 years. Forty-four percent of the departments indicated having

made changes in the content of the interview and 70% noted changes in interview procedures and structure of the board. In regard to interview content, change was reported in the type of questions asked and the atmosphere in which they were being asked. We found in the survey that U.S.A. departments are asking more structured questions that are job-related and quantifiable, and are creating an atmosphere that allows the applicant an opportunity to provide full explanations.

In regard to structured questions, 14% of the departments were found to still rely on an informal interview, but 36% asked structured questions which elicited general responses and 51% asked structured questions which required specific answers. Many of the departments of the latter group asked both general and specific questions.<sup>24</sup> There was also evidence that some departments were beginning to introduce situational testing (i.e., simulated exercises) at the oral interviewing stage. This new

---

<sup>24</sup> For a discussion of various oral interview procedures and techniques, see Territo, et al, Chapter 8. On page 146, Territo also discusses the patterned interview approach recommended in the California Police Selection Study for use in California's police agencies. An excerpt from the study describes the "patterned interview."

The patterned interview, then, differs from the structured interview in that while the areas of interest are defined, the actual questions are not; therefore, the system is controlled, yet flexible. In addition, it is an improvement over unstructured interviews in which it is difficult to determine what criteria are used in decision making because of lack of definition resulting in little assurance that the type and extent of information elicited from the competitor is the same as that elicited from other competitors.

feature provides oral board members with behavior data on applicants.<sup>25</sup>

We also found that departments were beginning to emphasize a relaxed atmosphere for applicants during the interview as opposed to a stressful situation. Techniques being used that might achieve this purpose include: bi-lingual oral exams, altering the seating arrangement of board members; use of minority/female board members especially when interviewing minority/female applicants; and pre-oral orientation before going into the interview.

As indicated above, 70% of the U.S.A. departments surveyed have made recent changes in the structure and/or procedure of the oral interview. The survey reflected that the composition of the oral boards is becoming more diverse. In addition to using civil service and departmental personnel on selection boards, departments are including community representatives, minority and female officers, and psychologists.<sup>26</sup> Preparation for board members has also increased. Eighty-three percent of the U.S.A. departments reported having some type of preparation (i.e. oral,

---

<sup>25</sup> This method is discussed more in detail in the subsection that addresses the psychological screening stage in several departments.

<sup>26</sup> Use of a group of experienced clinicians has been found to increase the effectiveness of the interview for predicting behavior when used in concert with other sources of information. Shealy and Roberts, "Police Selection." The Role of the Forensic Psychologist, Cooke, Gerald. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1980, p. 374.



written, and/or workshops) for the oral board members. Those departments that emphasized some type of preparation for board members also stressed consistency in scoring applicants. Of particular interest is that in several departments, validation studies have emphasized inter-scorer reliability among board members.

While there have been changes made in the oral interviewing stage of most U.S.A. departments surveyed, only eight departments reported challenges in this stage of the selection process.<sup>27</sup> All of these challenges were settled out of court. In regard to validation studies, the survey indicated that 14% of the departments had validated their oral interview; all did so in connection with validation of the entire selection process.

In summary, the following trends and special features that were uncovered in connection with the oral interviewing are as follows:

- The oral interview is popular in law enforcement agencies of the U.S.A. and other countries that participated in the study;
- U.S.A. departments introduce applicants to the oral interviewing stage at or near the end of the selection process, whereas many Canadian departments interview applicants at the first or second stage of the process;
- Law enforcement departments in the U.S.A. have made changes in the type of information being obtained by asking more structured questions that are job-related and qualifiable, by using situational tests to produce behavioral data and by creating a relaxed atmosphere during the interview.

---

<sup>27</sup> See Appendix D for additional information about these challenges.

- Law enforcement departments in the U.S.A. have made changes in the structure and procedure of the oral interview that reflect movement toward more involvement of outsiders, more preparation of board members and standardization of scoring;
- The most apparent special features of the oral interview stage in the U.S.A. and Canada include: use of a one-person interview as the first stage of the selection process; introduction of situational testing; bi-lingual oral exams; use of minorities/females when interviewing minority/female applicants; psychologists and community representatives on the oral board; and a pre-oral orientation before the actual interview.

### Psychological Screening

The purpose of establishing a psychological screening stage has been to identify those persons who are unfit for police work as well as identifying those who have a personality appropriate for the demands and rigors of a law enforcement career. According to some authorities, the use of this stage has gained in popularity as a police selection component.<sup>28</sup> Fifty-one percent of the U.S.A. and international departments surveyed confirmed use of some method of psychological screening in the last few years. A breakdown of screening methods used to determine psychological fitness by their popularity among the U.S.A. departments surveyed is as follows:

- 33% of the departments use only psychological tests;
- 5% of the departments require an interview by a psychologist;

---

<sup>28</sup> Gettinger, Stephen. "Psychological Testing on Recruits Can: Screen Out the Real Turkeys, b) Spot the Supercops, c) Both of the Above, d) Neither of the Above." Police Magazine. March, 1981. p. 30.

- 8% of the departments combine psychological testing with an interview by a psychologist.
- 5% require state certification which involves psychological testing and an interview by a psychologist.

Although the majority of U.S.A. departments with a psychological screening component use psychological tests which are a pencil and paper type, the tests themselves differ in make-up, purpose and method.<sup>29</sup> Among the different types are: intelligence, interest and preference, personality and social maturity. As reflected in the literature and survey results, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality test (MMPI) continues to be the most popular standardized test, even though it is considered suspect by some psychologists.<sup>30</sup> Conversely, a less widely used test, the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) has been referred to as the "sane man's MMPI" and some psychologists believe it may provide a more useful personality assessment device for use in research on police selection.<sup>31</sup> In at least one department, a

---

<sup>29</sup> See the following references for detailed discussions regarding psychological screening in law enforcement:

Crosby, Andrew. "The Psychological Examination in Police Selection." Journal of Police Science and Administration. Vol. 7, No 2(2), 1979, p. 215.

Beutler, Larry and O'Leary, Dennis. "Psychological Screening of Police Candidates." The Police Chief. 1980, August, p. 38.

Poland, James. "Police Selection Methods and the Prediction of Police Performance." Journal of Police Science and Administration. Vol. 6, No. 4, 1978, p. 374.

<sup>30</sup> The test was designed nearly 40 years ago, its normality was a white, rural Minnesotan and its principal purpose was to see if a person was ill enough to be committed to an institution. Gettinger, p. 38.

<sup>31</sup> Speilberger, et al, "A Model for the Selection of Law Enforcement Officers." Speilberger, Charles, ed. Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques. Chapter 2, p. 16.

psychological test has replaced the cognitive based written test.

In addition to the standardized tests being administered, the use of situational testing (applicable to individuals and groups) is being used by a few U.S.A. departments. Even though the tests seem to be more closely aligned to actual job performance, the expense seems to deter widespread use. This testing method, which is based on simulated exercises, produces job-related behavioral data, particularly behavioral information in regard to interpersonal skills.<sup>32</sup> In several instances, we found among the departments surveyed, that situational testing was associated with the oral interviewing stage and in several other cases, the method was introduced as part of an established psychological screening stage.

The psychologist has become more involved in the selection process in recent years, possibly because of the more widespread

---

<sup>32</sup> According to Mills, the strongest feature of the group stress method is that it is directly job-related. He states:

No psychiatric probing into personality psycho-dynamics is needed. A reasonably low level of inferences on future police behavior can be maintained. Candidate acceptance of the method is almost uniformly high. To the extent that stress and its management are a central feature of effective police performance, the group stress method is believed to provide a more valid index of such future field performance than any paper and pencil or interview in use.

Mill, Robert B. "Simulated Stress in Police Recruit Selection." Journal of Police Science and Administration. 1976, June, Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 183.

acceptance of the psychologists in law enforcement.<sup>33</sup> This has introduced a new dimension to law enforcement selection. The psychologist enables departments to more effectively use psychological and situational tests. At least one state (Texas) requires certification of the psychological fitness of law enforcement candidates. This increases the use of psychological expertise in the selection process.

In terms of litigation and validation studies in connection with psychological screening methods, there has been little activity during the past 10 years in either of these areas. Of the U.S.A. survey departments, only six reported that their psychological screening methods and procedures had been challenged.<sup>34</sup> Similarly, we were only able to find four departments which had validated the psychological screening devices. Usually these methods were validated as a part of a larger validation of the entire selection process.<sup>35</sup>

Trends and special features of the psychological screening stage in the U.S.A. can be summarized as follows:

---

<sup>33</sup> Among the survey departments in the U.S.A., we found that 40% employed psychologists and 77% indicated that they do utilize outside psychologists on occasion.

<sup>34</sup> See Appendix D for additional information on the types of challenges and results.

<sup>35</sup> The Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Division of Police Standards and Training has been working on developing a comprehensive police selection system (which includes a psychological test). A discussion of the psychological test research can be found in Speilberger, Chapter 14.

Trends and special features of the psychological screening stage in the U.S.A. can be summarized as follows:

- Psychological testing is the most commonly used method of assessing psychological fitness;
- Psychologists are beginning to play a larger role in the psychological assessment of law enforcement applicants;
- There have been few departments challenged for their use of psychological screening methods;
- There has been little validation or evaluation work in connection with psychological screening devices; and
- Unique features of the psychological screening stage include: state certification of psychological fitness in law enforcement selection; use of situational testing; and use of a psychological test in place of a cognitive oriented written test.

#### Physical Agility Testing and Background Investigation Stages

The final two stages that were examined in this study were physical agility testing (P.A.T.) and the background investigation (B.I.) stages of the selection process. With respect to the P.A.T., its basic purpose has been to weed out those candidates who, due to physiological impediments or lack of coordination, etc., will not be able to withstand the physical stress of police work. Typical events of the physical agility test include exercises in speed, endurance, agility and strength.<sup>36</sup> Seventy-eight

---

<sup>36</sup> For discussion of physical agility tests and methods see:

McGhee, Gary. "Job-Related Pre-Employment Physical Agility Tests." The Police Chief. Vol. 43, No. 1, 1976, p. 42.

Osborn, Gary. "Validating Physical Agility Tests." The Police Chief. Vol. 43, No. 1, 1976, p. 43.

Woods, Marcella. "The University of Washington Police Officer Physical Efficiency Battery." The Police Chief. Vol. 43, No. 2, 1976.

percent of the U.S.A. departments interviewed indicated that this stage was incorporated into the selection process, while 50% of the international departments surveyed reported that the P.A.T. was being used.

Among U.S.A. departments, 65% indicated that changes had been made in this stage of the process during the last 10 years.<sup>37</sup> A noticeable trend has been toward restructuring the physical agility test to be more job-related by having candidates perform functions normally associated with police work. Less emphasis is being placed on the traditional push-up, pull-up and broad jump exercises. Additionally, change has been stimulated by the high litigation potential stemming from the fact that, in 14 of the 47 departments reporting challenges in the selection process, all have been in connection with the P.A.T.<sup>38</sup> As such, departments have begun to take steps not only to modify the test structure, but to help prepare applicants for the test. Some departments noted that preparation for the test is given through the use of booklets describing the test and related exercises or through physical conditioning programs to prepare applicants for the test. Also, 22% of the U.S.A. departments indicated that a validation study had been conducted, mostly because of litigation.

---

<sup>37</sup> Seven U.S.A. departments reported adding the physical agility test and four stated that this test had been deleted.

<sup>38</sup> The number of challenges of the P.A.T. are second only to the written test. See Appendix D for the types of challenges and the results.

The background investigation, which nearly all U.S.A. and international departments report using, also serves to weed out undesirables; but potentially it can be used as a method to collect behavioral information on the positive qualities of an applicant. The most common areas in which the investigator focuses are as follows: work history; employment record; military record; educational background; criminal record; family/marital history; financial stability/credit; medical history; and the use of narcotics/ alcohol.

The polygraph test, which is sometimes used in the background investigation stage was found to be used by 41% of the 85 U.S.A. departments surveyed but only 3 of the 44 international departments. Several U.S.A. departments and one international department which indicated using the polygraph reported limiting its use to only certain circumstances where further determination of a candidate's credentials was necessary (i.e., used only to check the accuracy of information provided by the applicant at another stage of the selection process).

The B.I. has not been immune to challenge or change. Six of the 47 challenged departments in the survey were found to have been challenged in this area. This selection method has come under fire from applicants and the courts for being discriminatory in its content, or for having an adverse impact on members of minority groups. In regard to change, 53% of the U.S.A. departments surveyed indicated having made at least one change in the structure or content of the background investigation



(e.g., using better trained investigators or a more in-depth investigation format). Of the departments making changes in content, several indicated that changing social norms were responsible for deleting out-dated questions, or relaxation of past standards (e.g., an applicant's experimentation with marijuana is not necessarily an automatic reason for rejection.) Question content has also been changed in part due to increased privacy laws and guidelines which prohibit certain types of questions.<sup>39</sup>

While there have been considerable changes in this stage, validation action was found to be limited to only 6% of the U.S.A. departments. This may be due to the difficulty associated with the assessment of this facet of the process.<sup>40</sup>

A summary of the trends and special features of the physical agility testing and background investigation are reported below.

#### Physical Agility Testing Stage:

- P.A.T. is used more frequently in the U.S.A. than in the international departments under study;
- There is a trend to make the P.A.T. in the U.S.A. more job-related and less strength oriented;
- U.S.A. departments that use a P.A.T. tend to treat females

---

<sup>39</sup> For a discussion of the legal issues surrounding the B.I. and the "nuts and bolts" of conducting a B.I., see Wollack and Associates, "Background Investigators Manual: A Guide to the Evaluation of Municipal Police Officer Applicants." Greenwood, CA: Wollack and Associates, 1977.

<sup>40</sup> Unlike other selection devices that have undergone "validation," the B.I. cannot be assessed using the same approach, and, as a result, little validation research has been conducted.

as a protected class by scoring them differently or making changes in the type of exercises used;

- U.S.A. departments have begun to emphasize test preparation in connection with the P.A.T. stage;
- The P.A.T. has high litigation potential if not job-related and accommodating to females; and
- U.S.A. departments are being pressured to validate the P.A.T. stage of the selection process.

#### Background Investigation Stage:

- Nearly all of the U.S.A. and international departments use some form of a background investigation;
- The use of the polygraph in the U.S.A. is not widespread, and was found being used by only several international departments in the study; and
- There has been considerable effort in the U.S.A. to improve the background investigation stage of the selection process, which has included: modification of questions to reduce adverse effects on minorities and females, more in-depth screening and more training for investigators.

#### Unique Selection Practices Not Covered Elsewhere

In our survey we uncovered four unique selection methods that were atypical, but conceivably are viable considerations for the development of a model selection system. These include: assessment center approach; observation in the academy and in a field training program; a demonstration school; and, a lottery approach.

The assessment center approach has been said to be one of the more innovative selection practices that has been introduced in law enforcement in the last 10 years. Assessment centers have been most widely used in the private sector, and only within the last 15 years have they been incorporated into the law enforce-

ment field, most noticeably in regard to promotion.<sup>41</sup> Its use for selecting entry level officers has been gaining popularity in the last few years, but the expense of implementing the method has deterred widespread use.

The approach emphasizes a multiple assessment technique in which multiple evaluators assess a group of individuals at the same time using a variety of situational tests and simulated exercises. Attention is placed on behavior in connection with crime prevention, report writing, dispute resolution, interaction with the community, and team policing, among others. The true assessment center can replace the written exam, psychological screening and oral interview stages of the selection process.

In our survey, we found 8 U.S.A. and 2 international departments using the assessment center approach as a separate stage of the selection process, usually as a final stage prior to the academy. Unfortunately, the high cost of administering the assessment center has resulted in its being dropped by some departments, for example, Ft. Collins, Colorado, one of the earliest departments to use the method. One effort to minimize cost has been to set up regional assessment centers where a number of departments can send final applicants for testing prior to selection in the academy. This is being done in British Columbia,

---

<sup>41</sup> Ross, Joyce. "Determination of the Predictive Validity of the Assessment Center Approach to Selecting Police Managers." Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 8, 1980, p. 89-96.

Canada<sup>42</sup> as well as Florida,<sup>43</sup> reportedly with good results.

Another emerging feature in personnel selection for law enforcement is to use academy training and/or field training programs as an observatory which constitutes the final stages of the selection process. In these final stages, the applicant's behavior (i.e., job performance) is observed and evaluated in the academy training and on-the-job training settings. If a candidate successfully completes these stages, he or she becomes a commissioned law enforcement officer.

During the early 1970s, the Dayton Police Department<sup>44</sup> considered academy training as one of the most critical stages of the selection process. Additionally, the San Jose Police Department has considered field training and further, has validated the field training. Recently, Florida has incorporated the "systematic approach" for hiring, by integrating all phases of hiring, training and retention of officers into a six-part process, including: recruitment; recruit selection; psychological testing; classroom academy training; field training officer

---

42 Twelve municipal departments in British Columbia send final candidates to the Justice Institute of British Columbia in Vancouver for one day assessment center exercises in six areas.

