

# **STATEWIDE JOB ANALYSIS OF THE PATROL OFFICER POSITION**

## **Final Report**



**MICHIGAN COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT STANDARDS**

**October 2006**

**Copyright © 2006 Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards**

All rights reserved, including the right to reproduce this report. This report is not to be reproduced without the written permission of the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards

Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards  
7426 N. Canal Rd.  
Lansing, MI 48913

PH: (517) 322-1417

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Executive Summary .....	1
Background.....	1
The Job Analysis Inventory.....	2
Survey Administration.....	2
Survey Respondents .....	2
Ratings of Training Effectiveness .....	3
Core Job Tasks .....	4
1996-2006 Comparison of Job Tasks.....	4
Core Complaints, Sources of Information, and Equipment .....	4
1996-2006 Comparison of Non-Task Data .....	5
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	6
The Law Enforcement Profession in the State of Michigan: An Overview.....	7
The Job Task Analysis: Methodology and Rationale .....	7
Project Description and Strategy .....	8
Chapter 2: Job Analysis Inventory Design and Administration .....	11
The Patrol Officer Survey .....	11
The Patrol Supervisor Survey.....	13
Sampling Techniques.....	14
Statewide Return Rates.....	17
Chapter 3: Description of the Sample .....	18
Patrol Officer Sample .....	18
Supervisor Sample .....	19
Patrol Officers' Rating of Basic Training Curriculum and Training Priority .....	29
Patrol Officers' Ratings of In-Service Training Requirements and Curriculum.....	29
Chapter 4: Data Analysis .....	36
Task Ratings: The Frequency and Criticality of Job Tasks .....	36
Core Tasks.....	37
Tenure Analysis.....	39
1996-2006 Comparison of Job Tasks.....	40
Analysis of Non-Task Data .....	41
Complaints/Incidents.....	41
Sources of Information.....	41
Equipment .....	42
1996-2006 Comparison of Non-Task Data.....	42
Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusions.....	44
References .....	45



## Appendices

---

Appendix A:	Job Analysis Officer Survey
Appendix B:	List of Participating Agencies
Appendix C:	Average Frequency and Criticality Ratings for Task Statements
Appendix D:	List of Core Tasks
Appendix E:	List of Non-Core Tasks
Appendix F:	Reason for Exclusion of Non-Core Tasks
Appendix G:	Results of Tenure Analysis
Appendix H:	Core Complaints/Incidents
Appendix I:	Non-Core Complaints/Incidents
Appendix J:	Detailed Frequency of Response to Complaints
Appendix K:	Core Sources of Information
Appendix L:	Non-Core Sources of Information
Appendix M:	Core Equipment
Appendix N:	Non-Core Equipment

## **Executive Summary**

---

A job task analysis (JTA) is used by the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards (MCOLES) to fulfill its statutory responsibilities of establishing and maintaining the job-relatedness and relevance of employment, licensing, and training standards for patrol officers. The JTA was originally completed in 1979 and updated in 1996. Although the MCOLES routinely examines and evaluates its entry-level standards, basic training curriculum, and licensing examination, it is important to ensure that the JTA remains *contemporary* and accurately describes the job as it exists today. Therefore, in late 2005 - early 2006, the job task analysis was updated once again. The results of that project are detailed in the present report. This Executive Summary presents only an overview of methods and findings.

### **Background**

- The JTA is intended to capture the roles, responsibilities, and duties specifically of patrol officers, a category within the occupation of law enforcement officer.
- The JTA took place in three major phases:

Phase one included:

1. reviewing, revising, and updating the 1996 task inventory for use in 2006;
2. developing an online data capture format; and
3. pilot testing the job analysis inventory and making the necessary final revisions.

Phase two included:

1. determining agency stratifications;
2. identifying a scientifically-based random sample of agencies and officers;
3. identifying and contacting agency administrators and coordinators; and
4. administering the survey online.

Phase three included:

1. analyzing the data to determine the core and non-core tasks;
2. identifying the essential job functions for each of the eleven agency types; and
3. writing the final project reports.

## **The Job Analysis Inventory**

- While the majority of the tasks in the 2006 survey remained the same as in 1996, some editing was done to incorporate current terminology/methods, and several additions were made to reflect current job requirements. The deletions, amendments, and other edits to the job task list resulted in a final list of 459 job tasks.
- The job tasks were presented through a survey or inventory format, with standard instructions and response scales. Specifically, patrol officers were asked to indicate, on a scale of 1-5, how frequently they performed each task. Patrol supervisors were independently asked to indicate, on a similar five-point scale, the relative importance of each patrol officer task. In addition, officers were asked about the types of calls they respond to and the types of equipment and sources of information that they use.
- Inquiries regarding in-service training were added to the online survey.

## **Survey Administration**

- For the first time, the survey was administered online, and officers indicated their responses by pointing to and clicking on their selections.
- To ensure that the variety of assignments and agencies were represented in the JTA, all law enforcement agencies in the state were categorized into stratifications by type and size, beginning with the categories originally identified in 1979 and 1996. Eleven separate stratifications eventually emerged that contained all agencies in the state. All eleven agency types were represented in the sample.

## **Survey Respondents**

- The statewide response rate (considering any and all who accessed the survey) for patrol officers was 88% (3,333 out of 3,786), and for patrol supervisors was 92% (728 out of 793). The response rates remain high, even if only useable surveys are considered – 85% for patrol officers (3,231) and 89% for supervisors (706).
- The final survey sample for respondents was representative of Michigan's population of sworn officers in terms of agency type and demographics.

Descriptive characteristics of the patrol officer sample are as follows.

- Primary job responsibilities were patrol, criminal investigation, and/or traffic enforcement.
- 87% of the officers are male and 83% are white. The average age is 36.08.

- Over 90% have completed at least some college, with close to 60% having a post high school degree.
- Slightly less than half of the officers do not rotate shifts, while slightly more than half do.
- The average total number of years of experience as a licensed law enforcement officer was 10.95 years.

Demographic characteristics of the supervisor sample are listed below.

- Most are sergeants (72%) with an average of 19 years in law enforcement.
- 92% of the supervisors are male and 87% are white. The average age is 42.70.
- 100% of the supervisors had a high school diploma, with approximately 94% having completed at least some undergraduate coursework.

### **Ratings of Training Effectiveness**

- As part of the background information, patrol officers were asked to indicate how well prepared they were to perform the important tasks associated with their job following basic training, with the majority (approximately 82%) indicating that they were “fairly well” prepared or better (“quite well” or “very well” prepared).
- Officers also provided information about in-service training effectiveness and requirements. Specifically, officers were asked to rate how well in-service training prepared them to perform important tasks post 9/11. The officers did not perceive in-service training as favorably as they did basic training, with 40% indicating that in-service training did little to prepare them for important tasks post 9/11.
- Finally, with respect to training standards and curriculum, officers were also asked to give their opinions on the number of hours of in-service training an officer should have per year, with the majority (approximately 80%) suggesting at least 31 hours per year. The number of hours that should be left to agency discretion was also asked, with most officers indicating that the bulk of training be conducted at the local level. When asked how often officers should attend in-service training, almost 50% indicated once every 6 months. Finally, when asked to identify which concept or characteristic is most important to job effectiveness and the topic most important for road officers in the post 9/11 environment, the most frequent responses were Communication Skills, and Decision Making.



## **Core Job Tasks**

- Core tasks are defined as those tasks with “statewide significance” (PRC and MLEOTC, 1979). Four factors were considered in determining whether a task was core or non-core:
  1. Composite Score (a weighted composite of the criticality and frequency ratings)
  2. Tenure (with tasks performed significantly more often by high tenured officers excluded from the list of core tasks)
  3. The mean frequency rating for each task across all agency types (with a minimum frequency required for a task to be considered core)
  4. The mean importance rating for each task across all agency types (with critical tasks identified as core regardless of frequency)
- Using these criteria, 339 of 459 tasks (or 73.9%) were identified as core tasks.

