

**An Examination of the Selection Process in Law Enforcement: Can it benefit from
emotional intelligence?**

Troy R. Egger

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

Seminar Research Paper Spring 2014

**Approved by: Dr. Sabina Burton
May 10, 2014**

Abstract

The field of law enforcement has evolved greatly since its inception, which has increased the need for law enforcement agencies to change their hiring practices and focus on selecting the candidates that will best fit the needs of the agency and their policing models. By understanding what characteristics are needed in a modern day law enforcement officer, agencies can design their selection process in order to measure and rank the candidates in order to help predict their future performance. One quality that has been shown to be a great predictor of general performance is emotional intelligence. Not only has it been shown to be a predictor of performance in general, it has also been studied at length in the law enforcement community as a quality that many see as essential to a successful law enforcement officer. This paper will examine the history of policing and what it means to the modern day law enforcement officer and the law enforcement selection process. It will also look at emotional intelligence in order to understand what it is and if it can be used as a measuring device in a law enforcement selection process.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence; Selection Process; Hiring Requirements

Topic: Hiring in law enforcement

- I. Introduction to include:**
 - a. The Problem
 - b. Cost of hiring and officer misconduct
 - i. Selecting and Training new law enforcement officers
 - ii. Cost of litigations from officer misconduct
- II. The Evolution of Policing**
 - a. The history of policing
 - b. What does the evolution mean to the state of the selection process
- III. The Law Enforcement Selection and Hiring Process**
 - a. Current methods used in a selection process
 - b. Common requirements of a candidate
 - c. Are these requirements effective
 - d. Problems with the process itself
 - i. Time Consuming
 - ii. Expensive
 - iii. Current measuring tools are ineffective or lack in validity
- IV. Emotional Intelligence**
 - a. What is Emotional Intelligence
 - b. Why is it Emotional Intelligence important to law enforcement officers
 - c. Emotional Intelligence as a Predictor of Performance
 - i. Human Resource Concerns in Hiring**
 - 1. Are the current Emotional Intelligence tests valid
 - 2. Ensuring Racial/Sex Diversity
- V. Additional Hiring Factors**
 - a. New Police Training Program (PTO)
 - b. Generational Differences in Hiring
- VI. Conclusion**
- VII. References**

Introduction

There has been a large shift in the characteristics and qualities that law enforcement administrators are looking for in hiring new candidates. The shift from traditional policing to community oriented and problem solving policing has created the demand for officers with higher education, problem solving skills, technology skills and better communication abilities. There is also a greater concern for ethical behavior and police misconduct than at any other time. Law enforcement agencies are now spending more money than ever on the recruiting and selection process in order to find what they believe are the most qualified and suitable candidates for their agency. The hiring process is becoming more complex with the different stages and tests that are conducted, which is putting a greater strain on agencies because of the extensive amount of time and money that is being poured into filling vacancies. There are several consequences that have come from these more extensive selection practices that have caused the law enforcement field to examine what the most important characteristics that a new officer must have and how they find potential candidates with those characteristics. Not only do they have to find potential candidates but they must do it without hindering the selection process all together and without opening the agency up to any civil liabilities that may occur with the more stringent requirements.

Law enforcement is seen as a "public service" and a law enforcement agency's primary objective is generally viewed as "to protect and serve," however, it is not unlike any private sector job as the bottom line will always come down to the money the agency spends. Regardless of how the agency performs or how many crimes it prevents, there will always be questions about the agency's budget and where it is spending the tax payer's money. With this in mind it is important to understand what law enforcement administrators face when dealing with the actions

of their officers. When looking at the actions of law enforcement officers (LEO) it is important to examine what leads to the individual officer's actions. There are multiple factors that can cause a LEO to act in an unethical way; some reasons are out of direct control of the individual agency and others are a direct result of the agency due to lack of supervision, poor policies, or an agency philosophy that allows for such misconduct. With agencies being held responsible for the actions of their officers it is important that administrators do everything they can to prevent misconduct from their officers. Even though there are countless policy and training avenues to utilize in the fight against personnel misconduct, the most important approach should be start at the beginning and utilize the selection process to hire the right candidate. By identifying those candidates that have the skills necessary to perform the daily duties of the modern day LEO and have the ethical standards needed to possess the immense authority which is given to LEO agency can begin to lessen their risks of misconduct. It is also important to use the selection process to find the candidates that will meet the agency's needs and possess the skills necessary to work in the agency's policing strategies.