43 The Miami-Dade County Assessment Center is located at Miami-Dade County Community College in Miami, Florida.

44 See Angell, John E. and Gilson, John, "Dayton Police Training." Journal of Law Enforcement Education and Training. Vol. 1, No. 2, June, 1972, p. 58.

practice is usually incorporated into a selection system that considers observation in the academy and a field training program to be critical stages in the selection process.

#### Summary of Selection Trends and Special Features

Departments are making changes in their selection practices in an effort to bring the selection criteria more closely in focus with actual job responsibilities; however, much of the impetus has come from outside departmental walls. The nature of change in law enforcement selection practices has centered around (1) re-assessment and modification of current selection methods to reduce discrimination and (2) development of testing devices which accurately measure a candidate's ability to perform successfully in the field.

Traditionally, the selection process has been designed to successfully screen out applicants through a series of minimum standards and testing devices. The major problem with this "hurdle approach" is that the written test, commonly used at the first stage of the process, may be the least job-related stage of the sequence, and hence, a good number of candidates who might have proved themselves later in the process are rejected first.

More controversy and hence, research, has been conducted with respect to the written test than any other method. It has consistently come under fire for lack of validity (in testing what it is supposed to), but remains in use by nearly all departments (supplemented by validation studies to prove its job-relatedness). The oral interview remains a method cemented into

the process, and changes in the oral board make-up and interview content reflect efforts to make the interview a more accurate method of measuring a person's interpersonal skills. In the area of psychological screening, comparatively little has changed in that most departments administer a standardized test. However, there appears to be a trend toward more use of psychologists in the selection process. In both the oral interview and psychological screening stages, some departments are incorporating use of situational tests and simulation exercises to observe an applicant's behavior in real life situations.

The physical agility tests are being redesigned to shift focus from exercises of strength to physical exercises more representative of actual police duties. Candidates are also given better preparation to successfully complete this test. Much of the change noted with respect to the background interview has been to streamline the interview to exclude discriminatory or irrelevant questions and to focus more in-depth on the applicant's background characteristics such as criminal record, etc.

The assessment center approach has gained in popularity because of its ability to more accurately predict future job performance, but the cost of administration remains prohibitive for most departments. The concept of regionalized centers is growing. A few departments are using observation at the academy and field training stage as a regular selection method and are stressing the importance of incorporating this method into the selection process. Additional unique features that are being

used by several departments include a demonstration school where final candidates and sworn officers mingle in a relaxed atmosphere and a lottery system which emphasizes fairness and equity.

## Section IV

### SELECTION METHOD RATINGS BASED ON DPS CRITERIA

Following the examination of law enforcement selection practices in U.S.A. and elsewhere, the Justice Center's research team and the Department of Public Safety's personnel officer rated key selection methods that were based on three selection considerations: trainability, interpersonal skills and fairness. That is, does the method generate behavioral information which can be used to identify trainable candidates irrespective of their present ability? Does the method determine an applicant's level of interpersonal skills or potential for developing such skills; and is the method fair to all groups of applicants? Two additional criteria, cost and litigation potential, received secondary consideration.

This assessment focused on the prevalent law enforcement selection methods that were discussed in the state of the art section of the report. These were the written test, psychological screening (including testing and interviewing), physical agility test, background investigation (including the polygraph), oral interview, assessment center simulations, observation in academy training and observation in field training. Our rating of each selection method reflected the degree to which we felt departmental use of a particular device generates fair and equitable behavioral information that can help identify candidates who are



trainable and who have acceptable interpersonal skills or the potential to develop such skills. Later, in Section V of the report, we will discuss the potential of particular selection methods for generating behavioral information which is relevant to these considerations.

An examination of Table 4.1 shows that we gave the written test the lowest rating of all selection methods when using the assessment criteria desired by the Alaska DPS. The basis for our rating of poor is as follows. In regard to trainability our survey showed that the written test was generally used to generate information about a candidate's current cognitive ability rather than his or her potential to apply cognitive knowledge. Even in instances where departments were using intelligence tests, there was serious question about the extent to which cultural biases of such tests screened out trainable candidates. Additionally, we found that pass/fail cutoff scores were normally established arbitrarily.

The written test was viewed as a particularly ineffective way to generate information about a candidate's interpersonal skills. While the written test may measure the extent to which a candidate knows how to relate to the public, co-workers and superiors, this selection device does not measure the degree to which one can behave in a desirable manner.

We also gave the written test a poor rating on fairness. It should be stressed that in the past 10 years, a great deal of

Table 4.1 Rating of Law Enforcement Selection Methods Used in Other Jurisdictions by the Alaska Public Safety Criteria

SELECTION METHOD	PUBLIC SAFETY CRITERIA		
	Trainability	Interpersonal Skills	Fairness
Written Test	Poor	Poor	Poor <sup>a/</sup>
Background Investigation	Poor	Fair	Poor-Fair
Physical Agility Test	Fair	N/A	Good
Psychological Testing/Interview	Fair	Fair-Good	Fair-Good
Oral Interview	Fair-Good	Fair-Good	Fair-Good
Assessment Center Simulation	Fair	Good	Fair-Good
Academy Training Observation	Good-Excellent	Fair-Good	Good
Field Training Observation	Good-Excellent	Good-Excellent	Fair-Good

<sup>a/</sup> This method has been challenged more than any other method for being culturally biased.

attention has been placed on making the written test fair by courts demanding that tests be job-related. Even with this attention, however, the written test has not shown that it can produce information which can be used to indiscriminately identify trainable candidates who have the potential to develop acceptable interpersonal skills. Additionally, the large number of departments which were found to give special consideration to minorities, suggests that the scores of these applicants are disproportionately lower than other applicants, regardless of whether or not the test has been validated.

We rated the background investigation slightly higher than the written test: poor on trainability; fair on interpersonal skills; and poor to fair on fairness. Our survey showed that this selection method is not being used to identify trainable candidates but to weed out undesirables, and, on a limited basis, to check the accuracy and completeness of information about their past. Some interpersonal behavioral information is usually obtained in a background check, but again, this is not its main purpose. There is also serious question about the fairness of the method as it is commonly used. A few departments have improved fairness of this device by reducing adverse effects on minorities and women. While our rating is based only on how the background investigation is currently being used, this selection device could be effectively used to produce unbiased information about a candidate's trainability and interpersonal skill development.

In assessing the physical agility test, we realized that this device can only generate partial data on identifying trainable candidates, and no information about one's interpersonal skills. Our rating of fair for trainability was based on the survey results that showed a number of departments providing opportunities for applicants to train themselves. This preparation shows that some attention is being placed on trainability in the area of the physical fitness aspect of law enforcement. We also noted increased emphasis placed on helping applicants prepare for the physical agility test. This action was viewed as an indication of a fair selection practice. Another reason for our good rating on fairness of the physical agility test was that some departments had lowered the passing score for female applicants.

Psychological screening, oral interview and the assessment center were viewed, in varying degrees, as acceptable types of selection devices which produce information that can be used to make decisions about trainability and interpersonal skills of candidates. Differences in the acceptability of these three methods are noted below.

While psychological tests being used do not produce behavioral information, we rated psychological screening as fair on trainability because of the increased involvement of psychologists in the selection process. The psychological interview can generate data on past behavior of applicants which could be used to help identify trainable applicants. We gave the oral interview a slightly higher rating (fair-good) because there was evi-

dence in our survey that some departments were using a one person interview early in the selection process to generate information on past behavior, whereas the psychologist normally becomes involved later in the selection process. The assessment center, which focuses on simulated behavior, was given a fair rating on trainability because it has potential for generating such information, but currently the data tends to focus more on present abilities rather than on potential abilities.

In regard to interpersonal skills, we rated the psychological screening and oral interview as fair to good and the assessment center approach as good. The latter device was given a slightly higher rating because information can be produced through simulation that may be a more accurate assessment of one's present level of interpersonal skills than data based on past behavior.

When fairness was considered, we rated psychological screening, oral interview and the assessment center as fair-to-good. In our survey, these three devices were found to produce some job-related behavior information; however, there was potential for cultural bias toward minorities in cases where communication skills were heavily weighted.

Academy training and field training have been recognized by a number of departments as critical stages of the selection process. In terms of assessing trainability, we considered direct observation of a candidate's performance as the most effective way to determine whether or not an individual is trainable. As such, we rated direct observation in the academy and field

training settings as good-to-excellent. Similarly, observation of candidates' interpersonal skills in a training situation was considered most desirable. It should be noted that we rated the field training program as more desirable than the academy for observation of this behavior because the former setting provides more diverse experiences than the latter setting. That is, in a field training situation, candidates can be observed interacting with the public, co-workers and superiors, whereas an academy setting only provides opportunities to interact with co-workers and superiors. In contrast, observation at the academy training stage was given a slightly higher rating on fairness (rating of good) than observation in a field training program (fair-good). These ratings were based upon the fact that more supervisors are involved in observing candidates at the academy than in a field training program.

When we examined the above selection methods according to cost and litigation potential, several trends were apparent. First, the litigation potential for all selection methods was lowered in a number of departments by having a validation study performed which met at least concurrent validity criteria. The potential for court action could be reduced even lower by establishing predictive validity for each selection method. Second, whenever selection methods were validated, the initial costs for use of the method were usually high. Additionally, the operational cost was found to be high for assessment centers; however, several jurisdictions have formed regional assessment

centers which reduces the cost.

Selection methods which were rated above tend to vary in their utility to produce unbiased information which can be used to assess an applicant's trainability and interpersonal skills. Our evaluation has shown the written test to be the least desirable method being used by the survey departments when taking into consideration the DPS's criteria. The background investigation received only slightly higher ratings, while the physical ability test was found to be too limited in its scope to be evaluated by all criteria. Acceptable ratings were given to the oral interview, psychological testing/interview when psychologists were involved, and the assessment center method. Direct observation of candidates' performance in the academy and in a field training program was considered the most desirable method for identifying law enforcement candidates according to the DPS criteria.

## Section V

### OPTIONS FOR DEVELOPING A MODEL SELECTION SYSTEM

This section presents decision making options that allow for various selection devices to be combined in a fashion which highlights a fair and equitable approach to the selection of applicants on the basis of trainability and interpersonal skills. The previously discussed "state of the art" results and selection method ratings established the basis for posing specific options. We intend to provide a decision making configuration which will assist the Alaska Department of Public Safety in developing the selection model of its choice. Additionally, we suggest consideration of a particular evaluation and validation strategy which can be implemented concurrently with the selection model decided upon by DPS.

The decision making options for developing a model selection system consist of two forms. First, decisions have to be made about the process in general (i.e., will applicants be screened in or screened out of the process; how many stages or components will the process have?). Second, there are decisions to be made about the selection devices or methods to be used within each stage of the model selection system.

#### Decisions About the Selection Process

While the evidence is clear that law enforcement selection is geared to "screening out" large numbers of applicants, we suggest a positive selection approach which appears to be more suitable



for selecting applicants on the basis of trainability and interpersonal skills development. This approach focuses on the use of selection devices to "screen in" applicants based on positive attributes. The idea is to view the process as beginning with no candidates available for (x) number of unfilled positions for which (y) acceptable candidates have to be found. This is in contrast to the traditional view which sees the process beginning with a large pool of applicants, most of which have to be screened out. Additionally, a screening in approach directs the use of selection devices to search for positive information rather than negative information about applicants. Also, a truly positive selection system creates reinforcements at each stage of the process to ensure that applicants have the opportunity to demonstrate their maximum potential. Conversely, a screen out system creates hurdles which are designed to identify weakness. Finally, a positive selection system has composite scoring procedures in which applicants accumulate points for positive strengths, and unlike the screen out system, does not screen out applicants for weaknesses not known to negatively affect job performance.

It cannot be overemphasized that identifying applicants who are trainable and who can relate to people requires the development of a positive selection approach which focuses on the behavior of applicants. As discussed previously, there are selection methods which can be used to retrieve information on past behavior, simulated behavior and job performance.

A second decision making consideration about the selection process is the number of stages necessary to select law enforcement candidates. Again, DPS's concerns and also the state merit system seem to lead to certain conclusions. We envision a model selection system that is comprised of at least three stages. DPS's interest in "trainability" suggests that stage one entails orchestrating selection devices to produce information on past behavior of applicants which focuses on work, education and training experiences. The second stage would be comprised of other selection devices to produce past and simulated job-related behavior for establishing a ranked eligibility list. Since observed job performance is most critical for DPS's interests in question, the third stage would evolve around the academy training and the field training program. Examples of other departments that have collected information in a training setting for selection purposes include Dayton, Ohio, San Jose, California, and a number of Florida departments. Individuals who are under consideration for employment can be referred to as "applicants" in stages one and two and as "candidates" in stage three.

In summary, DPS's emphasis on trainability and interpersonal skills qualifying criteria directed our attention to a positive selection approach which relies on behavior information for selection purposes. Additionally, at least three stages of the selection process are needed that include a stage for indentifying trainable applicants, a stage for establishing an eligibility

list for employment, and a stage for determining final candidates.

### Decisions About Selection Methods

#### Stage I: Identifying Trainable Applicants

As stated previously, a minimum of three stages are suggested for the model selection process decided upon by the Alaska DPS. In stage one, the objective is to form a pool of trainable applicants based upon behavior data which are produced by particular selection methods. It is important to emphasize that a positive selection approach will exclude certain methods that have traditionally been used to screen out applicants (i.e., the written test and the psychological test).

There are important decisions to be made at stage one. First, it has to be decided which selection methods will produce the amount and type of information necessary to decide who qualifies for advancement to the next stage of the process. A second decision is whether applicant's trainability is weighted equally, on the basis of homogeneous groupings, or on an individual basis. Regarding the first decision, we identified from our survey departments and experiences with other law enforcement agencies, three selection devices that can potentially generate the trainability data. These are a social history questionnaire, a reference questionnaire and a one-person oral interview.

The social history questionnaire can be implemented as an addendum to the current state application form and would be completed by all persons who apply for employment with the

Division of State Troopers and the Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection.<sup>48</sup> This questionnaire would address past behavior in connection with employment (part-time and full-time), education, and training in which the applicant was supervised or taught by a skilled person. Particular emphasis should be placed on an applicant's experiences that relate to dealing with the public.

A follow-up questionnaire could also be sent to teachers, trainers and supervisors to whom the applicant referred in the social history questionnaire. In line with a positive selection approach, questions should elicit information on positive strengths, not information on signs of pathological disorders.

Another selection device which could aid in the search for information on trainability is a one-person oral interview.<sup>49</sup> Since there is some cost and time of DPS involved, this method may be limited to cases where there is marginal trainability information available. Based on our survey data, several suggestions can be made about implementation of this selection device. First, a number of Public Safety personnel should be trained in interviewing. Second, interview questions should be constructed to tap trainability, and inter-coder reliability

---

<sup>48</sup> See Appendix E for an example of a questionnaire being used by the Hampton Police Department in Virginia, U.S.A. and a supplemental experience statement that the City of Fresno, California, U.S.A. requires in place of a written exam.

<sup>49</sup> In Canadian departments we found use of this method as the first stage of the selection process. Departments larger than the Alaska DPS interviewed all applicants who met the pre-selection minimum requirements.

should be established among DPS interviewers. Third, the interview should be conducted in a location close to where the applicant lives.

The selection devices discussed above are intended to produce information for establishing a pool of trainable applicants who qualify for the next stage of the process. We found in our survey that some departments ranked applicants at this stage as DPS currently does and other departments did not. We suggest that the trainable applicants be weighted equally or that homogeneous groupings be formed which can be ranked. These options are suggested because of the difficulty in establishing a fair ranking system which is based on trainability data. At best, homogeneous groups can be identified which can be ranked. For example, if college graduates are classified as the most trainable groups, then these applicants as a group would be ranked number one. If applicants who have been promoted in a previous job dealing with the public are considered to be the next most trainable, then this group would be second, and so on. The problem with group ranking is that we really do not know at this point whether the first group or the second group is more trainable. Should DPS decide to conduct a rigorous evaluation and validation of its model selection system, empirical data would then be available to decide whether or not one type of experience yields a more trainable applicant than another type of experience.

## Stage II: Establishing an Eligibility List

Stage two addresses the establishment of an eligibility list for selecting candidates who qualify for the demonstration stage of the process (i.e., training).<sup>50</sup> Two sets of decisions have to be made by DPS at this juncture. First, guidelines have to be established to determine who will compete for the final eligibility list. Second, decisions have to be made about what method or combination of methods should be used to produce information for ranking applicants for the eligibility list.