## **1996–2006 Comparison of Job Tasks**

- The job of patrol officer in Michigan has, in fact, changed in the ten years since the prior JTA was completed. The change is, however, in breadth and scope. That is, new tasks and responsibilities have been identified which are core to the job, even though the criticality and frequency with which common tasks were performed remains relatively the same from 1996 to now.
- The tenure analysis revealed a change in the job of “new” officers from 1996 to 2006. Specifically, in 2006, a higher percentage of low tenured officers performed first aid tasks than they did in 1996. As a result, the first aid tasks are no longer excluded from core consideration due to tenure differences.

## **Core Complaints, Sources of Information, and Equipment**

- Patrol officers were asked to rate the frequency with which they respond to 162 different complaints/incidents. Complaints and incidents performed by at least 50% of patrol officers across all agency types were considered to be core. A total of 134 complaints/incidents out of 162 (or 82.72%) were identified as core.
- Data were gathered on both the importance of each source of information, and the frequency with which it is used and a composite score created. Considering both importance and frequency, 19 out of 34 sources of information (or 55.88%) were rated significant.

- When rating the 99 different kinds of equipment and vehicles, respondents simply indicated if they used the equipment or not. If 50% or more of the respondents across all eleven agency types indicated that they used the equipment, it was considered core equipment. A total of 43 pieces of equipment (or 43.43%) were identified as core.

### **1996–2006 Comparison of Non-Task Data**

- In comparing 1996 to 2006, the common complaints, core sources of information, and core equipment were similar in terms of their relevance to the job. The 2006 findings suggest, however, an increase in breadth and scope in that there were significantly more types of complaints, sources of information, and equipment now than 10 years ago.

## **CHAPTER 1: Introduction**

---

The Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards (MCOLES) is the state agency that sets standards in Michigan for the selection, employment, and training of law enforcement officers. The legislation that created the MCOLES can be found in Public Act 203 of 1965, as amended, sections MCL 28.601 through MCL 28.616 of the Michigan Compiled Laws. The MCOLES sets “minimum standards of physical, educational, mental, and moral fitness [that] govern the recruitment, selection, and appointment of law enforcement officers” statewide (MCL 28.609, Sec. 9., (a)). Specifically, this statutory responsibility includes the authority to promulgate mandated medical and non-medical standards, for example, education, hearing, vision, physical fitness, reading ability, good moral character, and training. In addition, the Commission promulgates rules with respect to “categories or classifications of advanced in-service training programs” for licensed law enforcement officers in the state (MCL 29.609, sec. 9 (4) (a)).

The current governing body, the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards, consists of 15 members who are appointed by the Governor. The Attorney General and Director of State Police are ex-officio members. Three Sheriffs, three Chiefs of Police, and one each of the following comprise the membership: Fraternal Order of Police, the Police Officers Association of Michigan, the Detroit Police Officers Association, the Michigan State Police Troopers Association, the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan, the Criminal Defense Attorneys of Michigan, and the Chief of the Police Department located in a city with a population of more than 750,000, or the Chief’s designated representative who is a command officer with that department (currently the Detroit Police Department).

As a state regulatory agency, and as a logical outgrowth of its statutory responsibilities, the MCOLES is required to establish and maintain the job-relatedness and relevance of all its standards. One way to demonstrate and support job relatedness and relevance is through a process called validation. The first step in any formal validation strategy includes a review of job information -- that is, a review of the tasks and activities performed on the job and the knowledges, skills, abilities, and other characteristics required for their successful performance. One of the most rigorous methods used to define job content is a job task analysis, where each and every task is described in terms of its frequency, and criticality or importance. The job task analysis approach was implemented in Michigan to ensure that the resulting job description would be comprehensive, complete, and useful for defining performance standards for entry into the profession as well as for continuing education.

In 1979, the MCOLES, then the Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council (MLEOTC), in partnership with Personnel Research Consultants (PRC), Fair Oaks, California, conducted a job task analysis of the patrol officer position using a random sample of Michigan law enforcement agencies and officers. A sample pool of patrol officers and patrol supervisors were asked about the frequency and criticality of specified common job tasks. The results of the 1979 job task analysis were ultimately used by the MLEOTC to develop mandatory statewide selection standards and training curricula for entry-level patrol officers across the state.

In 1996, the MLEOTC contracted with Stanard & Associates, Inc. (S&A), Chicago, Illinois, to conduct an updated job task analysis to ensure that the mandated standards remained valid and reflected current law enforcement practices. As was done in 1979, MLEOTC queried patrol officers and patrol supervisors regarding a list of common job tasks as to their frequency and criticality. Detailed information regarding the design and development of the 1979 and 1996 job

task analyses and the adherence of these efforts to professionally accepted guidelines can be found in the respective project reports (Personnel Research Consultants, 1979; Stanard & Associates, 1996).

Although the MCOLES routinely examines and evaluates its entry-level standards, training curriculum, and licensing examination, it is important to ensure that the job analysis remains *contemporary* and accurately describes the job as it exists today. Therefore, in late 2005 - early 2006, the job task analysis was updated once again. The results of that project are contained in the present report. The goal is to identify any significant changes in law enforcement practices and procedures over the past 10 years and to ensure that standards remain valid.

In addition, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) reinforces the need for employers to ensure that their employment standards are job-related and consistent with business necessity. Specifically, the ADA references essential job functions as a requirement/justification for employment practices (see Snyder, 1991). The current job analysis will also be used to update the essential job functions of the job of patrol officer in the state of Michigan.

### **The Law Enforcement Profession in the State of Michigan: An Overview**

Presently, an individual wishing to become a licensed law enforcement officer in Michigan must meet the MCOLES' minimum selection standards, satisfactorily complete the mandated 562 hour curriculum at an MCOLES approved basic training academy, pass a state licensing examination, and be employed by a law enforcement agency as a fully empowered law enforcement officer. The MCOLES' regulatory powers are quite broad due to the definition of the position of a law enforcement officer. "Law enforcement officer" means any member of any police force or other organization of a city, county, township, village or the state regularly employed and responsible for enforcement of the general criminal law of the state (MCL 28.602). Traditional agencies (e.g., municipal, county and state police) clearly meet the statutory definition of "police force", but the legislative language also includes specialized organizations such as park, tribal, conservation, airport and other state law enforcement agencies.

Any person who is a sworn member of an MCOLES recognized law enforcement agency must meet all selection and training criteria published by the MCOLES. In total, the MCOLES currently recognizes over 600 traditional and specialized agencies, and licenses approximately 21,660 full-time and 1,200 part-time officers statewide.

### **The Job Task Analysis: Methodology and Rationale**

As stated, a job task analysis is the tool used by the MCOLES to support the job-relatedness of the law enforcement standards for the position of patrol officer. It should be pointed out that other state standard-setting organizations across the nation use a very similar methodology. What the MCOLES has learned about the job tasks, through the job task analyses, is important to agencies statewide, and each and every officer across the state. Participating in the JTA was a unique opportunity for line officers to let the MCOLES know what type of person should be entering the law enforcement profession in Michigan. Moreover, understanding how law enforcement has changed since the terrorist attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 and the government's response to hurricane Katrina in 2005 is invaluable for ongoing and future selection and training initiatives – both for basic training and for continuing education purposes.

The JTA is structured to capture the roles, responsibilities, and duties specifically of patrol officers, a category within the occupation of law enforcement officer. In completing the job task inventory, patrol officers were asked to indicate, on a scale of 1-5, how frequently they performed each task. Patrol supervisors were asked to indicate, on a similar five-point scale, the relative importance of each patrol officer task. In addition, officers were asked about the types of calls they respond to and the types of equipment and sources of information that they use.

The survey was administered online, and officers were able to record their responses by pointing to and clicking on their selections. The job task analysis was made available through a secured internet connection and all officers and supervisors were able to respond to the survey anonymously. Officers and supervisors were able to access the survey at anytime from any computer with an internet connection during the data collection or survey phase. The ability to work on the survey and then return to it at a later time contributed to the “user-friendly” nature of the process.