While looking at the current tools used to measure a candidate's skills, one thing that the current selection process fails to do is measure the intangible skills of a candidate. These skills include, among others, how the individual will control themselves in high stress situations, whether the individual officer has the ability to make conversation with strangers, build relationships with co-workers, or mediate conflicts between groups of people. These intangible skills are vital to the modern day LEO because they are key components of modern day policing models such as Community Oriented and Problem Oriented Policing. Even though it may not be feasible to test a candidate for each of these skills individually, researchers have begun to see

that emotional intelligence (EI) is a cognitive intelligence, which has been shown to be a direct link to each of these intangible skills.

By examining the evolution of policing, the current selection tools utilized in the law enforcement hiring process, and the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and law enforcement, this paper will attempt to show the importance a modern selection process is to the today's law enforcement agencies. Along with understanding the importance that must be placed on an up to date selection process, this paper will also attempt to explain what EI is and why law enforcement agencies should be testing for it and placing a premium on the candidates that possess high levels of it. It is EI that can bridge the gap between the selection process of the past and the policing strategies of the future, ensuring that law enforcement agencies find the LEO that possess the characteristics and ethics needed to function in today's law enforcement field.

Cost of hiring and officer misconduct

The costs associated with hiring and training a new LEO are endless and can be seen in many different facets of the process. Costs can come from recruiting, the selection process itself, supplying the new officer with the proper uniforms or equipment, and academy and post-academy training. With the specialized training that comes with being a LEO in today's society it goes without saying that selecting and training a new officer is going to cost an agency a lot of money. These costs will vary from agency to agency depending on how much they choose to invest in the selection and training process. Some agencies hold their own academy trainings, while others pay for their new hires to attend state sponsored academies, and other small agencies leave it up to the new hires to obtain their academy training before they are even considered for hire. Once the academy training is complete there is more specific "field" training that a new LEO completes once at their agency. Like the academy training this varies greatly

upon the agency as each agency has different requirements that their new LEO must meet before they are assigned to a solo patrol. Depending on how long the field training program is and how the agency compensates their training officers determines how much an agency is going to invest into their new officers, but no matter the amount, the implications are the same; if the right candidate is not selected to participate in the training program and they do not succeed, the money goes to waste.

The ramifications of a faulty hiring process can cost an agency millions in litigation when they hire the wrong candidate and give them the authority trusted in a LEO. This litigation can come from civil lawsuits from a candidate that was unfairly eliminated from the process or from hiring the wrong person who can cost an agency millions in liability litigation as a result of poor, dangerous or unethical police work. In fiscal year 2011, litigation against the New York Police Department cost the citizens \$185.6 million, which is an increase of 35% over the previous year (Moore, 2012). Litigation from the Sheriff's Department cost Los Angeles County \$43 million in 2013, which was almost half of all litigation cost for the entire county. The \$43 million however, does not even include the \$20 million that was spent by the county in excessive force cases brought on against the Sheriff's Department (Sewell, 2014). The high cost of litigation is not subject only to the NYPD or LA County Sheriff's Office, but is a growing concern for the entire United States, which is why it is even more important for law enforcement agencies to structure their selection process to find the candidates that possess the skills and ethics that are so important in the field of law enforcement.

The evolution of policing

In order to identify where today's current policing practices stand and what characteristics are needed to be an effective officer, we must first understand the history of

policing and how it has evolved into policing as we know it today. The idea of policing dates back to 2300 BC when Sumerian rulers began to codify their rules and define the offenses against society. After this period it was not until the Anglo-Saxons began to group their farms into small villages that were required to police themselves. King Alfred the Great (849-899 CE) introduced the tithing system of collective responsibility for maintaining social order by requiring all men to enroll for some sort of police purpose. The police function turned toward a more military function in 1066 when William the Conqueror forced all men to swear to his loyalty and pledge to maintain local peace and national security (Miller & Hess, 2008).