In regard to the first decision, there are several options that can be explored. One option is to allow everyone who qualifies as trainable in stage one an opportunity to compete for the eligibility list in stage two. This would ensure fairness; however, the cost may be high depending upon the number of selection devices used during stage two. There is another option which still ensures fairness and greatly reduces cost. First, determine how many applicants are needed to be processed through stage two to ensure that a sufficient number are available for the eligibility list.<sup>51</sup> Second, draw that number at random from the pool of trainable applicants to be processed through stage

---

<sup>50</sup> A final eligibility list with ranked applicants is required by the Alaska Merit System.

<sup>51</sup> One way of determining the number needed is to analyze the dropout or failure rate for prior selection cycles and then add that number to the number of positions available in the academy.

two.<sup>52</sup> The remaining trainable applicants who were not chosen for stage two processing would remain in the pool for the next selection cycle. If DPS wants to make sure certain groups are equally or over-represented on the eligibility list, the trainable pool can be divided into homogeneous groups from which a random sample is drawn from each group represented. For example, if it is desirable to have applicants with special skills (e.g., management skills) well represented in the competition for the eligibility list, then these applicants would be placed in one group and the remaining applicants would comprise another group. From each of these groups the desired number of applicants would be selected at random. Any grouping (e.g., minorities/non-minorities) can be established so long as applicants within each group are chosen in a random fashion.

Decisions regarding appropriate selection methods for establishing the eligibility list in stage two are more complex. As a starting point, we reviewed the state of the art results and ratings for acceptable methods that could generate additional information on positive strengths of the applicants. This information could be used to form composite scores for ranking applicants on an eligibility list.

It is envisioned that some combination of five methods can be used to obtain sufficient information for establishing the eligibility list. These devices are as follows: oral interview;

---

<sup>52</sup> This option is based on the assumption that DPS decides it is not feasible to try to rank applicants within the trainable pool.

situational testing; psychological evaluation; background investigation;<sup>53</sup> and a medical exam. While physical agility is important in law enforcement, we feel that it is not cost effective to administer a separate test for assessing this quality. Sufficient data can be obtained on an applicant's physical agility through pre-selection stage requirements (e.g., weight proportion to height, a medical observation during the academy training). We do suggest, however, that more consideration be given to the importance of physical fitness in the performance of operational duties.

Based on our research, it appears that the oral interview board is the best method around which other methods can be designed to provide supplemental data. Structurally, three to five people can make up the oral board. Since DPS has set a high priority on the ability of law enforcement officers to work with the public (oftentimes under stressful situations), the board should include a community representative and a psychologist. Additionally, an experienced state trooper and/or fish and wildlife protection officer, and a DPS headquarters staff member should be placed on the board.<sup>54</sup> As was the case in a number of

---

<sup>53</sup> The background investigation is included as an optional selection device because of the potential to generate information on the positive strength of candidates, not because of its current use for this purpose.

<sup>54</sup> If feasible, a clinical psychologist may be added to the DPS staff. One of his/her functions could be to serve on the oral board. Notably, a majority of the survey departments either employed a psychologist full time and/or contracted psychological services.



survey departments, DPS should consider having minorities and women board members available, particularly when interviewing minority and women applicants. This consideration has been said to help create an interview setting in which more accurate information could be obtained from such applicants.<sup>55</sup>

Developing an intensive training program, not an orientation program, for board members is imperative. The state of the art results revealed that a number of areas should be considered in such a training program. These areas include the following: creation of a relaxed atmosphere for applicants; familiarity with the selection philosophy; familiarity with EEO guidelines; establishment of inter-scorer reliability; and development of communication skills. Modalities mentioned by survey departments which can be used to train board members include lecture, discussion and role playing.

The general trend regarding the type of questions being asked by oral board members across the country appears to be that the questions are job-related, that they are specific, and that they allow applicants an opportunity to provide full explanations. We suggest that these types of questions be constructed to focus on uncovering information about the positive strengths of applicants. Special emphasis should be placed on designing all questions so that behavior can be tapped. Moreover, this behav-

---

<sup>55</sup> Special attention should be given to omitting women from the board who believe women should not be in law enforcement. This has been a problem in some departments.

ioral data should be used in a composite scoring scheme that is consistent with a positive selection approach. Questions should also be constructed so that there is a high level of consistency among all board members regarding the scoring of applicants.

Oral boards should also be sequenced so that members can review the results from a background investigation. It is important for the background investigation to be tailored to validate the accuracy of information and to uncover additional positive strengths. While the polygraph can be used to validate the accuracy of information, use of this device is more appropriate for a "screening out" philosophy than for a "screening in" approach. A large majority of the survey departments reported not using the polygraph even with select systems that are designed to weed applicants out.

Situational tests can provide the oral board with additional data on positive strengths of applicants, particularly in the area of interpersonal skills.<sup>56</sup> We found in our survey that a number of departments rely on data from various types of situational tests. Of utmost importance to DPS is information about applicants' interpersonal skills or their potential to develop such skills. There are standardized simulated exercises available which have been developed specifically for law

---

<sup>56</sup> See Appendix F for a comparison of selection methods (including situational testing and the traditional oral board) on various job performance qualities.

enforcement.<sup>57</sup> If simulated behavioral information is desirable in other areas (e.g., leadership) there are also these types of exercises available. Notably, when using situational tests, it is important that a psychologist play a key role in administering and evaluating the test results.

A personal interview with the psychologist can yield still additional information about an applicant's mental health. However, due to additional time and expense, it is suggested that this method be used only in special cases where other selection methods leave unanswered questions about an applicant. In regard to an applicant's physical health, DPS can require all applicants who are selected for the eligibility list to have a complete physical exam either at the applicant's expense or at DPS's expense.

A final decision in connection with selection methods for Stage II is whether to continue convening the oral board in one location or whether to regionalize it. Regionalization, which is not uncommon in Canada, entails appointing and training a cluster of board members in the community in which the applicant lives or lives close to. The establishment of regionalized oral boards should also take into consideration the proximity of the State

---

<sup>57</sup> Dunnette, Marvin and Motowidlo, Stephen. Development of a Personnel Selection and Career Assessment System for Police Officers in Patrol, Investigative, Supervisory and Command Positions. For the U.S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C.: Personnel Decisions, Inc. 1975.

Trooper and Fish and Wildlife detachment units. If feasible, scoring consistency can be enhanced by having a psychologist and/or DPS headquarters staff person be a member of each board.

There are several apparent advantages to regionalizing stage two of the selection process. First, since Alaska is so large and so diverse, culturally speaking, local citizens could enhance the collection of accurate and valid information on applicants from the same area. Second, regionalization could expose more citizens to the realities of law enforcement which has been found elsewhere to enhance the relationship between citizens and law enforcement officers. Third, more law enforcement officers would receive special training through their participation in the selection process, particularly in the area of community relations. Some departments have found such participation to positively affect officers' performance upon returning to their normal duties.

In summary, stage two of DPS's model selection system should focus on orchestrating five selection methods to produce data for ranking applicants on an eligibility list. DPS administrators have to make decisions in two areas. First, they have to decide whether to process all trainable applicants who are identified in stage one, or whether to select a desired number of applicants from the trainable pool in some random fashion. Second, decisions must be made about the selection devices which DPS feels can yield sufficient information about applicants for ranking purposes. Selection methods suggested in this report revolve

around a regionalized oral interview board whose membership includes a community representative, a state trooper and/or fish and wildlife officer, a psychologist, and a DPS headquarters staff person. We further suggest that supplemental information can be generated by a background investigation, situational tests, a medical exam, and, in special cases, a psychological evaluation. An intensive training program for all board members is viewed as paramount.

### Stage III: Assessing Candidates' Performance in Training

Stage III provides the DPS an opportunity to assess the final pool of candidates selected from the ranked eligibility list. The setting for this stage is the academy training and field training program. From a selection perspective, training can be thought of as a series of demonstration exercises in which a candidate's behavior can be assessed by direct observation.

Incorporating training as part of the selection process is not new. For example, our research uncovered that in Florida, U.S.A., the Division of Criminal Justice Standards and Training has moved to incorporate both academy training and field training into the selection process for all major Florida police departments. Additionally, the San Jose Police Department in California, U.S.A., considers the field training program to be one of the most important components of the selection process. Moreover, the Dayton, Ohio, U.S.A., Police Department has, in the past, incorporated academy and field training as critical elements of personnel selection.

The decision making design for this third and final stage of a model law enforcement selection process addresses two considerations. First, in line with positive selection considerations, we suggest that positive reinforcements be built into this stage so that a candidate's full potential will be revealed in the academy and field training. Second, an assessment scheme should be devised that highlights trainability and contact with the public.

The idea of positive reinforcement is being suggested at this stage of the selection process for two reasons. One reason is that it is anticipated that the DPS's continuing efforts to recruit Alaska Natives, coupled with re-designing its selection system, will significantly increase the percentage of Natives being selected for stage three processing. It is also anticipated that the cultural shock produced in the academy has the potential to easily eliminate a disproportionate number from this minority group who might be valuable law enforcement personnel. As such, building in positive reinforcements may insure a higher percentage of successful Native candidates being available for assignment. Another reason for positive reinforcement at the training stage is that there is a large cost savings for every candidate who, if because of positive reinforcement, successfully demonstrates the ability to be trainable, particularly in working with the public.

We suggest two types of positive reinforcement methods to be considered for implementation. First, there should be a positive

orientation program for all candidates who are about to enter the academy. This program should prepare candidates for academy training by describing the training in detail and by explaining the philosophy behind the training approach. Additionally, the candidates should have an opportunity to interact with State Troopers and Fish and Wildlife Protection Officers in a work setting prior to entry into the academy. This experience would not only help prepare candidates for academy training but would also help them decide whether they really want to become law enforcement officers. It is important to develop this program in line with the philosophy of a positive selection approach.

A second suggestion borrowed from private industry and the military is to design a buddy system which could be particularly effective in the case of Native American candidates.<sup>58</sup> This can involve pairing candidates during the academy and field training to provide reinforcement for each other. During the field training program, members of special groups such as Native Americans and females can also be assigned to an experienced officer of the same ethnic background or sex. This added support system would supplement the field training officer's training efforts.

---

<sup>58</sup> In the early 1970's the Criminal Justice Training Academy in Dayton, Ohio, U.S.A., implemented a buddy system in its field training program.

The DPS also needs to consider designing assessment devices and procedures for stage three that will complement the positive reinforcement elements of the training setting, and that will highlight candidates' ability to work with the public. Assessment information can be obtained from two sources. First, instructors and supervisors should evaluate each candidate using procedures that focus on observable behavior that is quantifiable. That is, rather than rate candidates according to a "happiness" index, the observers would be supplied with procedures for recording specific behavior of interest. For a designated period of the training, this behavior should be scored for evaluation and for feedback to candidates. These procedures should highlight positive behavior, particularly in instances where candidates correct previous mistakes. Candidates should also be well informed about what behavior is expected; consequently, the observers only have to assess the degree to which candidates can perform in a desired manner, not whether they will be motivated to perform under unsupervised conditions.

It is important for citizens to be involved in the assessment of law enforcement candidates. We suggest that candidates be monitored by obtaining feedback from citizens who have requested law enforcement services. This would require designing a short questionnaire which could be administered by telephone or in person to selected citizens who have had contact with candidates. Procedures can be developed so that this information can be analyzed quickly for consideration in each candidate's final evaluation for a position with the Divisions of State Troopers or State



## Fish and Wildlife Protection.

In summary, stage three comprises the final stage of the selection process in which behavior of candidates is observed during the academy and field training. In line with a positive selection approach, we suggested that the DPS design positive reinforcements for this stage to insure fairness to all groups and to enhance success by creating an atmosphere in which candidates can demonstrate their maximum potential. Two positive reinforcements were offered, a pre-academy orientation program for candidates and a buddy program. We also suggested that a behaviorally based evaluation system be designed that uses law enforcement supervisors and citizens as the primary source of information.

### Implementation Strategy

In the presentation above we have presented options for a model selection system. The model is based on a positive selection approach and is conceptualized as a process involving three stages. Within each of these stages, various decisions have been identified that require DPS's attention. We have also presented options on how to structure each stage and what selection methods are most appropriate for each stage.

Our final set of suggestions pertains to decisions about implementing DPS's model selection system. First and foremost is the decision about whether or not to implement the new model. In arriving at this decision, we suggest that high priority be given

to incorporating an evaluation and validation component into the implementation plan. This would entail the following considerations. A strategy can be designed to produce two types of results. One type of result concerns answering questions about whether the model selection system is more effective than the old selection system. This would require a comparison of the performance of candidates who were processed during the two 1981 cycles with two or three groups of candidates who were processed through the model selection system. Candidates of the two groups would be compared on academy performance, field training officer observation and citizen evaluation.

Another type of result that can be produced is predictive validity information on the indicators used to determine trainability (stage one), to determine the ranking for the eligibility list (stage two) and to determine academy and field training success (stage three). This would require a sufficient number of candidates processed through the model selection system (i.e., at least 100 candidates). Notably, such information would be valuable in the future to determine what happened as a result of the model selection system and what steps should be taken to improve the selection process.

If the above evaluation and validation strategy is important, a second key decision concerns the implementation date. The time schedule should be designed for the 1982 selection cycle. It is suggested that three months be allowed for construction of evaluation instruments and the development of material for stage one

of the model selection system. It is also suggested that the model selection system be considered a pilot project for three selection cycles which will allow sufficient time to evaluate the model and validate its component parts.

In summary, we suggest that the DPS's choice of a model selection system be evaluated and its key components be validated. This decision would provide the department with valuable information and would establish the department as among the first to have information about what happens as a result of making significant changes in its selection process.

POLICE SELECTION PROJECT  
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCE MATERIALS

GENERAL SELECTION INFORMATION MATERIALS:

Abrams, Nancy. "Sharing Selection Materials." Intergovernmental Personnel Notes of the U. S. Office of Personnel Management. Washington, DC: 1981, Jan.-Febr., 15.

Barry, David; Goldstein, Robert and Smith, Thomas Spence. The Screening and Selection of Police Candidates in Rochester, New York for the Rochester-Monroe County Criminal Justice Pilot City Program. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester, Graduate School of Management, 1975.

Bresler, Samuel. "Automating the Examining Process." Intergovernmental Personnel Notes of the U. S. Office of Personnel Management. Washington, DC: 1981, Jan.-Febr., 23-28.

Caulfield, Barbara A. The Chicago Police Department: Access to Information, Personnel Practices and Internal Control--A Review of Major Reports. Chicago: Chicago Law Enforcement Study Group, U. S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, 1975.

Chaiken, Jan M. & Cohen, Bernard. Police Civil Service Selection Procedures in New York City: Comparison of Ethnic Groups. New York, NY: The New York City Rand Institute, 1973.

Chiuramonte, Robert M. "Applicant Screening Process." The Police Chief, 1974, 41 (7), July, 49-50.

Collier, Patrick. "The Policeman--Selection and Training." Medico-Legal Journal, 1977, 45 (1), 4-18.

Conser, James A. & Thompson, Roger D. Police Selection Standards and Processes in Ohio: An Assessment. Youngstown, OH: Criminal Justice Dept., Youngstown State University, 1976.

Cordner, Gary W. "Job Analysis and the Police: Benefits and Limitations." Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1980, 8 (3), 355-362.

Dunnette, Marvin D. and Motowidlo, Stephen J. Development of a Personnel Selection and Career Assessment System for Police Officers in Patrol, Investigative, Supervisory and Command Positions. For the U. S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C.: Personnel Decisions, Inc., 1975.

-----, Research: Police Selection and Career Assessment. For the U. S. Dept. of Justice, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1976.

Eisenberg, Terry; Kent, Deborah Ann and Wall, Charles R. Police Personnel Practices in State and Local Governments. Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1973.

"Employment Screening Practices." 1981 Guidebook to Fair Employment Practices, Chapter 4. Chicago: Commerce Clearing House, 1980.

Florida State University, Center for Educational Technology. Job Task Analysis of Florida Law Enforcement Officers: Executive Summary. For the Florida Dept. of Law Enforcement, Police Standards and Training Commission. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1981.

Flynn, J. T. and Peterson, M. "The Use of Regression Analysis in Police Patrolmen Selection." The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science. 1972, 63 (4), December, 564-569.

Greisinger, George W.; Slovak, Jeffrey S. and Malkup, Joseph J. Civil Service Systems: Their Impact on Police Administration. For the U. S. Dept of Justice, LEAA, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, DC: USGPO, 1979.

IPMA: Catalogue of Assessment Services. Washington, DC: International Personnel Management Association, 1980.

Jackson, Robert J., researcher and compiler. Selection and Training of Police Officers: Phase I. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Assoc. of Chiefs of Police, Inc.

Job Analysis for Recruit Selection in a State Police Agency. Washington, DC: Institute for Manpower Management, 1975.