### **Project Description and Strategy**

The 2006 job task analysis took place in three major phases: Phase one focused on the design and development of the survey form; Phase two included the selection of the officers and supervisors to participate and the administration of the survey; and Phase three included analyses, results, and documentation. Each phase was completed in three steps, which are detailed below.

Phase one included:

1. reviewing, revising, and updating the 1996 task inventory for use in 2006;
2. developing an online data capture format; and
3. pilot testing the job task analysis inventory and making the necessary final revisions.

Phase two included:

1. determining agency stratifications;
2. identifying a scientifically-based random sample of agencies and officers;
3. identifying and contacting agency administrators and coordinators; and
4. administering the survey online.

Phase three included:

1. analyzing the data to determine the core and non-core tasks;
2. identifying the essential job functions for each of the eleven agency types; and
3. writing the final project reports.

Stanard & Associates completed phases one and two, with timelines for completion established in conjunction with the MCOLES. Phase three was a separate project and was completed by Performance-Based Selection, Ltd. (PBS), Westlake, Ohio.

In late May 2005, the MCOLES and S&A began the project. It was decided early on that the survey instrument would be administered online using a secure link to a server, rather than distributing survey booklets, bubble sheets, and No. 2 pencils, as was done previously. Since the number of patrol officers responding was anticipated to exceed 3,000 and the number of supervisors responding was anticipated to exceed 700, the computer-based online format allowed for the most reliable and efficient data collection and processing. In addition, it was anticipated that potential coding and scanning errors would be eliminated by using an online platform, as well as an increase in the overall response rate.

In June, 2005, the MCOLES and representatives from S&A held an initial planning meeting in Lansing. At the meeting, the participants agreed on the responsibilities of each organization and on reasonable timelines for the completion of the required project tasks. In phases one and two, as S&A began working on the data capture format, a work group of subject matter experts (SMEs) was identified to edit and update the existing task and inventory lists from 1996.

It was decided that the format and structure of the 2006 job analysis would closely resemble the 1996 JTA, and that many tasks inventoried in 1996 would still be relevant today. Therefore, the new survey was based largely on the inventory used in 1996, expanded to include the relevant updates that reflected best practices in 2006.

To review and identify the task statements, incumbent MCOLES licensed patrol officers and patrol supervisors (that is, the SMEs) from across the state participated in a facilitated meeting. At the meeting, their collective professional judgments were recorded. Staff asked the participants to examine the 1996 lists of tasks, equipment, complaints, and resources to determine their suitability for the 2006 questionnaire. Simultaneously, work began on a statistically sound sampling methodology to identify potential and representative participant agencies and officers across Michigan. Details of the sampling technique are presented in Chapter Two of this report.

It was also decided that the statistical decision-points used to distinguish core and non-core tasks, as well as the core equipment, core complaints handled, and important sources of information, would be the same as the decision-points used in 1996. Using the same decision criteria makes statistical comparisons between 1996 and 2006 JTAs much more direct and meaningful.

During the fall of 2005, in consultation with S&A, the MCOLES identified a potential pool of participant agencies and officers. Once identified, contact letters and follow-up telephone interviews were initiated with the chief administrative officer of each selected agency. Each agency administrator who agreed to participate in the job task analysis also agreed to identify an agency coordinator, an individual who would work in liaison with the MCOLES as the project progressed.

Specifically, the coordinator duties included:

1. serving as the single contact point, or liaison, with the MCOLES and the agency;
2. examining agency rosters to identify patrol officers and patrol supervisors;
3. meeting with the MCOLES representatives at a regional site to discuss:
  - a. what the JTA project is all about,
  - b. how to access the JTA survey online, and
  - c. directions for completing the survey for officers/supervisors;
4. explaining what a JTA is to the participants;
5. acting as an advocate for the value and importance of the JTA;
6. addressing issues as they arise, in consultation with the MCOLES; and
7. directing the officers/supervisors to the web site and provide directions on how to complete the survey.

Regional coordinator meetings were conducted during the first part of December, 2005, in the cities of Marquette, Gaylord and Lansing.

The job task analysis became available online on December 12, 2005.

## **CHAPTER 2: Job Analysis Inventory Design and Administration**

To develop the JTA survey, the 1996 job task list was examined closely to ensure its relevancy and utility for 2006. While the majority of the tasks in the 2006 survey remained the same as in 1996, some editing was done to incorporate current terminology/methods, and several additions were made to reflect current job requirements. The deletions, amendments, and other edits to the job task list resulted in a final list of 459 job tasks.

The frequency and criticality or consequences of inadequate performance rating scales used in 1996 were again used in 2006. Each rating was made using a 5-point scale. The rating scales are given below.

<b>Frequency of Performance</b>				
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Have never done this task	A few times per year (or less frequent)	A few times per month	A few times per week	Daily

<b>Criticality (Consequences of Inadequate Performance)</b>				
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Minimal	Not very serious	Serious	Extremely Serious	Disastrous (e.g. loss of life)

In addition, the rating scales used for complaints, equipment, and sources of information were the same as those used in 1996.

Modeling the approach used in 1996, the 2006 job task analysis consisted of two surveys, or questionnaires, one for patrol officers and one for patrol supervisors. Both surveys were administered online. The two different surveys were designed to capitalize on the unique perspective and expertise of patrol officers versus supervisors. Patrol officers were asked to make ratings that focused on day-to-day activities by rating the frequency with which they performed the tasks, used equipment, responded to complaints, or referred to resources. Supervisors were asked to rate the criticality of each task based on their experience with the components of successful job performance.

### **The Patrol Officer Survey**

The patrol officer survey was divided into five (5) main sections, which were intended to solicit relevant information from the respondents about the job tasks of a law enforcement patrol officer in Michigan. The five main sections of the survey are as follows:



1. background & training information – which contained questions regarding age, gender, length of experience, education, and primary job responsibilities. In addition, this section contained questions regarding the officers' perspective on how well basic training prepared them for patrol, the importance and relevance of in-service training, and the emphasis given to topics covered in their basic academy training.

In addition, at the end of the section, officers were invited to provide any comments that they have about basic or in-service training issues.

2. response to complaints – which contained questions regarding how often an officer responded to a specified list of complaints or incidents, for example, barricaded gunman, bomb threats, domestic violence, identity theft, computer crimes, and so forth.
3. types of equipment used – which contained a list of equipment traditionally associated with law enforcement, where officers were asked to indicate which items they used in the course of their duties. The list included items such as rifle, handcuffs, cellular telephone, live-scan machine, and car computer terminal.
4. sources of information – which contained questions regarding the written materials used by officers in the performance of their job, including court decisions, state statutes, Attorney General Opinions, incident reports, and Internet searches.
5. tasks performed – which is the foundation of the job task analysis. This section contained a list of 459 job tasks that were believed to be performed by law enforcement officers in Michigan. The list included a wide variety of tasks such as: investigate crimes against persons, interrogate suspects, obtain search warrants, read Miranda warnings, apprehend juvenile offenders, patrol freeways, and write reports.

A copy of the patrol officer survey, as it appeared online, is provided in Appendix A of this report.

The number of items and type of data associated with each section are detailed in Table 1 below.

**Table 1  
Number of Items and Type of Data Associated with Each Section**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Number of Items</b>	<b>Type of Data</b>
Background & training information*	40	Nominal
Response to complaints/incidents	162	Ordinal
Equipment list	99	Nominal
Resources used	34	Ordinal
Task list inventory	459	Ordinal
<b>Total</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>-</b>

\*Background information includes 15 demographic questions, 18 basic training questions, and 8 in-service questions. In addition, respondents were invited to submit narrative comments about basic and/or in-service training.

### **The Patrol Supervisor Survey**

The supervisor survey included two (2) main sections: (1) background & training information and (2) task criticality. The supervisor task list was identical to the patrol officer task list but the responses were based on a criticality rating not a frequency of occurrence.

Patrol Supervisors were asked to provide information descriptive of their job (e.g., type of agency, primary responsibility), experience, and education as well as of themselves (e.g., gender, age). They then rated the criticality of each task for patrol officers in terms of consequences of inadequate performance.