Policing began to evolve in the seventeenth century when governments began to institute a day/night watch system where the day watch was run by town constables who worked as jailers and performed other governmental duties and the night watch was the responsibility of the citizens. During the night watch, citizens were required to watch for things like inclement weather, disorderly individuals and fires (Miller & Hess, 2008). With this system it was expected every citizen take turns on watch and take responsibility for the safety of the community, but those with monetary means began to pay people to take their watch, which effectively began the idea of paid police services. When this happened, the people that were paid to take watch were reluctant to enforce many rules on the wealthy because they were the ones paying them, so the system in turn became ineffective.

In London in 1829, Sir Robert Peel was the home secretary and he proposed the idea of creating a police force that was paid for by the people and was charged with the prevention of crime and disorder. Modern day policing was born with the passage of the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829. Many of Sir Robert Peel's principles can still be seen in today's policing and include in part:

- The duty of the police is to prevent crime and disorder
- The power of the police to fulfill their duties is dependent on public approval and their ability to secure and maintain public respect.
- Public respect and approval also mean the willing cooperating of the public in the task of securing observance of the law.
- The police should strive to maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the tradition that the police are the public and the public are police (Miller & Hess, 2008).

These principles are important to the idea of modern policing and even though law enforcement started to veer away from many of them in the traditional policing model, these principles have reappeared with the transition to community policing.

Sir Robert Peel's modern policing ideas made their way to America in the 1840's when New York combined their day/night watch system into a functioning police department. Then by 1857 several other large cities, such as Boston, Chicago, New Orleans and Philadelphia made the transition as well. Although the principles behind Sir Robert Peel's modern policing were great building blocks for success, modern policing in America did not start off well, as policing was politically fueled and filled with corruption.

The beginning era of policing in the United States is known as the Political Era and occurred from 1840 to 1930. During this time of policing it was difficult to control the officers because it was run decentralized by the municipalities and the police chiefs had very little authority to hire, fire, or discipline their own officers. Hiring was a political game and it revolved more around who you knew and less about what you knew or your qualifications for the job. This led to officers that were not qualified for the job, which contributed to abuse of power, officers being intoxicated on the job and turning their head to offenses based on the offender's status.

The Political Era of policing started to come to an end in 1929 when President Hoover created the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. The purpose of this commission was to study the criminal justice system and former U.S. Attorney General George W. Wickersham was appointed as the first chairman. Wickersham published two reports in 1931 that are considered "the most important events in the history of American Policing," (Miller & Hess, p. 9). These reports detailed the corruption that took place and called for centralized control of departments, higher standards for personnel and began the transition of the policing as a profession (Miller & Hess, 2008). These reports help usher in the next era of policing in the United States, which is known as the Reform Era.

The Reform Era of policing was from 1930-1980 and was spearheaded by August Vollmer and O.W. Wilson. Vollmer was the police chief at Berkeley and can be attributed for such things as radios in patrol cars, fingerprinting classifications systems and establishing a police school for his department. Vollmer's main ideas were that police should be highly trained professionals that not only prevent and fight crime but are also trained in the social work context in order to provide rounded services to the community. Vollmer's ideas lead to some of the benefits that were brought from the Reform Era, which included the disassociation of politics and police. Police chiefs were no longer appointed based on political ties but many agencies began seeing police chiefs as civil servants who had to apply for the job and were forced to go in front of panels of civilians in order to be appointed. Separating police from politics not only helped with creating more centralized agencies it separated the police from the public and created a professional type relationship between the two. This was added by the addition of vehicular patrols with marked squad cars and rapid response to calls. Police officers were now seen as professional crime fighters (Miller & Hess, 2008).

Even though the public started to view police as professionals, some of the previous problems from the Political Era still existed. When society in America began shifting toward the civil rights movement the police were tasked with keeping the peace between the races and monitor the countless rallies, parades and protests. Unfortunately, the police force was predominately white males who lacked any training on how to handle such situations. Police turned to force in order to control crowds and were often seen beating Black protestors in order to gain compliance. When the police were using such tactics they became the picture of what the civil rights leaders wanted to change in America and the police quickly became the enemy of the mass public. This led to mistrust, hate and resentment of the police and questioned their abilities to effectively manage crime; many agencies were also facing corruption charges during this time.