Junger-Tas, J. Basic Police Training and Police Performance in the Netherlands: Some Preliminary Findings of an Evaluation Study on Police Training. Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre of the Ministry of Justice, 1977.

Katz, Howard A. "Minimum Reading and Writing Proficiency Standards for Police Applicants." The Police Chief, 1978, 45 (10), October, 297-299.

Kersey, Donald K. & Tarrant County Personnel Dept. Law Enforcement Applicant Selection Study: Phase I. For the Tarrant County Sheriff's Dept. Ft. Worth, TX: Tarrant County Personnel Dept., 1973.

Kersey, Donald K. & Tarrant County Personnel Dept. Law Enforcement Applicant Selection Study: Phase II. For the Tarrant County Sheriff's Dept. Ft. Worth, TX: Tarrant County Personnel Dept., 1973.

Knights, Ronald M. The Relationship Between the Selection Process and On the Job Performance of Albuquerque Police Officers. Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1976.

Marshall, Robert. "The Selection Consortia: Progress Through Joint Effort." Intergovernmental Personnel Notes of the U. S. Office of Personnel Management. Washington, DC: 1981, Jan.-Febr., 13-22.

Mc Creedy, Kenneth R. "Selection Practices and the Police Role." The Police Chief, 1974, 41 (7), July, 41-43.

National Directory of Law Enforcement Administrators and Correctional Institutions, vol. 15. Milwaukee: National Police Chiefs and Sheriffs Information Bureau, 1979.

Office of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs. State Personnel Management Projects and Programs: A Review of Recent Developments. Washington, DC: Office of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs, 1980.

Office of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs. Summary of Selected IPA Products. Washington, DC: USGPO, 1981.

Office of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs. How to Develop Job-Related Personnel Selection Procedures. Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Personnel Management, USGPO, 1979.

Office of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs. Improving Personnel Selection Through New Approaches to Classification. Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Personnel Management, USGPO, 1981.

Poland, James M. "Police Selection Methods and the Prediction of Police Performance." Journal of Police Science and Administration. 1978, 6 (4) Oct., 347-393.

Spielberger, Charles D., ed. Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Pub. Corp. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979.

Stahl, O. Glenn & Staufenberger, R. H., eds. Police Personnel Administration. Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1974.

Sterling, James W. "College Level Entry Requirement: A Real or Imagined Cure-All." The Police Chief, 1974, 41 (8), Aug., 28,30-31.

Stinchcomb, James D. "Law Enforcement Personnel Development." Modern Police Administration by Schultz, Donald O. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company, 1979.

Tejada, Susan, ed. Intergovernmental Personnel Notes of the U. S. Office of Personnel Programs. Washington, DC: 1978, Sept.-Oct.

Territo, Leonard; Swanson, C.R. and Chamelin, Neil C. The Police Personnel Selection Process. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishers, 1977.

U. S. Civil Service Commission. Job Analysis for Improved Job-Related Selection: A Guide for State and Local Governments. Washington, DC: Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs, USGPO, 1975.

Weber, James K. "It Can Work For You: Multnomah County Has No Difficulty Recruiting and Retaining College Graduates." Police Chief, 1973, 40 (10), Oct., 41-43.

White, Thomas W. & Bloch, Peter B. Police Officer Height and Selected Aspects of Performance. Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1975.

WRITTEN TEST INFORMATION MATERIALS:

McClung, Glenn G. Public Employment Practices Bulletin 7: Considerations in Developing Test Passing Points. Chicago: International Personnel Management Assoc., 1974.

Rosenfeld, Michael & Thornton, Richard F. The Development and Validation of a Multijurisdictional Police Examination. Chicago: International Personnel Management Assoc., 1976.

Schacter, Hindy Lauer. "Job-Related Examinations for Police: Two Developments". Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1979, 7 (1), 86-89.

Wollack, and Associates. Test Administration Manual. For the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement, Officer Standards and Education, Field Services Division, Management Services Section. Austin, TX: Texas Commission on Law Enforcement, 1977.



PSYCHOLOGICAL SCREENING INFORMATION MATERIALS:

Baehr, Melany E.; Fewcon, John E.; Froemel, Ernest C.; & Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago. Psychological Assessment of Patrolman Qualifications in Relation to Field Performance. Chicago: LEAA Grant #046 to Chicago Police Dept, 1968.

Beutler, Larry E. & O'Leary, Dennis. "Psychological Screening of Police Candidates." The Police Chief, 1980, August, 38-40.

Crosby, Andrew. "The Psychological Examination in Police Selection." Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1979, 7 (2), 215-229.

Gettinger, Stephen. "Psychological Testing of Recruits Can:  
A) Screen Out the Real Turkeys B) Spot the Supercops C) Both of the Above D) Neither of the Above." Police Magazine, 1981, March, 30-42.

Mills, Robert B. "Simulated Stress in Police Recruit Selection," Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1976, June, 4 (2), 179-186.

Murphy, Joseph J. "Current Practices in the Use of Psychological Testing by Police Agencies." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1972, December, 63 (4), 570-576.

Saxe, Susan J. & Reiser, Martin. "Comparison of Three Police Applicant Groups Using the MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory)." Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1976, December, 4 (4), 419-425.

Shealy, Allen E. & Roberts, Elizabeth. "Police Selection." The Role of the Forensic Psychologist, in Gerald Cooke, ed. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1980, 373-386.

ORAL INTERVIEW INFORMATION MATERIALS:

Huett, Dennis L. Improving the Selection Interview in a Civil Service Setting. For the Great Lakes Assessment Council. Washington, DC: International Personnel Management Assoc., 1976.

Landy, Frank J. "The Validity of the Interview in Police Officer Selection." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61 (2), 193-198.

Reynolds, L. H. Oral Interview Standards. New York, NY: National Urban League, 1977.

Wollack and Associates. Interviewer's Manual: A Guide to Evaluation of Municipal Police Officer Applicants. Prepared for Texas Commission on Law Enforcement, Officer Standards and Education. Greenwood, CA: Wollach & Assoc., 1977.

Wollack, Waibel & Guenther. Interviewer's Manual: A Guide to the Evaluation of Police Officer Applicants. Greenwood, CA: Wollach & Assoc., 1977.

PHYSICAL AGILITY TEST INFORMATION MATERIALS:

Evans, David H. "Height, Weight and Physical Agility Requirements: Title VII and Public Safety Employment." Journal of Police Science and Administration. 1980, 8 (4), 414-436.

Mc Ghee, Gary. "Job-Related Pre-Employment Physical Agility Tests." The Police Chief, 1976, 43 (1), Jan., 42-43.

Osborn, Gary D. "Validating Physical Agility Tests." The Police Chief, 1976, Jan., 43-45.

Price, Clifford S.; Pollock, Michael L.; Gettman, Larry R. & Kent, Deborah A. Physical Fitness Programs for Law Enforcement Officers: A Manual for Police Administrators. For the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, LEAA. Washington, DC: USGPO, 1978.

Shanahan, Michael G. "A Factor for Survival: Police Officer Physical Efficiency." The Police Chief, 1976, Febr., 58-60.

Study of Job-Related Physical Tests for Police Officers.  
Seattle, WA: King County Dept. of Public Safety, 1973.

Technical Report No. 23: Development of Strength and Agility Exercises for the Minnesota State Patrol. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Dept. of Personnel, 1977.

Wilkie, Richard C., Jr. "Job-Related Physical Tests for Patrol Officers." The Police Chief, 1974, May, 42-44,47.

Woods, Marcella D. "The University of Washington Police Officers Physical Efficiency Battery." The Police Chief, 1976, Febr.

MEDICAL EXAMINATION INFORMATION MATERIALS:

California, State of. Medical Screening Manual for California Law Enforcement. Sacramento, CA: Dept. of General Services, Office of Procurement, Publications Section, 1977.

BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION INFORMATION MATERIALS:

Kohls, John W. & Luke, Luella K. Background Information Manual: Guidelines for the Investigator, 2nd edition. State of California, Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. North Highlands, CA: California Office of Procurement, 1977.

Wollack and Associates. Background Investigator's Manual: A Guide to the Evaluation of Municipal Police Officer Applicants. Prepared for the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement, Officers Standards and Education. Greenwood, CA: Wollack and Assoc., 1977.

UNIQUE SELECTION PRACTICES INFORMATION MATERIALS:

Araiza, J. Fort Worth Police Department: Assessment Center Selection Model Component. Fort Worth, TX: Fort Worth Police Dept., 1975.

Gavin, J. F. & Hamilton, John. "Selecting Police Using Assessment Center Methodology." Journal of Police Science and Administration. 1975, 3 (2), June, 166-176.

Mc Cutcheon, William W. "St. Paul's Demo School for Police Candidates." The Police Chief, 1977, March, 46-47.

Mc Ghee, A. Lee & Deen, Morrell E. "Utilizing the Assessment Center to Select Police Officers for Ocala, Florida Department." The Police Chief, 1979, 46 (8), Aug., 69-74.

Personnel Decisions, Inc. Assessment Center Exercises for Patrol Officer Candidates: Assessor's Manual. Washington, DC: U. S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1975.

Reinke, Roger W. Selection Through Assessment Centers: A Tool for Police Departments. Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1977.

Ross, Joyce D. "Determination of the Predictive Validity of the Assessment Center Approach to Selecting Police Managers." Journal of Criminal Justice, 1980, 8, 89-96.

MATERIALS CONCERNING MINORITIES/LITIGATION:

Boyer, Jacque K. & Griggs, Edward. Equal Employment Opportunity Program Development Manual. Washington, DC: U. S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, Office of Civil Rights Compliance, 1974.

Cory, Bruce. "Minority Police: Tramping Through a Racial Minefield." Police Magazine, 1979, March, 7-14.

Guidebook to Fair Employment Practices. Chicago: Commerce Clearinghouse, Inc., 1981.

Jeannerett, P. R. & Dubin, J. A. Impact Analyses of the Selection, Training, Assignment and Promotion Procedures of the Houston Police Department. Washington, DC: U. S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, 1977.

Law Enforcement Minority Recruitment Handbook. For the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. North Highlands, CA: California Office of Procurement, Publications Section, 1976.

Locke, Hubert G. The Impact of Affirmative Action and Civil Service on American Police Personnel Systems. For the U. S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, DC: USGPO, 1979.

Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. OFCCP: Making EEO and Affirmative Action Work. Washington, DC: U. S. Dept. of Labor, Employment Standards Admin., USGPO, 1979.

Peres, Richard. Dealing With Employment Discrimination. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1978.

Rothenberg, Sheribil. "Minorities Constitutional Rights to Police Department Employment." Police Law Quarterly, 1977, 6 (2), Jan., 23-31.

Schlei, Barbara Lindeman & Grossman, Paul. Employment Discrimination Law. Washington, DC: The Bureau of National Affairs, 1976.

Territo, Leonard; Swanson, C. R. & Chamelin, Neil C. "Equal Employment Opportunity in Law Enforcement." The Police Personnel Selection Process, Chap. 2. Indianapolis: Bobs-Merrill Educational Publishers, 1977.

U. S. Civil Service Commission. Equal Employment Opportunity Court Cases. Washington, DC: Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs, USGPO, 1974.

U. S. Congress. "Part 60-3--Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978)." Federal Register, 43 (166), August 25, 1978.

U. S. Congress. "Part 60-3--Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978)." Federal Register, 44 (43), Friday, March 2, 1979, Part IV.

U. S. Office of Personnel Management. Equal Opportunity Court Cases: 1980 Supplement. Washington, DC: Office of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs, USGPO, 1980.

U. S. Senate. The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, Appendix C. Washington, DC: Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, USGPO, 1972, March.

Utah Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Affirmative Action in Salt Lake's Criminal Justice Agencies. Washington, DC: National Criminal Justice Reference Service, 1978.

VALIDATION STUDIES INFORMATION MATERIALS

Anderson, Marcella C. Validation Study Report for the Class of Police Officer, California State Police Division. Sacramento, CA: State Personnel Board, 1976.

Connell, Kenneth F. & Lengyel, Laurence E. Patrol Validation Manual. For the Ohio State Highway Patrol. Columbus, OH: Contemporary Solutions, 1975.

Ash, Philip & Cates, Judith. ...No Sacrifice Too Great: Technical Report for State Trooper Selection Procedure. Prepared for Commonwealth of Virginia, Dept. of State Police. Chicago: Ash, Blackstone & Cates, 1978.

Faley, Robert H. A Concurrent Validation Study of a Prototype Examination for the Selection of Police Officers in New Jersey. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Dept. of Civil Service, 1975.

Manasse, Susan C. Police Consortium Test Validation Study (City of Newark): A Program Evaluation Submitted to the Enforcement Committee of the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice. Wilmington, DE: Monitoring/Evaluation Unit, Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice, 1978.

State Police Trooper Validity Study. Idaho Personnel Commission, 1975.

Technical Report No. 18: Concurrent Validation of Police Promotional Examinations, An Interjurisdictional Study. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Dept. of Personnel, 1976.

The Validation of Entry-Level Law Enforcement Examinations in the States of California and Nevada. Sacramento, CA: Selection Consulting Center, 1974.

Wollach and Associates. Police Entry and Promotional Levels Test Validation Study. For Michigan Municipal League. Greenwood, CA: Wollach & Assoc., 1979.

APPENDIX A-1

List of PERF Membership That  
Participated in the Mail Survey  
and  
The PERF Mail Questionnaire



APPENDIX A-1

PERF SURVEY\*

1. Alexandria (VA) Dept of Police
2. Anaheim (CA) Police Dept
3. Atlanta (GA) Police Dept
4. Baltimore County (MD) Police Dept
5. Boston (MA) Police Dept
6. Charleston (SC) Police Dept
7. Charlotte (NC) Police Dept
8. Chicago (IL) Police Dept
9. Colorado Springs (CO) Police Dept
- \*\*10. Dade County (FL) Sheriff's Dept, Miami
11. Dallas (TX) Police Dept
12. Davenport (IA) Police Dept
13. DeKalb County (GA) Dept of Public Safety
14. Detroit (MI) Police Dept
15. Evanston (IL) Police Dept
16. Fairfax County (VA) Police Dept
17. Flint (MI) Police Dept
- \*\*18. Fort Collins (CO) Police Dept
- \*\*19. Fort Worth (TX) Police Dept
20. Fremont (CA) Police Dept
21. Fresno (CA) Dept of Police
22. Garden Grove (CA) Police Dept
23. Genesee City Sheriff, Flint, MI

\*Departments contacted through the literture are included in the PERF list.

\*\*Indicates departments identified through the literature.

24. Glendale (CA) Police Dept
25. Grand Rapids (MI) Police Dept
26. Hampton (VA) Police Division
27. Hayward (CA) Police Dept
- \*\*28. Houston (TX) Police Dept
29. Huntington Beach (CA) Police Dept
- \*\*30. Jacksonville (FL) Sheriff's Dept
- \*\*31. King County Department of Public Safety, Seattle, WA
- \*\*32. Los Angeles (CA) Police Dept
33. Macon (GA) Police Dept
34. Madison (WI) Police Dept
35. Memphis (TN) Police Dept
36. Miami (FL) Police Dept
37. Minneapolis (MN) Police Dept
38. Multnomah County Dept of Public Safety, Portland, OR
39. New Rochelle (NY) Police Dept
40. New York (NY) Police Dept
41. Newark (NJ) Police Dept
42. Oklahoma City (OK) Police Dept
43. Oakland (CA) Police Dept
44. Oakland County Sheriff's Dept, Pontiac, MI
- \*\*45. Ocala (FL) Police Dept
46. Orlando (FL) Police Dept
47. Peoria (IL) Police Dept
48. Portland (OR) Police Dept
49. Portsmouth (VA) Police Dept
50. Racine (WA) Police Dept

\*\*Indicates departments identified through the literature.

- \*\*51. Richmond (VA) Police Dept
- 52. Rochester (NY) Police Dept
- 53. Sacramento (CA) Police Dept
- \*\*54. St. Paul (MN) Police Dept
- 55. Salem (OR) Police Dept
- \*\*56. Salt Lake City (UT) Police Dept
- 57. San Diego (CA) Police Dept
- 58. San Diego County (CA) Sheriff's Dept
- \*\*59. San Francisco (CA) Police Dept
- 60. San Jose (CA) Police Dept
- 61. Santa Ana (CA) Police Dept
- 62. Santa Monica (CA) Police Dept
- 63. Seattle (WA) Police Dept
- 64. Southfield (MI) Police Dept
- 65. Sunnyvale (CA) Dept of Public Safety
- \*\*66. Tarrant County Sheriff's Dept, Ft. Worth, TX
- 67. Toledo (OH) Police Division
- \*\*68. Washington (DC) Police Dept
- 69. Wayne County Sheriff's Dept, Detroit, MI
- 70. White Plains (NY) Dept of Commissioner of Public Safety
- 71. Wichita (KS) Police Dept
- 72. Yonkers (NY) Police Dept

\*\*Indicates departments identified through the literature.