The number and kind of items in the patrol supervisor survey are given in Table 2.

**Table 2  
Number of Items and Type of Data Associated with Each Section**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Number of Items</b>	<b>Type of Data</b>
Background & training information	10	Nominal
Task list inventory	459	Ordinal
<b>Total</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>-</b>

## **Sampling Techniques**

To ensure that a variety of agency types were represented in the JTA, a stratified random sampling technique was used to select participants for the project. A stratified random sample is one based on the identification of distinct sub-populations or groupings, where each participant in a grouping has an equal chance of being selected. As implemented here, the groupings were defined as types of law enforcement agencies (e.g., large city police department), where each agency within a type had an equal chance of being selected for participation. In this way, the variety of agency types present in the state of Michigan were sure to be represented in the sample.

Before beginning the sampling process, agencies with three or fewer officers were excluded due to the impracticality of sampling officers from such agencies. Then, all remaining law enforcement agencies in the state were categorized into stratifications by type and size, beginning with the categories originally identified in the 1979 and 1996 job task analyses. Eleven separate stratifications eventually emerged that contained all agencies in the state.

The two largest law enforcement agencies in the state, the Detroit Police Department (DPD) and the Michigan State Police (MSP) were each included as separate stratifications. The remaining nine stratifications were defined as follows:

- large city/township/village police departments (100+ officers)
- medium city/township/village police departments (30-99 officers)
- small city/township/village police departments (4-29 officers)
- large county sheriff departments (30+ officers)
- small county sheriff departments (4-29 officers)
- university/college police departments
- tribal police agencies
- other state agencies with law enforcement authority (the Michigan Department of Attorney General, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources)
- specialty police agencies (the Genesee County Parks and Recreation and the Capital Regional Airport Authority)

Once all law enforcement agencies in the state were placed in stratifications, the next step in the sampling process was to randomly select 25% of the agencies in each stratification for participation in the job task analysis project. The selected agencies were contacted, first by letter and then by a follow-up telephone call and invited to participate. Agencies that were unable to participate were replaced in the selection pool with other agencies of the same type to maintain the 25% representation per stratification.

Geographical representation across the state was considered during the sampling process as well. As a result, several agencies were included in similar stratifications to achieve a better statewide geographic representation.

For the DPD, two of their six patrol districts were selected to participate and for the MSP, fifteen posts statewide were selected to participate. These selections were made in full consultation with both DPD and MSP command staff to ensure a representative sampling of these agencies. It was important that the number of officers and supervisors sampled from the DPD represent its various operational areas and districts, and that the number of troopers and supervisors sampled from the MSP represent its various districts and posts. Accordingly, districts and posts from these departments were selected to represent various operational areas and geographic locations. The actual number of DPD districts and MSP posts sampled are provided in Tables 3 and 4. A listing of the agencies sampled in each of the eleven stratifications is presented in Appendix B.

**Table 3  
Detroit Police Department Sample**

District	Number in Sample	
	Patrol Officers	Supervisors
Eastern	211	33
Southwest	237	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>65</b>

**Table 4  
Michigan State Police Sample**

District	Post Number	City	Number in Sample	
			Troopers	Supervisors
1	12	Brighton	23	5
1	19	Jonesville	11	2
2	24	Richmond	32	6
2	25	Metro South	31	5
3	34	Sandusky	8	2
5	37	Bridgeport	30	5
5	54	Bridgman	22	4
5	55	South Haven	17	3
6	62	Reed City	16	2
6	65	Newago	12	2
7	75	Houghton Lake	14	3
7	78	Petoskey	15	2
8	81	Negaunee	16	6
8	83	St. Ignace	11	4
8	85	Gladstone	13	2
<b>Total</b>			<b>271</b>	<b>53</b>

Note: MSP does not have a district four.

Once agencies were identified for participation, the MCOLES needed to identify the officers and supervisors from each agency who were assigned to patrol operations as their primary responsibilities, since the JTA specifically targets the position of patrol officer. To obtain this information, the MCOLES asked for assistance from the “agency coordinator,” the local individual who served as the primary departmental contact person for the JTA. The coordinator provided the MCOLES with a list of officers and supervisors participating in the JTA who would be and who were assigned to patrol operations.

Based on the patrol rosters provided to the MCOLES by the agency coordinators, a sample pool of respondents was selected. The total number of sworn officers, per stratification, and the total number of those asked to participate in the JTA, per stratification, are displayed in Table 5.

**Table 5  
Agency Stratifications by Statewide and Sample Representation**

Agency Type/Stratification	Statewide		JTA Sample		
	Number of Agencies	Total Sworn Personnel	Number of Agencies, Districts, or Posts	Patrol Officers	Patrol Supervisors
College/Universities	11	440	8	102	26
Detroit Police Department	1	3,602	2*	448	65
Large Cities/Villages/Townships	18	3,022	6	595	95
Large County Sheriffs	24	4,191	11	589	102
Medium Cities/Villages /Townships	67	3,458	24	714	170
Michigan State Police	1	1,840	15**	271	53
Other State Agencies with Law Enforcement Authority	3	462	3	177	33
Small Cities/Villages/Townships	245	3,871	76	592	183
Small County Sheriffs	57	866	13	118	33
Specialty Police Agencies	31	276	5	109	22
Tribal Police Agencies	9	110	3	19	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>467***</b>	<b>22,138</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>3,786</b>	<b>795</b>

\* Districts

\*\* Posts

\*\*\*Agencies with three or less officers were excluded from the JTA project.

## **Statewide Return Rates**

Once the online survey was closed to participation in early 2006, the statewide return rates were analyzed by the MCOLES and PBS. Some of those invited to participate never responded at all, and some accessed the survey but never completed it. For those who did access the survey, any surveys for which less than 50% of the items were completed (considering only the task, complaint, and source of information sections for officers; and task section for supervisors) were eliminated. The following summary provides an overview of the participant activity:

<b>Participant Activity</b>	<b>Number of Patrol Officers</b>	<b>Number of Supervisors</b>
Contacted	3,786	793
Responding	3,333	728
Complete (Useable Surveys)	3,231	706

The statewide response rate (considering any and all who accessed the survey) for patrol officers was 88%, and for patrol supervisors was 92%. The response rates remain high, even if only useable surveys are considered – 85% for patrol officers and 89% for supervisors.

## CHAPTER 3: Description of the Sample

During the early part of 2006, as the online survey came to a close, the MCOLES contracted with Performance-Based Selection, Ltd (PBS), Westlake, Ohio to complete phase three of the project. PBS agreed to compile and analyze the raw officer and supervisor data, as provided by the MCOLES, complete the full report and the individual stratification reports, and provide conclusions and recommendations based on the analyses. The results of the analyses, as contained in this report, are used by the MCOLES to validate its entry-level standards and to provide direction for future in-service training initiatives.

This chapter summarizes the characteristics of the sample based on the background and training section of the survey. As shown in Table 6, the final survey sample for patrol officers was representative of Michigan's population of licensed officers.

**Table 6**  
**Number of Patrol Officer and Supervisor JTA Participants**

Agency Type/Stratification	% of MCOLES licensed officers statewide	Patrol Officers		Supervisors	
		N	% of those Sampled	N	% of those Sampled
College/University	2	102	3.16	26	3.68
Detroit Police	16	360	11.14	50	7.08
Large City Police	14	550	17.02	90	12.75
Large Sheriff Department	19	550	17.02	102	14.45
Medium City Police	16	626	19.37	156	22.10
Michigan State Police	8	260	8.05	53	7.51
Other State Agencies with Law Enforcement Authority	2	143	4.43	26	3.68
Small City Police	17	436	13.49	153	21.67
Small Sheriff Department	4	101	3.13	26	3.68
Specialty Police Agencies	< 1	91	2.82	19	2.69
Tribal Police Agencies	< 1	12	< 1	5	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

A brief overview of each sample is given below.