The actions of police during the 1960's and 1970's brought along many changes in policing, thanks to the creation of several federal commissions on law enforcement that were focused on improving police and public relations. Billions of dollars were spent during this era in studying the criminal justice system to which there was a greater focus on an individual's civil rights. These commissions and studies also focused on the functionality of traditional police patrols and their effectiveness on crime prevention. The results of these studies found the police needed to refocus their efforts toward the community and utilize the citizens in their efforts of crime prevention. This led to the present era of policing: The Community Era.

The Community Era started in 1980 and is currently ongoing today. The major shift in this era was away from a reactive approach to solving crime, to a proactive crime prevention approach. This approach to crime prevention is commonly referred to as either Community Oriented Policing (COP) or Problem Oriented Policing (POP). The main ideas and philosophies to POP and COP are taken directly from Sir Robert Peel's original policing principals, which

were the basis of modern policing 150 years prior. The idea that the police were part of the community and they utilized community relationships in order to prevent crime helped build stronger bonds with the neighborhoods the officers were task with patrolling. Other important aspects of COP and POP were to get officers out of the vehicles and reinstate foot patrols in order for the public to have a better face to face connection with the officer and more open lines of communication (Ortmeier & Meese 2010).

Although there are several different components and strategies to COP and POP one of the most widely used is called the SARA Problem-Solving model. SARA stands for scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. Scanning involves identifying the problem and looking at the risk and needs assessments of the problem. Analysis includes looking further into the problem in an attempt to identify some of the causes to the problem. This part of the process is where critical thinking is essential to the problem solving process. Response in the SARA model is where officers examine the problem and the contributing characteristics to the problem and begin to formulate ideas on how to respond to the problem and solutions that can be implemented in an attempt to solve the issue. Assessment is the most important part of the SARA model and is ongoing throughout the entire problem solving process. By continuing to assess as the officer develops and implements the plan it allows for adjustments to be made in order to ensure the effectiveness of the solution (Ortmeier & Meese 2010). The SARA model is a core tool in the problem solving stages of COP and POP and helps officers look into the underlying causes of crime in order to be proactive and come up with preventative measures of crime control. It is also a very complex idea that requires creative thinking, problem solving abilities and communication skills in order to be implemented effectively.

To add to the complexity of COP and POP, modern policing also faces the large threat of terrorism which has created an even more specialized form of law enforcement. As a result of the September 11th attacks against America we have seen the introduction of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), which was a result of the Homeland Security Act. The DHS was created and effectively reorganized 22 different government agencies under the responsibility of a single entity, the DHS (Bush, 2002). The DHS brought together the different federal organizations in order to assist in communication and information processing in order to protecting our homeland. The federal government is not the only level of government that has had to review their terrorist readiness; the increase of mass causality shootings and bombings have forced all law enforcement agencies, including state and local, to expand their knowledge and expertise into new and more complex fields.

The models of policing are not the only thing that has evolved since Sir Robert Peel introduced the ideas of modern day policing. The strategies, techniques and tools that are available to LEO today and that were not available just a decade ago have changed the face of policing. Technology has allowed LEO an endless amount of information at their finger tips with computers called Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs) in almost every patrol car. These MDTs allow officers to access criminal histories of subjects, driver's license records, even past contacts a subject has had with local law enforcement agencies in the area.

The new tools that help LEO with their jobs are not exclusive to law enforcement; the advancement of computers and technology has created an entirely new kind of crime that law enforcement must fight. Computers can now be used to facilitate crimes from across the world without the suspect ever being known. Sexual predators can also use computers to lure their victims to them in order to perpetrate sex crimes. Credit card fraud is no longer just having your

credit card stolen from your wallet as credit card numbers can be retrieved a number of ways with the use of technology, much of which can be bought on the internet with relative ease.

Along with the advanced technology for both law enforcement and criminals, comes the need for LEO to have the ability to navigate and use the technology. Modern day LEO must possess at least basic computer knowledge just to issue a simple traffic citation. LEO investigating computer crimes need more knowledge in information technology than they do in basic police investigations. The idea of LEO extensive use of technology presents a new characteristic that agencies must look for in potential candidates.