APPENDIX A-1

(1) Department Name: \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

(3) Contact Telephone Number: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) Any changes in recruit selection process in last ten years aimed at increasing the number of minority/female officers? Please describe:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(5) Has department developed any substitutes for written tests which are now being used as recruit selection devices? Please describe:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(6) Does department, or any department that contact is familiar with, use a single selection system for public safety officers (fire and police) rather than police officers alone?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(7) Does department have any program for identifying and working with applicants who, while not presently qualified to be police officers, could be trained to meet basic qualification levels? Please describe:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (8) Has department ever conducted or participated in a research project designed to explore police recruit selection approaches? If so, when and conducted by whom?

---

---

---

---

- (9) Is the contact familiar with any smaller jurisdictions in his vicinity that have addressed any of these issues? If so, get contact name, department, and telephone number.

_____ (Name)	_____ (Department)	( ) _____ (Number)
_____ (Name)	_____ (Department)	( ) _____ (Number)
_____ (Name)	_____ (Department)	( ) _____ (Number)
_____ (Name)	_____ (Department)	( ) _____ (Number)

APPENDIX A-2

List of International Departments That  
Participated in the Mail Survey  
and  
The International Mail Questionnaire

APPENDIX A-2

INTERNATIONAL SURVEY

AUSTRALIA

1. Australian Federal Police, Canberra City, ACT Australia
2. New South Wales Police Association
3. Queensland Police Dept, Brisbane
4. South Australian Police Force, Adelaide
5. Tasmania Police, Rokeby
6. Victoria Police Force, Melbourne
7. Police Dept of Western Australia, East Perth

CANADA

(ALBERTA)

8. Calgary Police Service
9. Edmonton Police Dept
10. Lethbridge City Police Force

Survey  
participants

(BRITISH COLUMBIA)

11. Justice Institute of British Columbia, Vancouver
12. Oak Bay Police Dept
13. Vancouver Police Dept
14. Winnipeg Police Dept, Manitoba

(NEW BRUNSWICK)

15. Moncton Police Force

(NOVA SCOTIA)

16. Halifax Police Dept

CANADA

(ONTARIO)- continued)

17. Atikokan Township Police Force
18. Belleville Police Force
19. Brantford Police Force
20. Regional Municipality of Durham Police Force, Oshawa
21. Fort Francis Police Force
22. Guelph Police Force
23. Halton Regional Police Force, Oakville
24. Hamilton-Wentworth Police Force, Hamilton
25. Kenora Police Force
26. Kingsville Police Force
27. Leamington Police Dept
28. Lindsay Police Force
29. London Police Force
30. Niagara Regional Police Force (Municipality), St. Catherines
31. Ontario Provincial Police
32. Orillia City Police Force
33. Peel Regional Police Force, Brampton
34. Toronto Metropolitan Police Force
35. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Ontario
36. Waterloo Regional Police Force

(QUEBEC)

37. Amerindian Police Service, Point Bleue
38. Montreal Urban Community Police Dept
39. Quebec Police Force, Montreal
40. Quebec Police Force, Quebec City



Canada

(SASKATCHEWAN)

41. Estevan City Police
42. Prince Albert City Police
43. Saskatchewan Police Commission, Regina

NEW ZEALAND

44. New Zealand Police, Wellington

EXAMINATION OF QUALIFYING CRITERIA  
FOR SELECTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL:  
INTERNATIONAL SURVEY

JUSTICE CENTER  
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, ANCHORAGE

INTERNATIONAL SURVEY  
OF  
POLICE SELECTION PRACTICES

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

Municipality (City): \_\_\_\_\_

Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

(Name)

(Title)

Contact Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Listed below are applicant screening procedures frequently used in the recruit selection process. Please indicate the sequence of assessment methods employed by your department, by placing a number next to each applicable method, and indicate whether each method is graded on a pass/fail or percentage basis.

	<u>Sequence used</u>	<u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Pct.</u>
a. written tests	( )	( )	( )
b. psychological tests	( )	( )	( )
c. physical tests	( )	( )	( )
d. background investigation	( )	( )	( )
e. oral interview	( )	( )	( )
f. polygraph test	( )	( )	( )
g. physical examination	( )	( )	( )
h. _____ (other method used)	( )	( )	( )
i. _____ (other method used)	( )	( )	( )

(2) Has your department made any changes in selection practices within the last 10 years aimed at increasing the number of female/minority recruits?

No             Yes            Please list any changes:

---

---

(3) Has your department developed any substitutes for written tests which are now being used as recruit selection devices?

No             Yes            Please list any substitutes:

---

---

(4) Does your department have any program for identifying or working with applicants, who, while not presently qualified to be police (or public safety) officers, could be trained to meet basic qualifications?

No             Yes            Please list any applicable programs:

---

---

(5) Does your department, or any other department that you are familiar with, use a different selection system for public safety officer (fire fighters, fish and wildlife protection officers, etc.) than is used for police selection?

No             Yes            Please list department and contact name and address:

---

---

---

(6) Does your department establish its own recruit selection requirements and procedures?

No             Yes

Who is responsible for doing this? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Agency)

\_\_\_\_\_

(Mailing address)

\_\_\_\_\_

(7) Has your department ever conducted or participated in a research project designed to explore police recruit selection methods?

( ) No

( ) Yes

Type of Study: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date Conducted: \_\_\_\_\_

Who conducted the Study: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(8) Are you familiar with any smaller jurisdictions in your vicinity that have addressed any of the issues raised in this survey?

( ) No

( ) Yes

Name of Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(9) May we have your permission to contact your department for more detailed information on your recruit selection system (based on the information obtained from this survey)?

( ) No

( ) Yes

Name of Person to Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Does the Contact Person Speak English? \_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

Please return the completed survey to:

Knowlton W. Johnson, Ph.D.  
Director of Research  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska, Anchorage  
3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska 99504  
U. S. A.

APPENDIX A-3

List of the U.S.A. State Police Departments That  
Participated in the National Mail Survey  
and  
The National Mail Questionnaire

APPENDIX A-3

NATIONAL SURVEY

1. Arizona Dept of Public Safety, Phoenix, AZ
2. Alabama Dept of Public Safety, Montgomery, AL
3. Arkansas State Police, Little Rock, AR
4. California Highway Patrol, Sacramento, CA
5. Colorado Division of State Patrol, Denver, CO
6. Connecticut Dept of Public Safety, Hartford, CT
7. Delaware State Police, Dover, DE
8. Florida Highway Patrol, Tallahassee, FL
9. Illinois Dept of Law Enforcement, Springfield, IL
10. Indiana State Police, Indianapolis, IN
11. Kansas Highway Patrol, Topeka, KS
12. Kentucky State Patrol, Frankfort, KY
13. Louisiana Dept of Public Safety--State Police, Baton Rouge, LA
14. Maine Department of Public Safety, Augusta ME
15. Maryland State Police, Pikesville, MD
16. Massachusetts State Police, Framingham, MA
17. Michigan Dept of State Police, East Lansing, MI
18. Minnesota Dept of Public Safety, State Patrol Training Center,  
New Brighton, MN
19. Missouri State Highway Patrol, Jefferson City, MO
20. Montana Highway Patrol, Helena, MT
21. Nebraska Highway Patrol, Lincoln, NE
22. Nevada Highway Patrol, Carson City, NV
23. New Hampshire State Police, Concord, NH
24. New Mexico State Police, Training Division, Santa Fe, NM
25. North Carolina State Highway Patrol, Raleigh, NC

26. North Dakota Highway Patrol, Bismarck, ND
27. Ohio State Highway Patrol, Columbus, OH
28. Oklahoma Dept of Public Safety--Highway Patrol,  
Oklahoma City, OK
29. Oregon State Police, Salem, OR
30. Pennsylvania State Police, Harrisburg, PA
31. Tennessee Dept of Public Safety, Nashville, TN
32. Texas Dept of Public Safety, Austin, TX
33. Utah Highway Patrol, Salt Lake City, UT
34. Vermont Dept of Public Safety, Montpelier, VT
35. Virginia Dept of Public Safety, Richmond, VA
36. Washington State Patrol, Olympia, WA
37. Wyoming Highway Patrol, Cheyenne, WY



EXAMINATION OF QUALIFYING CRITERIA  
FOR SELECTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL:  
NATIONAL SURVEY

JUSTICE CENTER  
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, ANCHORAGE

NATIONAL SURVEY  
OF  
POLICE SELECTION PRACTICES

State: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Title)

Contact Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Contact Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Listed below are applicant screening procedures frequently used in the recruit selection process. Please indicate the sequence of assessment methods employed by your department, by placing a number next to each applicable method, and indicate whether each method is graded on a pass/fail or percentage basis.

	<u>Sequence used</u>	<u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Pct.</u>
a. written tests	( )	( )	( )
b. psychological tests	( )	( )	( )
c. physical tests	( )	( )	( )
d. background investigation	( )	( )	( )
e. oral interview	( )	( )	( )
f. polygraph test	( )	( )	( )
g. physical examination	( )	( )	( )
h. _____ (other method used)	( )	( )	( )
i. _____ (other method used)	( )	( )	( )

(2) Has your department made any changes in selection practices within the last 10 years aimed at increasing the number of female/minority recruits?

( ) No                      ( ) Yes                      Please list any changes:

---

---

(3) Can an applicant fail the written examination and still be considered for selection using other criteria?

( ) No                      ( ) Yes

a. What criteria would be considered in this situation?

---

---

---

(4) Which of the areas listed below are measured in the written test?

<input type="checkbox"/> verbal ability	<input type="checkbox"/> spelling
<input type="checkbox"/> mathematical ability	<input type="checkbox"/> vocabulary
<input type="checkbox"/> reading comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/> observation/memory
<input type="checkbox"/> mechanical reasoning	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> situational reasoning	other
<input type="checkbox"/> abstract reasoning	_____
	other

(5) Who developed the written test used by your department?

<input type="checkbox"/> state personnel	
<input type="checkbox"/> state civil service commission	
<input type="checkbox"/> outside agency	_____
	name of agency
	_____
	name of test

(6) Has the written test been validated?

No

Yes

a. By whom? \_\_\_\_\_

b. When? \_\_\_\_\_

(7) Has your department made any efforts to make the written test more job-related?

No

Yes

a. What changes have you made?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(8) Does your department use any alternative selection devices as a substitute for the written test?

No

Yes

Please list any substitutes

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(9) Which techniques are utilized in the oral interview? (If appropriate, check more than one response)

informal discussion w/applicant

structured questions w/oral response

structured questions w/written response

\_\_\_\_\_  
other

(10) How many persons make up the oral board? \_\_\_\_\_

(11) What is the composition of the Board?

civil service personnel

DPS administrator

psychologist

state police/trooper

community representative

personnel department

police chief

\_\_\_\_\_  
other

(12) How many women \_\_\_\_\_ minorities \_\_\_\_\_ are represented?

(13) What type of preparation is provided to members of the oral board prior to appointment? (If appropriate, check more than one response.)

\_\_\_\_\_ No preparation

\_\_\_\_\_ Participation in a training seminar

\_\_\_\_\_ Provided oral instructions

\_\_\_\_\_ Provided written instructions

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  
other

(14) Has the content and/or procedure of the oral interview been changed in the last 5 years to make it more job-related?

( ) No

( ) Yes

1. Please list any changes

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(15) Would it be possible for you to include a copy of the questions and procedures used in the oral interview?

( ) No

( ) Yes

(16) Does your department have any program for identifying or working with applicants, who, while not presently qualified to be police (or public safety) officers, could be trained to meet basic qualifications?

( ) No

( ) Yes

Please list any applicable programs:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(17) Has your department ever conducted or participated in a research project designed to explore police recruit selection methods?

( ) No

( ) Yes

Type of Study: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date Conducted: \_\_\_\_\_

Who conducted the Study: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(18) Are you familiar with any smaller jurisdictions in your state that have addressed any of the issues raised in this survey?

No             Yes            Name of Contact: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(19) Which of the following are used by your department to determine minimum qualifications for the position of state trooper/police officer?

<input type="checkbox"/> height	<input type="checkbox"/> H.S. diploma or equivalent
<input type="checkbox"/> weight	<input type="checkbox"/> college education
<input type="checkbox"/> visual acuity	<input type="checkbox"/> medical exam
<input type="checkbox"/> minimum age	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> maximum age	other _____

(20) Have any of the minimum requirements or selection devices employed by your department been challenged?

No             Yes

a. What device(s) or requirement(s) were challenged?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(21) May we have your permission to contact your department for more detailed information on your recruit selection system (based on the information obtained from this survey)?

No             Yes            Name of Person to Contact: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

Please return the completed survey to:            Knowlton Johnson, Ph.D.  
Director of Research  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska, Anchorage  
3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska, 99504

APPENDIX B-1

List of Departments That  
Participated in the  
Telephone Interview Phase of the Study  
and  
The Telephone Interview Schedule

APPENDIX B-1

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

1. Arizona Department of Public Safety, Phoenix, AZ
2. Alabama Department of Public Safety, Montgomery, AL
3. Arkansas State Police, Little Rock, AR
4. California Highway Patrol, Sacramento, CA
5. Colorado Division of State Patrol, Denver, CO
6. Florida Highway Patrol, Tallahassee, FL
7. Indiana State Police, Indianapolis, IN
8. Illinois Dept of Law Enforcement, Springfield, IL
9. Kansas Highway Patrol, Topeka, KS
10. Louisiana Department of Public Safety--State Police, Baton Rouge, LA
11. Maine Department of Public Safety, Augusta, ME
12. Maryland State Police, Pikesville, MD
13. Massachussetts State Police, Framingham, MA
14. Michigan Dept of State Police, East Lansing, MI
15. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, New Brighton, MN
16. Missouri State Highway Patrol, Jefferson City, MO
17. Montana Highway Patrol, Helena, MT
18. Nebraska Highway Patrol, Lincoln, NE
19. New Hampshire State Police, Concord, NH
20. North Carolina State Highway Patrol, Raleigh, NC
21. North Dakota Highway Patrol, Bismarck, ND
22. Ohio State Highway Patrol, Columbus, OH
23. Oklahoma Department of Public Safety, Oklahoma City, OK
24. Oregon State Police, Salem, OR
25. Tennessee Department of Public Safety, Nashville, TN



26. Texas Department of Public Safety, Austin, TX
27. Utah Highway Patrol, Salt Lake City, UT
28. Washington State Patrol, Olympia, WA
29. Wyoming Highway Patrol, Cheyenne, WY
30. Pennsylvania State Police, Harrisburg, PA
31. Virginia Dept of State Police, Richmond, VA
32. Kentucky State Police, Frankfort, KY
33. Alexandria Dept of Police, Alexandria, VA
34. Anaheim Police Dept., Anaheim, CA
35. Baltimore County (MD) Police Dept
36. Boston (MA) Police Dept
37. Charlotte (NC) Police Dept
38. Chicago (IL) Police Dept
39. Colorado Springs (CO) Police Dept
40. Dallas (TX) Police Dept
41. Davenport (IA) Police Dept
42. DeKalb County (GA) Dept of Public Safety
43. Detroit (MI) Police Dept
44. Evanston (IL) Police Dept
45. Flint (MI) Police Dept
46. Ft. Collins (CO) Police Dept
47. Fort Worth (TX) Police Dept
48. Fresno (CA) Dept of Police
49. Garden Grove (CA) Police Dept
50. Glendale (CA) Police Dept
51. Hampton (VA) Police Division
52. Houston (TX) Police Dept
53. Huntington Beach (CA) Police Dept
54. King County Department of Public Safety, Seattle, WA

55. Macon (GA) Police Dept
56. Madison (WI) Police Dept
57. Miami (FL) Police Dept
58. Multomah County Div of Public Safety, Portland, OR
59. Oklahoma City (OK) Police Dept
60. Oakland (CA) Police Dept
61. Oakland County Sheriff's Dept, Pontiac, MI
62. Ocala (FL) Police Dept
63. Orland (FL) Police Dept
64. Peoria (IL) Police Dept
65. Portland (OR) Police Dept
66. Richmond (VA) Police Dept
67. Rochester (NY) Police Dept
68. San Diego (CA) Police Dept
69. San Francisco (CA) Police Dept
70. San Jose (CA) Police Dept
71. Santa Ana (CA) Police Dept
72. Santa Monica (CA) Police Dept
73. Seattle (WA) Police Dept
74. Southfield, MI Police Dept
75. St. Paul (MN) Police Dept
76. Tarrant County Sheriff's Dept, Ft. Worth, TX
77. Toledo (OH) Police Dept
78. Washington, D.C. Police Dept
79. White Plains, NY Dept of Public Safety
80. Wichita (KS) Police Dept
81. Salt Lake City (UT) Police Dept
82. Dade County Sheriff's Dept, Miami, FL

83. Jacksonville (FL) Sheriff's Dept
84. Los Angeles (CA) Police Dept
85. Atlanta (GA) Police Dept
86. Prince Albert City Police, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, Canada
87. Justice Institute of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
88. Vancouver Police Dept, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
89. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Ontario, Canada
90. Hamilton Wentworth Police Force, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

APPENDIX B-1  
POLICE SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE  
PHONE INTERVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*  
\* A. Administrator I.D. \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
\*  
\* B. Interviewer I.D. \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
\*  
\* C. Date of Interview \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
\*  
\* D. Time Started \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
\*  
\* E. Time Finished \_\_\_\_\_ \*  
\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Hello, Mr./Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_, my name is \_\_\_\_\_. I'm involved in a study concerning law enforcement recruitment and selection. This study, which is being conducted by the Justice Center of the University of Alaska, is for the Alaska Department of Public Safety. They would like to find out what other departments are doing before making major changes in their recruitment and selection practices.