### **Patrol Officer Sample**

- Primary job responsibilities were patrol, criminal investigation, and/or traffic enforcement.
- 87% of the officers are male and 83% are white. The average age is 36.08.

- Over 90% have completed at least some college, with close to 60% having a post high school degree or GED.
- Slightly less than half of the officers do not rotate shifts, while slightly more than half do.
- The average total number of years experience as a certified law enforcement officer was 10.95 years.

### **Supervisor Sample**

- Most of the supervisors are sergeants (72%) with an average of 19 years in law enforcement.
- 92% of the supervisors are male and 87% are white. The average age is 42.70.
- 94% of the supervisors completed at least some undergraduate coursework.

Details of the patrol officer sample are provided in Tables 7 through 18 with the characteristics of the supervisor sample provided in Tables 19 through 28. The background and demographic information indicates characteristics of the participants themselves (e.g., age and gender) as well as of their typical work assignments (e.g., recent primary responsibility and shifts worked). Finally, the survey contained questions about training curriculum priority, and descriptive statistics for these questions immediately follow.



**Table 7**  
**Patrol Officers' Primary Responsibility(ies) in the Last Six Months**

<b>Primary Responsibility(ies)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>% of Total Responses</b>
Patrol	3,091	22.92
Traffic Enforcement	2,354	17.46
Criminal Investigation	2,068	15.33
Community Relations	1,894	14.04
Warrant Service & Property Control	1,246	9.24
Narcotics Investigation	651	4.83
Identification	588	4.36
Civil Processes	560	4.15
Other	376	2.79
Dispatching	283	2.10
Bailiff/Court Officer	173	1.28
Vice Investigation	127	<1
Canine Unit	48	< 1
Evidence Technician	27	< 1
<b>Total Number of Responses</b>	<b>13,486</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: The total number of responses is greater than 3,231 because respondents could respond to more than one selection.

**Table 8**  
**Age of Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>Age</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
21-25	207	6.41
26-30	664	20.55
31-35	876	27.11
36-40	655	20.27
41-45	364	11.27
46-50	226	6.99
51-55	142	4.39
56-60	62	1.92
61-65	16	<1
Unidentified	14	<1
Invalid Age (e.g., <18)	5	<1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 9  
Gender of Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	2,805	86.82
Female	413	12.78
Unidentified	13	<1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 10  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Category of Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>EEOC Category</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
White	2,679	82.92
Black	322	9.97
Hispanic	95	2.94
Multi-Racial	41	1.27
Unidentified	35	1.08
American Indian	34	1.05
Alaska Native	1	<1
Asian	16	<1
Native Hawaiian	2	<1
Pacific Islander	6	<1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 11  
Patrol Area of Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>Patrol Area</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Suburban	1,019	31.54
Urban	947	29.31
Suburban/Rural	393	12.16
Rural	380	11.76
Urban/Suburban	264	8.17
Urban/Suburban/Rural	184	5.69
Urban/Rural	35	1.08
Unidentified	9	<1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 12**  
**Rank/Job Title of Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Patrol Officer	2,010	62.21
Deputy	564	17.46
Trooper	260	8.05
Public Safety Officer	139	4.30
Corporal	90	2.79
Conservation Officer	66	2.04
Other	42	1.36
Unidentified	36	1.11
Sergeant	24	<1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 13**  
**Preemployment Education Level of Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>Highest Grade Completed Before Employed as a Police Officer</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
GED	20	<1
High School	313	9.69
Some Undergraduate	967	29.93
Undergraduate	1,631	50.48
Some Graduate	265	8.20
Masters	20	<1
Ph.D., J.D., or equivalent	4	<1
Unidentified	11	<1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 14**  
**Post Employment Education Level of Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>Highest Grade Completed at Present Time</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
GED	15	<1
High School	203	6.28
Some Undergraduate	841	26.03
Undergraduate	1,584	49.03
Some Graduate	338	10.46
Masters	61	1.89
Ph.D., J.D., or equivalent	10	<1
Unidentified	179	5.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 15**  
**Frequency of Shift Rotation for Officers in Patrol Sample**

<b>How Often Do You Rotate Shifts?</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Every week	119	3.68
Every two weeks	29	<1
Every four weeks	18	<1
Monthly	46	1.42
Every two months	42	1.30
Every three months	456	14.11
Do not rotate shifts	1,474	45.62
Other rotation schedule	924	28.60
Unidentified	123	3.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

Patrol officers rated how often (within the last 12 months) their work schedule included overtime shifts using the following frequency scale:

- 1 = Have never done this;
- 2 = A few times per year (or less);
- 3 = A few times per month;
- 4 = A few times per week;
- 5 = Daily.

The frequency ratings for overtime shifts are given in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

**Table 16  
Frequency of Working Scheduled Overtime in Patrol Sample**

Overtime Shift	N	%
Daily	7	< 1
A few times per week	206	6.38
A few times per month	1,210	37.45
A few times per year (or less)	1,355	41.94
Have never done this	443	13.71
Unidentified	10	< 1

**Table 17  
Frequency of Working Unscheduled Overtime – Patrol Officers**

Overtime Shift	N	%
Daily	12	< 1
A few times per week	269	8.33
A few times per month	1,250	38.69
A few times per year (or less)	1,319	40.82
Have never done this	352	10.89
Unidentified	29	< 1

**Table 18  
Frequency of Missing a Scheduled Meal – Patrol Officers**

Overtime Shift	N	%
Daily	265	8.20
A few times per week	777	24.05
A few times per month	1,200	37.14
A few times per year (or less)	733	22.69
Have never done this	237	7.34
Unidentified	19	< 1

The tables below detail the characteristics of the supervisors who responded to the task inventory.

**Table 19**  
**Agency Types Represented in Supervisor Sample**

<b>Type of Agency</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Municipal	388	54.96
Township	79	11.19
Sheriff	127	17.99
State Police	79	11.19
University/College	26	3.68
Unidentified	7	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 20**  
**Supervisors' Primary Responsibility(ies) in the Last Six Months**

<b>Primary Responsibility(ies)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>% of Total Responses</b>
Patrol	626	23.14
Traffic Enforcement	436	16.12
Criminal Investigation	426	15.75
Community Relations	297	10.98
Warrant Service & Property Control	256	9.46
Other	147	5.43
Narcotics Investigation	133	4.92
Civil Processes	117	4.33
Dispatching	115	4.25
Identification	81	2.99
Vice Investigation	42	1.55
Bailiff/Court Officer	29	1.07
<b>Total Number of Responses</b>	<b>2,705</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: The total number of responses is greater than 706 because respondents could respond to more than one selection.

**Table 21  
Age of Officers in Supervisor Sample**

<b>Age</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
24-30	15	2.12
31-35	96	13.60
36-40	184	26.06
41-45	166	23.51
46-50	134	18.98
51-55	78	11.05
56-60	18	2.55
61-65	7	< 1
Unidentified	6	< 1
Invalid Age	2	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 22  
Gender of Officers in Supervisor Sample**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	648	91.78
Female	55	7.79
Unidentified	3	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 23  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Category for Officers in Supervisor Sample**

<b>EEOC Category</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
White	616	87.25
Black	54	7.65
American Indian	11	1.56
Hispanic	9	1.27
Asian	1	< 1
Pacific Islander	2	< 1
Multi-Racial	6	< 1
Unidentified	7	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 24**  
**Pre-employment Education Level of Officers in Supervisor Sample**

<b>Highest Grade Completed Before Employed as a Police Officer</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
GED	3	< 1
High School	68	9.63
Some Undergraduate	226	32.01
Undergraduate	333	47.17
Some Graduate	57	8.07
Masters	16	2.27
Ph.D., J.D., or equivalent	-	-
Unidentified	3	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 25**  
**Education Level of Officers in Supervisor Sample before Promotion to Supervisor**

<b>Highest Grade Completed at Time of Promotion to Supervisor</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
GED	-	-
High School	31	4.39
Some Undergraduate	221	31.30
Undergraduate	326	46.18
Some Graduate	91	12.89
Masters	27	3.82
Ph.D., J.D., or equivalent	-	-
Unidentified	10	1.42
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>