---

We understand that your department has taken a close look at the area of police selection and that you may be doing some things which we could use here in Alaska. Because of the distance and the need to get information to our state police as quickly as possible, I would like to ask you a few questions on the phone and then send you a short follow-up questionnaire. Is this a convenient time?

---

You were referred to us by \_\_\_\_\_ as a resource person for information about your department's selection process. Because of the distance and need to get information to our state police as quickly as possible, I would like to ask you a few questions over the phone and then send you a short follow-up questionnaire. Is this a convenient time?

---

Your response to our preliminary survey a short time ago indicates that your department is using selection methods and procedures which may be useful to us here in Alaska. Because of the distance and need to get information to our state police as quickly as possible, I would like to ask you a few questions over the phone and then send you a short follow-up questionnaire. Is this a convenient time?

---

(IF THE RESPONDENT HESITATES OR GIVES VERBAL INDICATIONS THAT HE/SHE IS APPREHENSIVE, READ THE FOLLOWING:)

If this is not a good time for you, I could call back or I could have Dr. Johnson, the Director of Research for the Justice Center, call you.

(IF THE RESPONDENT AGREES TO CONTINUE, PROCEED WITH:)

Great, let's begin with questions regarding the selection process for law enforcement applicants.

Section I

QUESTIONS REGARDING SELECTION PROCESS

1. We have found in a preliminary survey that the following selection methods are commonly used. As I mention each method could you please indicate if your department uses it? Also, indicate its sequence.

(INTERVIEWER: STOP HERE. WAIT UNTIL RESPONDENT HAS INDICATED EACH STAGE BEFORE GOING ON TO A. IF INFORMATION WAS PROVIDED ON THE PRELIMINARY MAILED SURVEY, SIMPLY REPEAT THE STAGES IN SEQUENCE AND GO TO UNANSWERED QUESTIONS IN SECTION II.)

Method	Sequence	
1. Written Application		
2. Written Test		
3. Psychological Test		
4. Physical Agility Test		
5. Background Information		
6. Oral Interview		
7. Polygraph		
8. Physical Exam		
9. Other _____		

2. Does your department award preference or points toward the overall applicants score for:

(INTERVIEWER, REPEAT EACH OF THE BELOW)

- \_\_\_\_\_ A. Veteran
- \_\_\_\_\_ B. College Credits
- \_\_\_\_\_ C. Police Cadet
- \_\_\_\_\_ D. Prior Police Experience
- \_\_\_\_\_ E. Other Special Skill; Type \_\_\_\_\_

3. Can an applicant fail any stage of the selection process and still be considered for employment?

( )no ( )yes What selection method(s) can be substituted for another?

---

---

---

4. When examining the total scores of final applicants, does your department give any special consideration to female or minority applicants?

( )no ( )yes What are the special considerations?

---

---

---

---

5. Are all final applicants notified of their status?

( )no ( )yes In what manner are they notified?



---

---

---

If no, who is notified and how?

---

---

6. Have any research studies been conducted which examined the validity of your department's selection methods?

( )no ( )yes a. Who conducted the study and when was it completed? (INTERVIEWER: PROBE VARIOUS COMPONENTS. i.e.: PHYSICAL AGILITY TEST, ORAL INTERVIEW, WRITTEN EXAM)

---

---

---

---

6. (cont.)

Any other studies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. What impact has the study had on your department's selection process? (PROBE FOR SPECIFICS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Have any of the selection methods used by your department been challenged? Let's begin with the challenges of the written test...\* (INTERVIEWER: REPEAT EACH METHOD LISTED BELOW)

( )no ( )yes a. Method challenged and when.

i. \_\_\_\_\_  
ii. \_\_\_\_\_  
iii. \_\_\_\_\_  
iv. \_\_\_\_\_

b. How was/were the issues resolved?

	i.	ii.	iii.	iv.
i. Federal Court	_____	_____	_____	_____
ii. State Court	_____	_____	_____	_____
iii. Municipal Court	_____	_____	_____	_____
iv. Human Rights Commission	_____	_____	_____	_____
v. Other _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

c. What was the end result and when was it resolved?

i. Dropped	_____	_____	_____	_____
ii. Modified	_____	_____	_____	_____
iii. Retained	_____	_____	_____	_____
iv. Pending	_____	_____	_____	_____
v. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

- \*Psychological test
- Physical agility test
- Background
- Polygraph
- Physical Exam
- Oral Interview
- Other

Section II

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO SELECTION METHODS

Let's shift our attention to specific methods used by your department.

(NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: ONLY ASK QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO PARTICULAR SELECTION METHODS IF THE DEPARTMENT USES THE METHOD.)

1. Beginning with the written test, which of these areas are included in the test? (INTERVIEWER REPEAT EACH AREA.)
- a. Situational reasoning
  - b. Observation/memory
  - c. Job related writing sample (e.g., preparing a police report)
  - d. Job related reading comprehension (e.g., interpret statute)
  - e. Other job related areas. Specify \_\_\_\_\_

2. Who developed the written test currently being used by your department and how long has the department been using it?
- |                                       | <u>Time in Use</u> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| a. State personnel                    | _____              |
| b. State civil service commission     | _____              |
| c. Outside agency (Name agency) _____ | _____              |
| d. Other _____                        | _____              |

3. In the last 10 years have any changes been made in the written test stage of the selection process?

( )no ( )yes What were these changes?

(INTERVIEWER, PROBE FOR SPECIFICS: DID DEPARTMENT USE ANOTHER TEST, SUBSTITUTE ALTERNATIVE METHOD, ADD/DELETE QUESTIONS?)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(continued)



3. (cont.)

When were these changes made?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Why were these changes made?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ORAL INTERVIEW)

Now let's turn our attention to the oral interview.

1. How is your oral interview conducted?  
(INTERVIEWER, REPEAT ALTERNATIVES IF NECESSARY)

\_\_\_\_\_ informal discussion  
\_\_\_\_\_ structured questions, but general  
\_\_\_\_\_ structured questions, specific  
\_\_\_\_\_ other \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many individuals make up the oral board? \_\_\_\_\_

3. What positions are represented on the oral board? (CHECK APPROPRIATE ONES)

_____ civil service personnel	_____ DPS administrator
_____ psychologist	_____ State police/trooper
_____ community representatives	_____ Personnel department
_____ police chief	_____ Other

\_\_\_\_\_  
(specify)

4. Is there any special consideration given to (women)/(minorities) when selecting board members?

( ) no ( ) yes What special consideration is given?



\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

a. Do you occasionally have women/minorities on the oral board?  
( ) no ( ) yes

5. What type of preparation is provided to members of the oral board prior to appointment?

(INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR EXHAUSTIVENESS.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ no preparation
- \_\_\_\_\_ provided oral instructions
- \_\_\_\_\_ provided written instructions
- \_\_\_\_\_ participation in training
- \_\_\_\_\_ other \_\_\_\_\_  
(specify)



What was covered in this training?

---

---

---

---

6. In the last 10 years, have there been changes in the content and/or procedure of the oral interview?

( )no ( )yes What were these changes?

---

---

---

---

When were these changes made?

---

---

Why were these changes made?

---

---

---

---

(QUESTIONS REGARDING PHYSICAL AGILITY, BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SCREENING)

Now I would like to ask a few questions regarding several other selection methods used by your department.

1. What methods are used to determine the psychological fitness of applicants?

---

---

---

2. In the last 10 years, have any changes been made in how you conduct your psychological screening?

( )no ( )yes What were these changes?

---

---

When were these changes made?

---

---

Why were these changes made?

---

---

- In the last 10 years,  
3. have any changes been made in how you conduct your Physical Agility Test and your Background Investigation?

P.A.T. ( )no ( )yes

B.I. ( )no ( )yes

What were these changes?

---

---

---

---

When were these changes made?

---

---

3.(cont.)

Why were these changes made?

---

---

---

---

4. Has your department made any changes in the last 10 years to help prepare applicants for various stages of the selection process, e.g., physical agility test, written test, etc.?

( )no ( )yes What type of preparation is provided?

---

---

---

---

5. Reflecting back, have the mentioned changes concerning your department's selection methods:

a. Increased or decreased the quality of applicants who are selected as sworn officers?

( )no ( )yes i. Increased or decreased quality?

ii. In what way?

---

---

---

---

(IF MORE THAN ONE CHANGE, ASK:)

iii. What particular change do you attribute this to?

---

---

---

b. Have these changes increased the number of females and minority group members who are selected?

( )no ( )yes i. What change do you attribute this to?

---

---

c. Have the changes produced any adverse or positive effects on the organizational process of selecting police applicants?

( )no ( )yes i. What are these effects?

---

---

---

---

(IF MORE THAN ONE CHANGE:)

ii. What change do you attribute this to?

---

---

---

---

Section III

---

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS & CAPACITY FOR CHANGE

---

The final type of information which we would like to include in our analysis concerns organizational characteristics and their capacity to make changes in selection practices.

1. How many sworn and civilian personnel (excluding clerical) does your department currently have as of June 1, 1981?

sworn \_\_\_\_\_  
civilian \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many employees are in the Personnel division of the department, excluding training personnel?

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Does your department have a Police Association or union?

( )neither ( )Police Assoc. ( )Union ( )both

4. Do you have a departmental psychologist?

( )no ( )yes How many and for how long?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Are there psychologists available from outside of your departments who provide you assistance regarding selection matters?

( )no ( )yes Where does the psychologist work and how does he help you?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. Does your department employ an EEO officer?  
( )no ( )yes



Who handles Affirmative Action/EEO matters?

---

---

7. Does your department have access to a legal advisor on civil matters involving the department?

( )no ( )yes Where does he/she work?

---

---

Well, that concludes the interview. You should be receiving the follow-up questionnaire in about a week. It focuses more on minimum requirements, recruitment and organizational arrangements that may be important when implementing particular selection methods. At the completion of our research project in October, we will forward you a copy of our survey results. The information will represent the state of the art in police selection practices for approximately 100 departments in the United States, Canada, and other selected countries. Thank you for your time and cooperation. We certainly appreciate your help with our project.

APPENDIX B-2

The Follow-Up Questionnaire



EXAMINATION OF RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION PRACTICES  
IN LAW ENFORCEMENT:  
A FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

JUSTICE CENTER  
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, ANCHORAGE

Section I

RECRUITMENT

Listed below are recruitment strategies which may have been used by your department to attract women and minority law enforcement applicants. Please indicate those strategies that you have tried during the last 10 years by using the letter in front of the alternatives provided. Specify whether each strategy has been used for recruiting minority and/or female applicants.

- a. Have not tried
- b. Have not tried, but making plans to implement.
- c. Have tried and continued to use
- d. Have tried, but discontinued

	Use For	
Minority		Female
<u>Recruitment</u>		<u>Recruitment</u>

- |       |       |   |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | 1. Use minority and female recruiting teams specially trained in recruit techniques to talk to potential applicants |
| _____ | _____ | 2. Work with local minority and female group leaders to attract applicants  |
| _____ | _____ | 3. Use posters or bulletins depicting minorities and women in police role   |
| _____ | _____ | 4. Advertise in media specifically targeted to minority and female audiences  |
| _____ | N/A   | 5. Advertise using jargon/language indigenous to specific minority groups   |
| _____ | N/A   | 6. Concentrate recruitment efforts at schools, shopping centers or gathering places in minority communities         |
| _____ | _____ | 7. Other strategy (please specify)  |
|       |       | _____   |
|       |       | _____   |
| _____ | _____ | 8. Other strategy   |
|       |       | _____   |
|       |       | _____   |

9. If any of the recruitment strategies have been discontinued, please briefly explain why it was discontinued and when.

---



---



---



---

Section II  
MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

1. Which of the following requirements are used by your department to determine minimum qualifications for sworn personnel? Please check each requirement used and indicate the standard presently used by your department.

<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Department Standard</u>	<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Department Standard</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> height	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> H.S. Diploma	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> weight	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> college educ.	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> visual acuity	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> medical exam	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> minimum age	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> residency	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> maximum age	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> drivers license	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> other	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> other	_____

2. In the last 10 years, have any of the minimum requirements been changed?

( ) no                      ( ) yes

a. what was changed? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. when was the change(s) made? \_\_\_\_\_

c. why was the change(s) made? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

d. How effective have the change(s) been in attracting more female/minority applicants?

( ) very effective                      ( ) somewhat effective  
 ( ) moderately effective              ( ) not effective at all

3. Are the minimum requirements the same for all applicants?

( ) no ( ) yes

What are the differences?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. Have any of the minimum requirements set by your department been challenged in the last 10 years?

( ) no ( ) yes

a. which requirements were challenged and when?

i. \_\_\_\_\_

ii. \_\_\_\_\_

iii. \_\_\_\_\_

b. how were the issues resolved?

i. ii. iii.

o federal court \_\_\_\_\_

o state court \_\_\_\_\_

o appeals court \_\_\_\_\_

o human rights comm. \_\_\_\_\_

o other \_\_\_\_\_

c. what was the result and when was it resolved?

o dropped \_\_\_\_\_

o modified \_\_\_\_\_

o retained \_\_\_\_\_

o pending \_\_\_\_\_

o other \_\_\_\_\_

Section III  
SELECTION PRACTICES

1. Has your department encountered any problems in implementing changes with respect to the following selection methods? If your department does not use a particular method, or no change has been made, indicate Not Applicable.

Selection Method/Implementation Problem

a. written test

no             yes            type of problem \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. psychological test

no             yes            type of problem \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c. oral interview

no             yes            type of problem \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

d. physical agility test

no             yes            type of problem \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

e. background investigation

no             yes            type of problem \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

f. other methods not indicated (please specify)

no             yes            type of problem \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. During our telephone interview, you indicated that various selection methods used by your department were given in a set sequence. Using the time frame in which your last group of applicants were processed, please indicate the number of applicants who were screened out at each stage. As a bench mark begin by indicating the total number of applicants, the number of minorities and the number of females who completed the application stage.

Stage (including each method)	Number of Applicants Screened Out		
	Total Applicants	Minorities	Females
a. Application			
b.			
c.			
d.			
e.			
f.			
g.			
h.			
i.			
j.			

3. What is the approximate total time from the application stage through the selection process (up to entry into the training stage)? Use the last group of applicants who were processed.

Number of weeks \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many special schools/workshops relating to police selection have members of your department attended in the last 5 years?

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Number Attended</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

5. Who is responsible for performing the following selection functions relative to hiring police officers? Please check the most appropriate column(s).

Functions	Police Department	Civil Service Commission and/or Central Personnel Office <sup>1/</sup>	Performed by Other Agency	Function Not Performed
Establishing entrance qualification standards for applicants				
Education	_____	_____	_____	_____
Height/Weight	_____	_____	_____	_____
Vision	_____	_____	_____	_____
Residency	_____	_____	_____	_____
Preparing examination announcements	_____	_____	_____	_____
Constructing written test examinations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Purchasing selection tests	_____	_____	_____	_____
Determining relatedness of examinations and other selection processes to job performance	_____	_____	_____	_____
Conducting job or task analysis	_____	_____	_____	_____
Preparing job specifications and/or position descriptions	_____	_____	_____	_____
Conducting recruitment programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Conducting psychiatric or psychological appraisals	_____	_____	_____	_____
Screening applications and/or applicants for eligibility before written tests	_____	_____	_____	_____
Administering and scoring written tests	_____	_____	_____	_____

<sup>1/</sup> Central Personnel Department refers to the component of government which is responsible for all civil service workers including members of your department.

	Police Department	Civil Service Commission and/or Central Personnel Office	Performed by Other Agency	Function Not Performed
Determining minimum acceptable test scores	_____	_____	_____	_____
Deciding appeals by applicants regarding examination/selection process	_____	_____	_____	_____
Determining the eligibility of candidates <u>after</u> written tests	_____	_____	_____	_____
Certifying eligible candidates for appointment	_____	_____	_____	_____
Conducting oral interviews	_____	_____	_____	_____
Conducting medical exams	_____	_____	_____	_____
Conducting physical agility tests	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating results of background investigations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Conducting polygraph examinations	_____	_____	_____	_____

6. On an average, how frequently do you and members of the police personnel division deal with the following personnel concerning law enforcement selection matters?

	once or twice a year	once or twice a month	once or twice a week	almost daily
Head police administrator (chief, commissioner, etc.)				
Director of central personnel department				
Psychologist(s) of central personnel department				



6. (continued)

	once or twice a year	once or twice a month	once or twice a week	almost daily
Psychologist(s) of public safety/ police department				
Equal employment opportunity officer				
Legal advisor				

7. How helpful are the following personnel in resolving problems concerning police selection matters?

	Not helpful at all	Somewhat helpful	Usually helpful	Almost Always helpful
Head police administrator (chief, commissioner, etc.)				
Director of central personnel department				
Psychologist(s) of central personnel department				
Psychologist(s) of public safety/police department				
Equal employment opportunity/ officer				
Legal advisor				

8. How would you rate the following personnel's ability to help your division make changes in the department's selection system:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Head police administrator (chief, commissioner, etc.)				
Director of central personnel department				
Psychologist(s) of central personnel department				
Psychologist(s) of public safety/police department				
Equal employment opportunity/ officer				
Legal advisor				

9. How would you characterize the quality of communication between the police personnel division and the following personnel?

	Very Good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor
Head police administrator (chief, commissioner, etc.)					
Director of central personnel department					
Psychologist(s) of central personnel department					
Psychologist(s) of public safety/police department					
Equal employment opportunity/officer					
Legal advisor					

10. To what extent do the following personnel take the needs of the police personnel division into consideration when making decisions about selection matters.

	To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To Little Extent	To No Extent
Head police administrator (chief, commissioner, etc.)				
Director of central personnel department				
Psychologist(s) of central personnel department				
Psychologist(s) of public safety/police department				
Equal employment opportunity/officer				
Legal advisor				

Section IV  
ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ARRANGEMENTS

1. What is the size of the area served in square miles? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is the population of the area served by your department? \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the ethnic population of the area served by your department?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White	_____
Black	_____
Oriental	_____
Spanish/Latin American	_____
Indian/Native American	_____
Other	_____

4. How many sworn and civilian personnel (excluding clerical) did your department have at the end (June 30) of each of the following fiscal years?

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Total # of Sworn Personnel</u>	<u>Total # of Civilians</u>
1977	_____	_____
1978	_____	_____
1979	_____	_____
1980	_____	_____
1981	_____	_____

5. How many of the total number of sworn personnel for the past 5 fiscal years were minority or female officers?

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Total # of Minority Officers</u>	<u>Total # of Female Officers</u>
1977	_____	_____
1978	_____	_____
1979	_____	_____
1980	_____	_____
1981	_____	_____

6. For each of the past five fiscal years, how many minority, female and other applicants successfully passed through each of your department's selection stages (up to the training academy) and were offered positions as sworn officers?

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u># of Minority Applicants Offered a Sworn Position</u>	<u># of Female Applicants Offered a Sworn Position</u>	<u># of Other Applicants Offered a Sworn Position</u>
1977	_____	_____	_____
1978	_____	_____	_____
1979	_____	_____	_____
1980	_____	_____	_____
1981	_____	_____	_____

7. Which of the following police positions are being held by a civilian?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ Director of Personnel
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ Director of Training
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ Director of Planning and/or Research
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ Administrative Assistant to the Chief
- e. \_\_\_\_\_ Other key policymaking position held by a civilian (please specify)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

8. Additional questions overlooked in the telephone interview and/or requests for information on unique aspects of your department's police selection system.

APPENDIX C

An Analysis of the Impact of  
Personnel Selection Changes in  
Law Enforcement Departments

## APPENDIX C

### AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF PERSONNEL SELECTION CHANGES IN LAW ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENTS

An assessment of the impact of planned changes requires a rigorous evaluation under controlled conditions. Unfortunately, personnel selection changes which have been implemented in the last ten years in law enforcement have not been subjected to such evaluation. We were only able to uncover in our survey one department that had produced empirical evaluation results of any kind. Moreover, our literature review only uncovered scant evidence of evaluation research being conducted in the personnel selection area.

In lieu of this lack of "hard data" on the impact of personnel management changes in law enforcement, we present below the survey respondents' assessment which are based mostly on their personal experiences or observations. Questions were asked about the impact of selection changes in three areas: impact on the quality of applicants who are selected as sworn officers; impact on the number of females and minority group members; and impact on the department itself.

In regards to the quality of applicants, only 12% of the U.S.A. departments indicated that changes in the personnel management area, particularly personnel selection, had decreased the quality of applicants, while 19% stated no effects and 69% reported positive impact effects. Most departments reported an increase in the number of females and minorities, but only 38% attributed this increase solely to changes in personnel selection. Forty-five percent of the departments attributed the effects to changes in recruitment, minimum requirements and salaries, and 17% indicated that these

changes along with changes in personnel selection, were responsible for the impact on female and minority hiring.

An examination of the effects of personnel changes on the department itself revealed that 24% of the U.S.A. departments reported adverse effects (e.g. more time consuming), 49% reported no effects and 27% reported positive effects (e.g., processing of applicants ran smoother). These effects, whether adverse or positive, were attributed to personnel selection changes by 58% of the survey departments. In contrast, 40% of the departments indicated that changes in recruitment, minimum requirements and salary, as well as changes in selection practices were responsible for the effects on the department.

In summary, the survey respondents in the U.S.A. reported that personnel selection has had more positive effects on the quality of applicants than on female and minority hiring or on the department. While impact was evidenced in the latter two areas, it was attributed to mostly to other personnel management changes in the areas of recruitment, minimum requirements and salary.

APPENDIX D

Challenges and Results by  
Selection Method



WRITTEN EXAM

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
Jacksonville FL Sheriff's Dept	Federal Court	Retained
Portland, OR Police Dept	State Labor Bureau	Pending
Flint, MI Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
Charlotte, NC Police Dept	Federal Court	Retained
Boston MA Police Dept	Federal Court	Retained
DeKalb County, GA DPS	State Supreme Court	Modified
Baltimore County (MD) P.D.	Federal Court	Modified
Evanston (IL) Police Dept	State Court	New Test
Virginia State Police	Federal Court	Modified
St. Paul (MN) Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
Indiana State Police	Federal Court	Modified
Macon, GA Police Dept	Federal Court	Dropped
White Plains, NY DPS	Federal Court	Modified
Illinois Dept of Law Enf	Federal Court	Retained
*California Highway Patrol	Missing Data	Modified
*Peoria, IL Police Dept	Dept. Administration	Retained
*Washington, DC Police Dept	Federal Court	Retained
*Toledo, OH Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Madison, WI Police Dept	Dept. Industrial Labor & Human Relations	Modified
*Maryland State Police	Federal Court	Dropped
*King County (WA) DPS	Federal Court	Retained
*San Francisco (CA) Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
Richmond VA, Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified

Written Exam  
(Continued)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
*Atlanta (GA) Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Pennsylvania State Police	Federal Court	Modified
*Santa Ana Police Dept	State Court	Modified

\*Indicates had more than one method challenged

ORAL EXAM

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
Colorado State Patrol	EEOC	Pending
Glendale CA Police Dept	City Personnel	Retained
Kansas Highway Patrol	Board?	Retained
*Madison, WI Police Dept	Dept of Industrial Labor & Human Relations	Modified
*Atlanta (GA) Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Pennsylvania State Police	Federal Court	Modified
*Arkansas State Police	Federal Court	Modified
*Santa Ana, CA Police Dept	State Court	Modified

\*Indicates had more than one method challenged

PHYSICAL AGILITY TEST

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
*King County (WA) DPS	Local Civil Service	Retained
*San Francisco Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
Maine State Police	Human Rights Commission	Modified
*Toledo, OH Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Madison, WI Police Dept	Human Rights Commission	Modified
Missouri Highway Patrol	EEOC	Pending
Colorado Springs	Misssing Data	Modified
Oakland, CA Police Dept	State Court	Modified
Fresno, CA Police Dept	Municipal Court/Civil Service Board	Modified
Los Angeles Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Peoria Police Dept	Federal Court	Retained
*Atlanta Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Pennsylvania State Police	Federal Court	Modified
*Santa Ana, CA Police Dept	State Court	Modified

\*Indicates had more than one method challenged

PSYCHOLOGICAL TEST

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
*King County (WA) DPS	State Court	Pending
*Davenport, IA Police Dept	State Court	Dropped
*Washington, DC Police Dept	Federal Court	Pending
*Atlanta Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Arkansas State Police	Federal Court	Modified
*Santa Ana Police Dept	State Court	Modified

\*Indicates had more than one selection method challenged

BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
Multnomah County (OR) DPS	County AIA Officer/State	Retained
*San Francisco Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
Houston Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Atlanta Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
*Pennsylvania State Police	Federal Court	Modified
*Arkansas State Police	Federal Court	MOdified

\*Indicates had more than one method challenged

POLYGRAPH

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
*Davenport, IA Police Dept	Department	Dropped
*Maryland State Police	State Court	Modified
Alexandria, VA Police Dept	EEOC	Retained

\*Indicates had more than one selection method challenged

PROBATION/FIELD TRAINING

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
San Jose, CA Police Dept	EEOC	Modified



MEDICAL EXAM

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
*King County (WA) DPS	Local Civil Service	Retained
Minnesota Highway Patrol	Human Rights Board	Retained
Michigan State Police	Federal Court	Retained
*California Highway Patrol	Missing Data	Retained

\*Indicates more than one selection method challenged

ENTIRE SELECTION PROCESS

Location	Resolved by	End Result
Santa Ana, CA Police Dept	State Court	Retained
Pennsylvania State Police	Federal Court	Modified
Arkansas State Police	Federal Court	Modified
Atlanta Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified
San Francisco Police Dept	Federal Court	Modified

NON-SPECIFIC METHOD

<u>Location</u>	<u>Resolved By</u>	<u>End Result</u>
Washington State Patrol	Human Rights Commission	Retained
Orlando Police Dept	Police Investigation	Retained
San Diego, CA Police Dept	Civil Service Comm	Voluntary compliance with LEAA- Modified
Dallas Police Dept	Federal Court	Pending

\*Indicates had more than one method challenged

APPENDIX E

Police Applicant Background Questionnaire  
and  
Police Officer Supplemental Experience Statement

APPENDIX E

HAMPTON POLICE DIVISION  
APPLICANT BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

NOTICE

This Questionnaire must be typewritten or clearly printed in black ink. All questions must be answered, if applicable. If not, indicate N/A (not applicable). Questionnaires which are not complete and legible will not be considered. If space provided is not sufficient for complete answers, or you wish to furnish additional information, attach additional sheets of the same size as this application, and refer to the question answered.

CAUTION

Any willful omission or misrepresentation of facts on this questionnaire may be grounds for rejection of your application or for dismissal from City employment.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ TELEPHONE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_  
(First) (Middle) (Last)

OTHER NAMES USED: (nicknames, aliases, maiden name, former names changed legally or otherwise) \_\_\_\_\_

PRESENT ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ CITY: \_\_\_\_\_ STATE: \_\_\_\_\_

RACE: \_\_\_ SEX: \_\_\_ HEIGHT: \_\_\_ WEIGHT: \_\_\_ COLOR HAIR: \_\_\_ EYES: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF BIRTH: \_\_\_\_\_ PLACE OF BIRTH: \_\_\_\_\_

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_ V.A. FILE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

VIRGINIA OPERATOR'S LICENSE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_ EXPIRES ON: \_\_\_\_\_

SELECTIVE SERVICE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_ DRAFT STATUS: \_\_\_\_\_

MILITARY SERVICE

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES, U.S. OR FOREIGN? \_\_\_\_\_

BRANCH OF SERVICE: \_\_\_\_\_ SERVICE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF ENTRY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE OF DISCHARGE: \_\_\_\_\_

TYPE OF DISCHARGE: \_\_\_\_\_ PLACE OF DISCHARGE: \_\_\_\_\_

RANK UPON ENTRY: \_\_\_\_\_ RANK UPON DISCHARGE: \_\_\_\_\_

MILITARY CITATIONS AND AWARDS RECEIVED: \_\_\_\_\_

LIST ANY DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS OR MILITARY COURTS RECEIVED: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>date</u>	<u>command</u>	<u>location</u>	<u>nature of charge</u>	<u>disposition</u>
-------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------------	--------------------



LIST THE NAMES, AGES, ADDRESSES AND OCCUPATIONS OF ALL BROTHERS AND SISTERS:

(name) (age) (address) (Occupation)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

LIST YOUR ADDRESSES FOR THE PAST 15 YEARS. IF YOU HAVE SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES, LIST YOUR DUTY STATIONS WHILE IN THE MILITARY. START WITH YOUR PRESENT ADDRESS AND WORK BACK.

FROM TO ADDRESS CITY STATE

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

EMPLOYMENT

START WITH YOUR PRESENT EMPLOYER AND WORK BACK FOR THE PAST TEN YEARS. (INCLUDE PERIODS OF UNEMPLOYMENT). (FILL OUT IN DETAIL).

=====

\_\_\_\_ (from) \_\_\_\_ (to) \_\_\_\_ (name of employer) \_\_\_\_ (complete address) \_\_\_\_ (zip code)

\_\_\_\_ (supervisor) \_\_\_\_ (position held) \_\_\_\_ (salary)

\_\_\_\_ (reason for leaving in full)

=====

\_\_\_\_ (from) \_\_\_\_ (to) \_\_\_\_ (name of employer) \_\_\_\_ (complete address) \_\_\_\_ (zip code)

\_\_\_\_ (supervisor) \_\_\_\_ (position held) \_\_\_\_ (salary)

\_\_\_\_ (reason for leaving in full)

=====

\_\_\_\_ (from) \_\_\_\_ (to) \_\_\_\_ (name of employer) \_\_\_\_ (complete address) \_\_\_\_ (zip code)

\_\_\_\_ (supervisor) \_\_\_\_ (position held) \_\_\_\_ (salary)

\_\_\_\_ (reason for leaving in full)

=====

\_\_\_\_ (from) \_\_\_\_ (to) \_\_\_\_ (name of employer) \_\_\_\_ (complete address) \_\_\_\_ (zip code)

\_\_\_\_ (supervisor) \_\_\_\_ (position held) \_\_\_\_ (salary)

\_\_\_\_ (reason for leaving in full)

=====

\_\_\_\_ (from) \_\_\_\_ (to) \_\_\_\_ (name of employer) \_\_\_\_ (complete address) \_\_\_\_ (zip code)

\_\_\_\_ (supervisor) \_\_\_\_ (position held) \_\_\_\_ (salary)

\_\_\_\_ (reason for leaving in full)

=====



LEGAL HISTORY

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED IN ANY COURT OF LAW OF ANY CRIMINAL CHARGE WHETHER FELONY OR MISDEMEANOR? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN ARRESTED AND CHARGED WITH ANY CRIMINAL OFFENSE? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN DETAINED FOR QUESTIONING BY ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY IN CONNECTION WITH A CRIMINAL ACT? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN REQUIRED TO FURNISH BAIL OR BOND FOR AN APPEARANCE IN ANY COURT OF LAW? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER RECEIVED A TRAFFIC SUMMONS FOR ANY VIOLATION OF TRAFFIC LAWS? \_\_\_\_\_

\* IF THE ANSWER TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS IS "YES", EXPLAIN BELOW IN DETAIL: GIVING DATE, PLACE, CHARGE AND FINAL DISPOSITION IN EACH CASE.

DATE	PLACE	CHARGE	FINAL DISPOSITION
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, HAS ANY MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY EVER BEEN ARRESTED FOR A CRIMINAL OFFENSE? IF SO, EXPLAIN BELOW.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY CRIMINAL ACT WHICH WAS REPORTED TO THE LEGAL AUTHORITIES? IF SO, EXPLAIN BELOW.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

MEDICAL HISTORY

HAVE YOU **EVER** BEEN HOSPITALIZED FOR ANY ILLNESS OR INJURY? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU **EVER** SUFFERED FROM OR CONSULTED A PHYSICIAN, PSYCHIATRIST, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AGENCY, FAITH HEALER OR CRISIS CENTER FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING:

ANY PHYSICAL OR MEDICAL DISORDER? \_\_\_\_\_ ANY MENTAL OR PSYCHIATRIC PROBLEM? \_\_\_\_\_

ANY NERVOUS CONDITION? \_\_\_\_\_ ADDICTION TO ANY NARCOTIC DRUGS? \_\_\_\_\_

ANY ALCOHOLIC DRINKING PROBLEM? \_\_\_\_\_ MARITAL OR FAMILY PROBLEM? \_\_\_\_\_

DO YOU NOW OR HAVE YOU EVER TAKEN ANY MEDICATION OR DRUG, PRESCRIBED OR OTHERWISE? \_\_\_\_\_

• IF THE ANSWER TO ANY OF THE ABOVE IS "YES", EXPLAIN BELOW IN DETAIL, GIVING DATES, NATURE OF PROBLEM, PERSONS CONSULTED AND TREATMENT.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

HAVE YOU EVER USED ANY ILLEGAL DRUG OR SUBSTANCE, SUCH AS:

MARIJUANA    HEROIN    LSD    "SPEED"    COCAINE    HASHISH,    ETC? \_\_\_\_\_

IF THE ANSWER TO ANY OF THE ABOVE IS "YES", DESCRIBED THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN FULL BELOW: GIVING THE FIRST TIME USED, THE LAST TIME USED, AND THE EXTENT OR FREQUENCY OF THE USE THEREOF.