**Table 26**  
**Current Education Level for Officers in the Supervisor Sample**

<b>Highest Grade Completed at Present Time</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
GED	1	< 1
High School	21	2.97
Some Undergraduate	199	28.19
Undergraduate	300	42.49
Some Graduate	108	15.30
Masters	58	8.22
Ph.D., J.D., or equivalent	4	< 1
Unidentified	15	2.12
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 27**  
**Current Rank of Officers in Supervisor Sample**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Sergeant	510	72.24
Lieutenant	86	12.18
Other	60	8.50
Chief	30	4.25
Corporal	13	1.84
Patrol Officer	1	< 1
Unidentified	6	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 28**  
**Background and Experience of Officers in Supervisor Sample**

<b>Experience</b>	<b>Average Number of Years</b>	<b>N</b>
With Present Agency	16.42	697
In Law Enforcement	19.06	697
As a Patrol Officer	12.01	696
Supervising the Work of Patrol Officers	6.06	694

## **Patrol Officers' Ratings of Basic Training Curriculum and Training Priority**

Patrol officers were asked to indicate how well prepared they were to perform the important tasks associated with their job following basic training, with the majority (approximately 82%) indicating that they were "fairly well" or better ("quite well" or "very well") prepared. Detailed results are given in Table 29.

**Table 29**  
**Perceptions Regarding Officer Preparation, for 21<sup>st</sup> Century,**  
**as a Result of Basic Training**

<b>How Well Prepared?</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Fairly well	1,631	50.48
Quite well	789	24.42
Very little	443	13.71
Very well	257	7.95
No Response	69	2.14
Not applicable	42	1.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

Patrol officers were asked to assess the training curriculum in terms of how much attention should be paid to various topics by selecting one of the following responses: (1) more attention, (2) less attention, or (3) have devoted about the right amount of attention. The results are provided in Table 30.

## **Patrol Officers' Ratings of In-Service Training Requirements and Curriculum**

Officers were also asked to provide information about in-service training effectiveness and requirements. Specifically, officers were asked to rate how well in-service training prepared them to perform important tasks post 9/11. The officers did not perceive in-service training as favorably as they did basic training, with 40% (instead of 14%) indicating that in-service training did little to prepare them for important tasks post 9/11. Actual responses are given in Table 31.

Officers were also asked about in-service training requirements for their agency, including if it was mandated and the number of hours mandated. Specific responses are detailed in Tables 32 and 33.

Finally, officers were asked to give their opinions on the number of hours of in-service training an officer should have per year, with the majority (approximately 80%) suggesting at least 31 hours per year. The number of hours that should be left to agency discretion was also asked, with most officers indicating that the bulk of training be conducted at the local level. When asked how often officers should attend in-service training, almost 50% indicated once every 6 months. Finally, when asked to identify which concept or characteristic is most important to job effectiveness and the topic most important for road officers in the post 9/11 environment, the most frequent responses were Communication Skills, and Decision Making. Specific responses are given in Tables 34 through 37.

**Table 30**

**The Number and Percent of Patrol Officers Indicating the Amount of Attention that should be Devoted to Training Topics**

Training Topic	More Attention		Right Amount of Attention		Less Attention		Unidentified		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Legal instruction related to arrest, search and seizure	1,577	48.81	1,589	49.18	52	1.61	13	<1	3,231	100
Criminal investigation procedures	1,748	54.10	1,342	41.54	128	3.96	13	<1	3,231	100
Report writing	1,570	48.59	1,381	42.74	260	8.05	20	<1	3,231	100
Patrol operations	1,495	46.27	1,504	46.55	214	6.62	18	<1	3,231	100
Juvenile matters	1,174	36.34	1,583	48.99	462	14.30	12	<1	3,231	100
Officer safety	2,098	64.93	1,076	33.30	43	1.33	14	<1	3,231	100
First aid	557	17.24	2,003	61.99	647	20.02	24	<1	3,231	100
"Use of force" techniques/skills (deadly and non-deadly force)	1,588	49.15	1,562	48.34	59	1.83	22	<1	3,231	100
Traffic and driving	1,145	35.44	1,930	59.73	142	4.39	14	<1	3,231	100
Interpersonal communications	1,228	38.01	1,674	51.81	313	9.69	16	<1	3,231	100
Ethics	868	26.86	1,984	61.41	359	11.11	20	<1	3,231	100
Problem solving	1,326	41.04	1,720	53.23	171	5.29	14	<1	3,231	100
Decision making	1,526	47.23	1,575	48.75	116	3.59	14	<1	3,231	100
Cultural diversity	640	19.81	1,790	55.40	787	24.36	14	<1	3,231	100
Critical incident response	1,572	48.65	1,426	44.13	213	6.59	20	<1	3,231	100
Computer crimes/identity theft, etc.	1,774	54.91	994	30.76	447	13.83	16	<1	3,231	100
Terrorism prevention	1,530	47.35	1,287	39.83	394	12.19	20	<1	3,231	100

**Table 31**  
**Perception Regarding Officer Preparation, Post 9/11, as a Result of In-Service Training**

<b>How Well Prepared?</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Very little	1,307	40.45
Fairly well	1,248	38.63
Quite well	531	16.43
Very well	122	3.78
No response	23	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 32**  
**Is In-Service Non-Firearm Training Mandated by Your Agency?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	2,408	74.53
No	798	24.70
No response	25	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 33**  
**Number of Hours of Mandated Training per Officer per Year**

<b>Number of Hours</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0	146	5.96
1-10	336	13.72
11-20	480	19.60
21-30	307	12.54
31-40	770	31.44
41-50	125	51.04
51-60	70	2.86
61-70	11	< 1
71-80	76	3.10
81-90	3	< 1
91-100	91	3.72
101-110	9	< 1
111-120	12	< 1
121-130	1	< 1
131-140	1	< 1
141-150	-	-
151-200	6	< 1
201-250	-	-
251-300	1	< 1
301-350	1	< 1
351-400	2	< 1
640	1	< 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,449</b>	<b>100</b>

\*Two responses were excluded as unresponsive and classified as outliers (-10 and 8,000).

**Table 34**  
**Number of Hours of In-Service Training each Officer Needs per Year**

<b>Number of Hours</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0	15	< 1
1-10	82	2.64
11-20	275	8.87
21-30	265	8.54
31-40	893	28.79
41-50	221	7.12
51-60	166	5.35
61-70	20	< 1
71-80	465	14.99
81-90	14	< 1
91-100	373	12.02
101-110	4	< 1
111-120	127	4.09
121-130	1	< 1
131-140	4	< 1
141-150	27	< 1
151-160	28	< 1
161-170	1	< 1
171-180	4	< 1
181-190	-	-
191-200	72	2.32
201-250	11	< 1
251-300	13	< 1
301-350	1	< 1
351-400	8	< 1
401-450	1	< 1
451-500	6	< 1
501-750	3	< 1
751-1,000	2	< 1
<b>Average</b>	<b>64.99</b>	<b>100</b>

\*One response, of 8,000 hours, was eliminated as unresponsive and an outlier.

**Table 35**  
**Number of Training Hours Left to Local Agency Discretion**

<b>Number of Hours</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0	183	5.91
1-10	335	10.82
11-20	650	20.99
21-30	406	13.11
31-40	716	23.13
41-50	239	7.72
51-60	125	4.04
61-70	21	< 1
71-80	156	5.04
81-90	13	< 1
91-100	162	5.23
101-110	6	< 1
111-120	26	< 1
121-130	1	< 1
131-140	2	< 1
141-150	12	< 1
151-160	5	< 1
161-170	-	-
171-180	2	< 1
181-190	-	-
191-200	18	< 1
201-250	3	<1
251-300	6	< 1
301-350	1	< 1
351-400	3	< 1
401-450	-	-
451-500	2	< 1
1,000	2	< 1
More than 1,000	1	< 1
<b>Average</b>	39.48	-

**Table 36**  
**How Often Should Officers Attend Non-Firearm In-Service Training**

<b>How Often?</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Once Every Month	967	29.93
Once Every 6 Months	1,579	48.87
Once a Year	536	16.59
Once Every 2 Years	57	1.76
Once Every 3 Years	53	1.64
Not Applicable	39	1.21
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 37**  
**Most Important Concept or Characteristic for Effective Line Officer Job Performance**

<b>Concept/ Characteristic</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Communication Skills	867	26.85
Decision Making	858	26.57
Job Experience	445	13.78
Multi-Tasking	329	10.19
Problem Solving	286	8.86
Legal Knowledge	220	6.81
Ethics	97	3.00
No Response	67	2.07
Physical Fitness	62	1.92
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,231</b>	<b>100</b>



## **CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis**

---

The data were analyzed to describe the job of patrol officer in the State of Michigan as it exists in 2006. The analyses were designed to identify:

- frequency and criticality of job tasks
- core tasks (across agency types)
- task differentiation based on tenure
- core tasks/job requirements across time
- core complaints
- core sources of information, and
- core equipment used.

Details of each analysis and findings follow.

### **Task Ratings: The Frequency and Criticality of Job Tasks**

The average frequency and criticality ratings were calculated for all 459 tasks, and are presented in Appendix C. Summary findings are as follows:

- 21% of the tasks had an average frequency rating of 3.0 or higher; that is, 21% of the tasks (or 96 of 459) are performed at least “a few times per month”.
- The task with the highest average frequency rating was #118 – “Inform dispatcher by radio as to your status”, with an average of 4.73, or almost “Daily”.
- The task with the lowest average frequency rating was #167 – “Patrol on horse”, with an average frequency of 1.08, which indicates that the vast majority of respondents have never done this task.
- 48% of the tasks had an average criticality rating of 3.0 or higher; that is, 48% of the tasks (or 221 of 459) have, at a minimum, “serious” consequences associated with inadequate performance.
- The single most critical task (in terms of average criticality rating) is #276 – “Discharge firearm at person.”
- The task with the lowest average criticality rating, and only minimal consequences associated with inadequate performance, is #424 – “Investigate and report on police applicant’s background.”

## Core Tasks

Information on the criticality and frequency of performance of tasks were used to identify core tasks for patrol officer. The core tasks, in turn, are used to determine the training curricula and to support the selection standards for entry-level law enforcement officers in the state of Michigan.

Core tasks are defined as those tasks with “statewide significance” (PRC and MLEOTC, 1979) and are determined using information from two rating scales: Criticality (consequences of inadequate performance or CIP) and Frequency, and from two perspectives: supervisors (who rated criticality) and officers (who rated frequency).

Four factors were considered in determining whether a task was core or non-core:

1. Composite Score – Data from the two rating scales (criticality and frequency) were combined to create a composite score for each agency type. The composite was created using the same methodology implemented in 1979 and 1996, with criticality receiving the majority weight (67%). The range for the composite was 1 to 5, and it was calculated by summing each agency type’s weighted mean Criticality response (.67 x mean criticality) and weighted mean Frequency response (.33 x mean frequency).
2. Tenure – Tenure is an important consideration in identifying core tasks given the fact that the data from this analysis were to be used primarily for the development of an entry-level training curriculum. Therefore, it was useful to identify which tasks are performed significantly more frequently by high-tenure officers.  
  
The rationale is that tasks which are performed significantly more frequently for high-tenure officers should be addressed in on-the job or specialized training as opposed to entry-level training.
3. The mean frequency rating for each task across all agency types – Mean frequency plays a role in that regardless of a task’s criticality rating, if a task is virtually never performed, it should not be a significant part of the job. Therefore, in identifying core tasks, a minimum average frequency rating was implemented.
4. The mean CIP rating for each task across all agency types – The average CIP rating for tasks across all agency types was also considered when selecting core tasks for similar reasoning. Regardless of a task’s frequency rating, if the task is considered extremely serious, it should be considered significant.

The decision rules for identifying core tasks replicated those used in 1996 as did the process of review. First, the mean composite scores were considered. Tasks were identified as potential core tasks if the:

- Task had a mean composite rating of 2.25 for 9 of the 10 agency types (where one agency type, Tribal, was eliminated from consideration due to small sample size).
- Task had a mean composite rating of 2.50 for at least half (5) of the 10 agency types remaining in the study.
- Task had a mean composite rating of 3.00 for at least 3 of the 10 agency types remaining in the study.

Thus, a task had to be important for at least half of the agency types, essential for at least one quarter of the agency types, or moderately important for nearly all of the agency types to be considered as a possible core task.

Then, each potential core task was reviewed for tenure differences and critical levels of frequency and importance. Tasks which showed high tenure differences (based on frequency ratings) were eliminated from core consideration. (See the next section, [Tenure Analysis](#), for details.) Using these criteria, 13 additional tasks were eliminated from core consideration.

A potential core task was also eliminated from consideration if it had an overall average frequency rating of 1.25 or less. Since a frequency rating of 1 corresponds to the description “Have never done this task”, tasks with an average frequency rating of 1.25 are tasks which are performed extremely infrequently. These tasks were therefore eliminated from core consideration, regardless of the task’s composite score.

Finally, potential core tasks which had a mean CIP rating of 4.0 or higher across all agency types were classified as core, regardless of the tasks’ composite ratings. This rule is meant to retain tasks which are extremely critical and may be otherwise eliminated by one of the other decision rules. Since a CIP rating of 4 corresponds to “Extremely serious”, only the most critical tasks are included in this category.

A summary of the final decision rules used to select core tasks follows:

- Core tasks must have a composite score of 3.0 for at least 3 agency types, a composite score of 2.5 for at least 5 agency types, or a composite score of 2.25 for 9 agency types.
- Core tasks must not have significant tenure differences.
- Core tasks must have an average frequency rating greater than 1.25 across all 11 agency types.
- Any task with an average CIP rating of 4.0 or greater across all agency types is considered core.

As a result of these selection criteria, 339 out of 459 tasks, or 73.9 percent were deemed core. A list of the core tasks is provided in Appendix D. A list of non-core tasks is provided in Appendix E. Finally, the reason for eliminating a task from core consideration is summarized in Appendix F.

## **Tenure Analysis**

It is impossible to address all potential training needs in an entry-level curriculum. One way to help determine focus and priority is to review the tasks performed by senior versus new officers. If a task is performed significantly more frequently by more senior officers and the task is performed infrequently by low tenure officers, then the task should be addressed in on-the-job, in-service, or specialized training rather than basic training. Priority in basic training should be given to the tasks typically performed by relatively new patrol officers.

Therefore, a tenure study was conducted to determine which kinds of tasks are performed more frequently by officers who have been on the job for a relatively long time. To justify the elimination of a task from the MCOLES basic training curriculum based on tenure differences, one must demonstrate that the task is 1) performed infrequently by low-tenure officers and 2) is performed much more frequently by more senior officers.

When examining the difference between low and high tenure groups, the sample was first split into two groups. Low tenure officers were classified as those officers with less than three years on the job. High tenure officers were classified as those officers with three or more years on the job.

The sample size of each group is as follows:

**Table 38  
Description of Tenure Samples**

<b>Tenure Group</b>	<b>Months of Experience</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>
Low Tenure	36 months or less	393
High Tenure	More than 36 months	2,838

The difference between low and high tenure groups was then examined by looking at the average frequency ratings for each task and task category, as well as the average percent performing ratings. Patrol officers rated each task in terms of how frequently they performed the task, ranging from 1 (have never done this task) to 5 (perform daily). Percent performing was calculated by dichotomizing officers' responses on the frequency scale into performed (2-5) versus not performed (1).