••NOTE: (THE USE OF ANY ILLEGAL DRUG OR SUBSTANCE WILL NOT NECESSARILY DISQUALIFY AN APPLICANT FROM CONSIDERATION. THIS DEPENDS UPON THE TYPE AND EXTENT OF THE USE OF THESE SUBSTANCES. HOWEVER, WILLFULL CONCEALMENT OF DRUG USE MAY BE GROUNDS FOR REJECTION OF YOUR APPLICATION OR FOR DISMISSAL FROM CITY EMPLOYMENT).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

ARE YOU CURRENTLY MEETING YOUR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONTACTED BY A COLLECTION AGENCY IN REFERENCE TO ANY OUTSTANDING, UNPAID DEBT? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER FILED FOR BANKRUPTCY? \_\_\_\_\_

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN DECLARED OFFICIALLY BANKRUPT? \_\_\_\_\_

IF SO, GIVE THE DATE, NAME OF COURT AND LOCATION: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

LIST YOUR CURRENT INDEBTEDNESS?

AMOUNT	TO WHOM OWED	MONTHLY PAYMENT	ITEM(S) PURCHASED
--------	--------------	-----------------	-------------------


HAVE YOU EVER APPLIED FOR EMPLOYMENT WITH ANY FIRE, RESCUE OR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT? \_\_\_\_\_

IF YES, GIVE DATE, AGENCY, LOCATION AND STATUS OF APPLICATION. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

DO YOU HAVE ANY RELATIVES, FRIENDS OR ACQUAINTANCES EMPLOYED BY ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT, FIRE OR RESCUE AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT? IF SO, GIVE THEIR NAMES, AGENCY, LOCATION AND POSITION.






POLICE OFFICER SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERIENCE STATEMENT

City of Fresno, California

A traditional written examination will not be given. Instead, you will be evaluated on the extent to which you possess the following abilities and personal characteristics which job analysis has shown to be required for success in police work in the City of Fresno:

- |   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| I. Ability to Communicate                                     | V. Ability to Take Orders     |
| II. Ability to Exercise Self Control                          | VI. Common Sense and Judgment |
| III. Emotional Stability                                      | VII. Integrity                |
| IV. Ability and Willingness to Handle<br>Emergency Situations | VIII. Ability to Learn        |

NOTE: READ THIS CAREFULLY: Please answer all of the questions in this supplemental form. The importance of providing all of the information requested is stressed, as this information is needed in the rating or scoring process. Failure to provide complete information concerning your knowledge, skills, and abilities may affect your score. Remember, you cannot be given credit for something you do not tell us about. Questions not answered will be considered to indicate that you have not performed that particular activity. If a particular question does not seem applicable to you, then write N/A in the column, box, or space. Your statements must be true and accurate to the best of your ability. The truth of your statements will be verified in later phases of the examination process.

COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE YOURSELF, IN INK, AND IN YOUR OWN HANDWRITING OR PRINTING.

Additional Instructions:

When stating the frequency with which you performed tasks or activities within this form, use the following definitions as a guide:

Frequently: Daily, weekly, or as a continuing responsibility.

Occasionally: Performing in a non-continuous, but recurrent manner.

Seldom: Not a normal responsibility; happens once in a while, very infrequent.

Never: Have not performed.

IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED WHEN COMPLETING THIS FORM, PLEASE, CONTINUE ON SEPARATE SHEETS OF PAPER. PLACE YOUR IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON EACH EXTRA SHEET AND IDENTIFY TO WHICH QUESTION YOU INTEND THE RESPONSE TO APPLY.

BE AS COMPLETE AND ACCURATE AS POSSIBLE. GIVE YOURSELF THE BEST CHANCE YOU CAN.

FALSIFICATION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE OR ITS PREPARATION BY SOMEONE OTHER THAN THE APPLICANT WILL BE GROUNDS FOR RATING THE MATERIAL INELIGIBLE OR FOR REMOVING THE APPLICANT FROM THE LIST OF ELIGIBLES.

POLICE OFFICER SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERIENCE STATEMENT  
CITY OF FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:

Please indicate below any education beyond high school you have completed which might be of value in doing the work of a police officer:

I. Communication:	Course Title	Year Completed	Name of School - Where	Grade Received
1a. English Composition				
b. Law				
c. Police Science				
d. Psychology				
e. Sociology				
f. Speech or Drama				
g. Other				

2. List below all military courses taken while in service or in military academies. Give the course title (not number) and indicate whether or not in your subsequent military experience you applied the material learned, giving the circumstances and dates of application.

3. Have you taken any courses which required extensive library research and subsequent preparation of long reports, theses or dissertations? Describe below this research and indicate type of paper(s) prepared.



4. Have you ever attended lectures on police officer work? Have you ever read texts or journals about police work? Which ones?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
5. In any of your jobs or volunteer work, have you had to do a substantial amount of reading of laws, regulations, directives, difficult texts or references? In what jobs or activities? Describe below the type of material you had to read and interpret. Was it necessary to memorize the substance of what was read in order to perform the work? (Be sure to indicate what job required this and how long you performed this job.)
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
6. In any of your jobs or volunteer work (which ones and how long) have you had to do a substantial amount of original writing, such as composing letters (what type and to what kinds of people), directives, brochures, news articles, etc.? Describe below the kind of writing you have done.

7. In any of your jobs or volunteer work (which ones and how long) have you had to do a substantial amount of communication (precise giving and receiving of information) by telephone, radio or digital terminals? Describe the media used, length of time in which they were used and type of information exchanges.

## II. Self Control

A police officer must exercise a high level of self control at all times. The officer is often required to control his/her temper and emotions while working in stressful, hazardous situations involving severe personal injury or loss of life. In order to enforce the law impartially and fairly, and especially in such situations, an officer is required to make reasonable and appropriate decisions rapidly, while, at times subjecting himself/herself to oral and physical abuse. The officer must have an interest in, and take responsibility for, performing police work including helping the public, making arrests, and using physical or deadly force when necessary, without losing his/her self-esteem or lowering his/her moral standards.

Check in ONE of the following boxes to show how you evaluate your capability of achieving the degree of self control necessary for a police officer as described above:

Check:

- 8a.  If you feel you can achieve an exceptional degree of self control as described above.
- b.  If you feel you can achieve a very good degree of self control as described above.
- c.  If you feel you can achieve a good degree of self control (lack some of the characteristics described above).
- d.  If you feel you can achieve a fair degree of self control as described above, or if you have had little opportunity to find out your degree of self control under stressful conditions.
- e.  If you feel you can achieve a degree of self control less than that required FOR POLICE OFFICER.

9. To support the degree of self control you have marked, please describe some life experiences you have had which illustrate how you have had to exercise self control. Describe the circumstances and indicate whether these experiences were frequent, occasional, or seldom.

10. Have you ever been discharged from a job? \_\_\_\_\_

Describe each instance, give cause, date, and circumstances.

11. Have you ever received a warning letter from your employer? \_\_\_\_\_

Describe each reason for having received such a letter, give date and circumstances.

12. Have you ever received a formal discipline action from your employer (such as being placed on leave without pay)? \_\_\_\_\_

Describe each instance, give cause, date and circumstances.

13. Have you ever received any formal disciplinary action while in military service? \_\_\_\_\_

Describe each such circumstance.

THESE ARE INSTRUCTIONS FOR CATEGORY III, EMOTIONAL STABILITY, on the next page:

Use columns II, III, and IV to respond to statements in Col I. You may use additional sheets of plain paper or the back of this sheet to describe the checks you made under the "frequently" or "occasionally" items in column III. Describe these situations in each case stating what you did, where, when and how often as well as the circumstances under which the actions were performed.

REMEMBER ONE CHECK AND ONLY ONE CHECK IS REQUIRED IN EACH MAJOR COLUMN (II, III, IV) OPPOSITE EACH STATEMENT IN COLUMN I. FOR EXAMPLE: OPPOSITE STATEMENT 22, MARK "VERY WILLING" OR "NOT WILLING". Likewise, one choice under Have Done, (Column III) and one under Supervision, (Column IV).

III. EMOTIONAL STABILITY:

Please read the instructions for Category III, Emotional Stability, on the bottom of page 7.

Column I	Column II			Column III				Column IV			
	Will Do			Have Done				Supervision Received			
	VERY WILLING TO DO	WILLING TO DO	NOT WILLING TO DO	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Supervised Others	Worked Under Immediate Supervision	Worked Under General Supervision	Worked Independently
14. Work calmly <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> stressful situations											
15. Work calmly in dangerous situations											
16. Work where reasonable decisions must be made rapidly											
17. Work where need to accept responsibility for decisions made											
18. Assert necessary force and authority in performance of duties											
19. Work where essential to keep personal feelings separate from job decisions											
20. Work which required perseverance in spite of personal abuse											
21. Work which required perseverance in spite of following work conditions:											
a. Shift changes											
b. Adverse weather											
c. Overtime											
d. Sunday work											
e. Saturday work											
f. Holiday work											
22. Work which required continuing education, training &/or home study											
23. Work requiring continuing maintenance of top physical fitness											
24. Work requiring acceptable grooming standards											
25. Work requiring maintenance of high moral standards											

#### IV. EMERGENCY SITUATIONS:

A police officer must be able to adapt quickly to, and work under, a variety of conditions or in many different situations involving personal hazard, while, at the same time, asserting himself/herself and giving or taking orders, performing highly stressful, emotional or dangerous work which may result in depriving people of their freedom (making arrests). The officer must be able to deal effectively with people and situations which call for extreme patience, excellent physical ability, health, and endurance. He/she must also be able to drive all types of vehicles, sometimes at top speed and in pursuit of other vehicles. In addition, the police officer may be required to spend substantial periods of time doing monotonous or routine work both inside and outside.

Rate yourself in terms of your potential ability and willingness, after training, to handle emergency situations as described above by checking one of these boxes:

Check:

- 26 a.  If you feel you will be exceptionally well qualified in these abilities and are very willing to work in these types of situations.
- b.  If you feel you will be well qualified in these abilities and are willing to work in these types of situations.
- c.  If you feel you will be qualified in these abilities and are willing to work in these types of situations.
- d.  If you feel you will not be qualified OR would not be willing to meet the standards and working conditions expected in police officer work with respect to exposure to emergency situations.
27. If you have had specific experiences which demonstrate your potential level of competence and willingness as checked above, indicate what work, where, when and under what circumstances you performed the work. Indicate whether or not you liked or disliked that particular type of work. (Consider here a wide variety of experiences such as working alone at night in service stations, directing hiking or other excursions, driving school buses, etc.)

V. TAKE ORDERS:

A police officer in the City of Fresno must, at all times, be able to take orders and carry them out unquestioningly under stressful conditions, and accept responsibility for his/her actions and decisions; he/she must be able to accept supervision and work as a team member with peers and others. He/she must be able to read, understand, interpret, and follow police regulations, directives and laws governing the police department's operations.

RATE yourself in terms of your potential ability, after training, to follow police instructions and assume responsibility as described by checking ONE of the boxes below:

Check:

- 28 a.  If you feel you will be exceptionally well qualified in this ability.
- b.  If you feel you will be well qualified in this ability.
- c.  If you feel you will be qualified in this ability.
- d.  If you feel you will not be qualified to meet the standards expected in a Fresno Police Officer with respect to this ability.
29. If you rated yourself as "exceptionally well qualified", well qualified" or "qualified", please describe below, situations or job experience in which you have had to follow orders and take responsibility where the final result of your work involved the welfare or safety of others. (A wide range of duties should be considered here such as directing a life saving crew, inspecting parachutes, guarding children at school crossings, driving school buses, directing a team, carrying out combat military orders, mountain climbing, etc.)

VI. COMMON SENSE:

A Fresno Police Officer must have a high degree of common sense and be able to exercise it to make judgments in situations for which there are few or no guidelines. An officer must function effectively in both routine assignments and in emergency or crisis situations which require the ability to observe minor differences and which call for appropriately modifying standard procedures to meet such differences.

Check one of the following boxes to indicate your possession of and ability to exercise common sense and judgment:

Check:

- 30 a.  Possess a high degree of common sense and the ability to exercise it in a variety of situations.
- b.  Possess a satisfactory degree of common sense and the ability to exercise it in a variety of situations.
- c.  Possess a fair degree of common sense and the ability to exercise it in a variety of situations.
- d.  or not possess a degree of common sense and judgment consistent with that required to be an effective law enforcement person.
31. List below those educational, work, or other related (hobbies, etc.) experiences which you have had that would clearly demonstrate and support the level which you have checked.



VII. INTEGRITY:

A police officer in the Fresno Police Department has a sincere interest in assisting the public. This officer should have the ability to impartially and fairly enforce the law, while maintaining high personal and moral standards of honesty and ethics in the performance of that duty. An officer should be most willing and able to maintain confidentiality of records, reports, and materials and to maintain a loyal responsibility toward his/her work and the work of the Fresno Police Department.

Considering the above paragraph as representing the very highest level of police integrity, would you rate yourself as:

Check:

- 32 a.  Having a high level of integrity.
- b.  Having a satisfactory level of integrity.
- c.  Having a fair level of integrity.
- d.  Or having a level of integrity not in conformance with that of the Fresno Police Department.
33. List below, those educational, work, or other related (hobbies, etc.) experiences which you have had that would clearly demonstrate and support the level which you have checked.

VIII. LEARNING:

Police officers must be willing and able to learn continuously throughout their employment. They must be able to comprehend and analyze facts and data covering a wide variety of subjects; some of the learning experience will involve not only understanding theory and procedures, but taking actions based on these concepts. The actions required may involve making split-second decisions and may need to be adapted to differing requirements as work demands gradually or immediately change. The formal educational and practical learning experiences may include a variety of such things as learning how to deal effectively and impartially with people, reading and understanding complex written material, and learning about social and community problems.

Rate yourself in terms of your potential ability, after training, to participate in learning situations as described by checking one of these boxes:

Check:

- 34 a.  If you feel you will be exceptionally well qualified to learn and apply what is learned.
- b.  If you feel you will be well qualified to learn and apply what is learned.
- c.  If you feel you will be qualified to learn and apply what is learned.
- d.  If you feel you will not be able to learn and apply at the level expected of officers in the Fresno Police Department as described above.
35. Please support the rating you gave yourself above by describing situations in which you have had to learn theoretical material or concepts and put these into actual practice. Also give examples, if you have had any, of experiences in which you have had to continue your education or training in order to achieve advancement, change your career, learn other methods or procedures of doing work required by your employer. State whether such required learning or relearning was frequent, occasional or seldom.

36. Indicate what type of directives or procedural material you have been required to read and understand and whether you were required to interpret the material on your own, from supervisory instruction, from demonstration, or from formal classroom training.

NOTE TO APPLICANTS: Question 36 is the final question in the Police Officer Supplemental Experience Statement.

APPENDIX F

Comparison of Selection Methods by  
Job Performance Qualities

APPENDIX F

COMPARISON OF SELECTION METHODS BY JOB PERFORMANCE QUALITIES

Motivation for Police Work	X					X		X		
Self-Assertion and Self-Confidence	X				X	X	X	X		
Emotional Stability under Stress	X			X			X	X		
Sensitivity and Social Sense							X	X		
Flexibility in Complex Situations					X		X	X		
Mature Relationship to Authority	X				X	X	X	X		
Oral Communication	X				X	X	X	X		
Ethics/Moral Character	X	X		X		X	X	X		
Practical Judgment					X	X	X	X		
General Personality Characteristics	X						X	X	X	
Intelligence and Aptitude										X
Health			X							
	Police Staff Interview	Background Check	Physical	Polygraph	LCD	Individual Interview	Situational Tests	Oral Board	MMPI	LVS

Gavin, J.F. & Hamilton, John. "Selecting Police Using Assessment Center Methodology." Journal of Police Science and Administration. 1975, 3 (2), June, p 169.