The extent to which a task shows evidence of a meaningful difference between tenure groups was evaluated by comparing the percent performed ratings for each tenure group and by examining the average frequency rating for the low tenure group. Tasks with high tenure difference were defined as those tasks with a percent performing ratio of at least 2:1 and tasks with an average frequency rating of less than 1.25 (where 1 is not performed) for the low tenure group. Tasks with a frequency rating of less than 1.25 were to be excluded simply because they could not reasonably be considered part of the job, at least as performed by “new” patrol officers. Using these criteria, 21 (or 4.5%) of the 459 tasks were excluded. The results of the tenure analysis are given in Appendix G.

The number of tasks excluded in 2006 from core consideration based on the tenure analysis was 21 while the number excluded in 1996 was 46. The method of analysis was slightly different in 1996 versus 2006. In addition, the proportion of the officers classified as “low tenure” in 2006 was substantially less than in 1996, with 12% of the sample being “low tenure” in 2006 and 25% in 1996. The primary difference, however, was due to changes in the frequency with which low tenured officers perform first aid tasks. In 2006, a higher percentage of low tenured officers performed first aid tasks than they did in 1996.

### **1996 – 2006 Comparison of Job Tasks**

One of the primary goals for completing the 2006 JTA was to identify changes in the job of patrol officer that have occurred since the prior JTA and over the last ten years.

To identify significant changes, the average 2006 composite scores for each task were correlated with the composite scores from 1996. The correlation was extremely high, .97, indicating that the relative criticality and frequency of common tasks stayed much the same from 1996 to present day.

The percent performing each task in 2006 versus 1996 was also examined. As raw data were not available, the percent performing for 1996 was estimated from data presented as a part of the tenure analysis (percent performing for “low tenure” and percent performing for “high tenure” were weighted and combined to estimate overall percent performing). The correlation was also very high, .98, indicating that the same relative percent of respondents performed each task in 1996 and 2006.

The high correlations do not mean, however, that the job or tasks have stayed the same across the ten year period. The correlations are based on and considers only those tasks that are common to both surveys. There were a total of 409 statements that were the same (even though minor edits may have been made to the text) across the two surveys. This leaves 50 tasks in the 2006 survey unaccounted for in this analysis.

Average criticality and frequency ratings were determined for the 50 “new” tasks. The average frequency was 2.34, which on the frequency response scale falls between “a few times per year” and “a few times per month”. The average criticality of these statements was 3.34, where a 3 is associated with “serious” and a 4 with “extremely serious”. This analysis suggests that the 50 new statements are, in fact, currently performed by Michigan patrol officers and represent non-trivial duties and responsibilities.

In summary, the job of patrol officer in Michigan has, in fact, changed in the ten years since the prior JTA was completed. The change is, however, in the addition of new tasks and responsibilities, and not in the criticality or frequency with which tasks are performed.

### **Analysis of Non-Task Data**

In addition to the task statements, patrol officers were asked to respond to questions regarding the complaints or incidents to which they respond, the sources of information they use on the job, and the types of vehicles and equipment they use. Non-task data were analyzed to identify “core” complaints, sources of information, and equipment.

### **Complaints/Incidents**

Patrol officers were asked to rate the frequency with which they respond to 162 different complaints/incidents. A percent performing statistic was calculated by determining the percentage of responses of a 2, 3, 4 or 5, since these values indicate that the subject has indeed responded to the complaint/incident at least once.

**Table 39  
Complaint/Incident Rating Scale**

Rating	Anchor
1	Have Never Done This
2	A Few Times Per Year or Less
3	A Few Times Per Month
4	A Few Times Per Week
5	Daily

Complaints and incidents performed (i.e., rated 2, 3, 4 or 5) by at least 50% of patrol officers across all agency types were considered to be core complaints (i.e., the combined average of all agency types is 50% or greater). A total of 134 core complaints/incidents out of 162 (or 82.72%) were identified. A list of all 134 core complaints, their average percent performing, and the percent performing for all eleven agency types combined is provided in Appendix H. The non-core complaints are given in Appendix I. Detailed information about the frequency of responses to complaints is given in Appendix J.

### **Sources of Information**

Data were gathered on both the importance of each source of information, and the frequency with which it is used. A composite score was created in much the same manner used for task statements (i.e., giving Criticality twice the weight of Frequency (composite = [Criticality x .67] + [Frequency x .33]). The rating scales are presented in Tables 40 and 41.

**Table 40**  
**Sources of Information Frequency Scale**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Anchor</b>
1	Do not refer to this information source
2	Refer to this source a few times per year (or less frequently)
3	Refer to this source a few times per month
4	Refer to this source a few times per week
5	Refer to this source daily

**Table 41**  
**Sources of Information Importance Scale**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Anchor</b>
1	Minimally important
2	Not very important
3	Important
4	Very important
5	Extremely important

Using a cutoff of a composite score of 2.50 or higher across all agency types, 19 out of 34 sources of information (or 55.88%) were rated significant. Core sources of information along with the composite scores for all eleven agency types are provided in Appendix K. The non-core sources of information are given in Appendix L.

**Equipment**

When rating the 99 different kinds of equipment and vehicles, respondents simply indicated if they used the equipment or not. If 50% or more of the respondents across all eleven agency types indicated that they used the equipment, it was considered core equipment. A total of 43 pieces of core equipment (or 43.43%) were identified. A list of core equipment is provided in Appendix M. Non-core equipment is listed in Appendix N.

**1996-2006 Comparison of Non-Task Data**

1996 and 2006 results may be compared in terms of core complaints, sources of information, and equipment as well.

For core complaints, 1996 and 2006 shared a total of 114 types of complaints. Of the 114 in common, 113 of them (or 99%) were classified the same way – core versus non-core. The only change was that “labor/management disputes”, classified as core in 1996, no longer meets the core criteria in 2006.

For sources of information, 24 sources were listed in common in the 1996 and 2006 surveys. Of the 24, 20 (or 83%) were classified the same way both times – core versus non-core. One, computer bulletin boards, was non-core in 1996 and is now core. The other three were core in 1996 and no longer are, including a first aid manual, the hazardous materials manual, and the Michigan Liquor Control Act.

For equipment, 66 pieces of equipment were included in both the 1996 and 2006 surveys. Of those in common, 58 (or 88%) were classified the same way both times – core versus non-core. For the four that are currently core and previously were not, three reflect the now ubiquitous nature of technology – cellular phone, personal computer, and radio car computer terminal. The other additional core piece of equipment is a gas mask, which in 1996 was categorized as non-core.

Four pieces of equipment currently classified as non-core were once considered core. These four pieces of equipment are: (1) car door lock opening device, (2) crisscross directory (e.g., Bressiers), (3) public address system, and (4) tape recorder.

Once again, the similarity between the 1996 and 2006 can only be quantified in terms of common elements on both surveys. Significant changes in the job may be masked if only these analyses are considered. For example, the 2006 survey included over 38 additional types of complaints, 8 new sources of information, and 30 pieces of equipment; all of which suggest that the breadth and scope of the job have significantly increased since 1996.



## **CHAPTER 5: Summary and Conclusions**

---

The responsibilities and requirements of the patrol officer position in the state of Michigan were identified and defined through a job task analysis, in which 150 agencies (posts/districts) participated.

The job analysis was comprehensive and included a variety of data sources. Initial lists of tasks, complaints, sources of information, and equipment were developed based on prior job task analyses. The lists were reviewed and refined through a focus group meeting with experienced officers and supervisors and verified by the MCOLES. The lists were incorporated into two job analysis surveys, which were administered online. Representative and knowledgeable patrol officers and patrol supervisors throughout the state and across 11 different agency types were invited to participate. An overall response rate of 89% was achieved.

Individual ratings of frequency and/or importance were used to identify core tasks, complaints, sources of information, and equipment. The core requirements define the essential job functions of Michigan patrol officers regardless of agency type or geographic area. They represent the common characteristics of the job that have practical significance for setting hiring and training standards.

## REFERENCES

---

Personnel Research Consultants and Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council (1979). Statewide Job Analysis of the Police Patrol Officer Position.

Snyder, D.A. (1991). The Americans with Disabilities Act. Portland: The Labor Relations Information System.

Stanard & Associates and Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council (1996). Statewide Job Analysis of the Patrol Officer Position.