What does evolution of policing mean to the state of the selection process?

By having an understanding of where policing has come from, some mistakes that were made, and where policing is going we can better understand what characteristics are needed in today's LEO and how to best find those officers. One of the biggest changes from the beginning of modern policing in America is the centralization of the selection process. In the beginning it was a very politically motivated process and the individual agencies had little say in who was hired. Individual officers were hired more on who they knew and less on the qualities they possessed that made them good LEO. When individual agencies were given the hiring power it allowed them to employ different steps in a selection process to find the most qualified applicant.

Another large shift in policing that affects the qualities sought in individual officers is the shift back to a community oriented officer. Even though the idea of COP and POP are relatively new in America, Sir Robert Peel's principles of the law enforcement officer being a part of the community have been around for 150 years. These principles encourage officers to be problem solvers and be able to build good relationships with the public and community they serve. In COP and POP these principles are taken further and the need for critical thinking, great

communication skills and creative implementation of solutions is even more important. These are qualities that are essential to modern day officers and also contribute to another shift in preferred officer attributes: education

Education has long been a debated attribute in policing especially when August Vollmer began to document in 1926 that law enforcement officers needed more intellectual training in order to professionalize policing and because he felt officers with greater education had a much lower risk of breaking the ethical barrier (Bruns, 2010). The shift in policing practices from enforcement to prevention has given an even greater emphasis on the education level of officers. Not only do officers need to evolve to the ever changing technologies and practices, they must maintain the higher ethical standards of the public and we have seen that untrained and uneducated officers are more likely to engage in unethical behavior. According to Bruns, 2010, officers with at least two years of college have less citizen complaints, less discipline problems and have better relationships with the public than officers with no college education.

As a result of the Reform Era we also saw several commissions on law enforcement like the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which focused on advancing the law enforcement field, in particular the selection practices, to include equal opportunity employment and affirmative action. These studies contributed greatly to the shift from trying to find officers that were focused on the adventure to more community service orientated candidates (Scrivner, 2006). A large part of these modern day selection process and the shift to service orientated candidates also comes from a piece of work by Herman Goldstein in 1977, Policing in a Free Society, which spells out a paradigm shift when he observed that more of officer's time is actually spent in service related activities and not actual law enforcement.

Another lesson that we have learned from the years of racism and corruption in law enforcement was the implementation of tools like extensive background checks, psychological exams and/or personality testing. Law enforcement now uses these tools during the selection process in an attempt to pre-screen applicants for mental stability or ethical concerns that may arise, such as truthfulness or discrimination tendencies. These screening mechanisms are also important in finding candidates that fit the mold of the more service orientated officer of today.

As with every field, law enforcement administrators need to be cognizant of the ever evolving process, in order to ensure they are keeping up with the changing times and providing their community with the service that is demanded by the public. This means understanding what the community needs and what characteristics are needed in an officer in order to best provide those services. By being conscious of law enforcement's past failures and working to prevent those failures and looking for new ways to stay ahead of the evolution, law enforcement administrators can find those LEO that possess the characteristics and skills that needed to keep up with the ever growing complexity of the law enforcement field.

The law enforcement selection process and hiring requirements

With all the different advancements in law enforcement and the evolution of policing practices, it is essential that the field of law enforcement and its agencies adapt and also evolve their selection process in order to find the most qualified candidates. The current modern day selection processes for law enforcement are designed not only to find the most qualified candidates but also focus on important things like equal opportunity hiring, affirmative action and other human resource concerns that previously went ignored. The hiring process has become more in depth and scientific and include things like basic cognitive skills examinations, background checks, oral interview boards and psychological exams (Taylor III, Moersch &

Franklin, 2003). Each agency has their own process they have designed that they feel fits their needs the best. To go along with the selection process each agency also sets minimum requirements that each candidate must meet in order to begin the process. Some of these requirements are set by the states and others are set by the law enforcement departments in order to find officers they feel meet their community's needs. Some of these requirements are education attainment levels, work experience, age, and/or pre-employment police academy training. In order to understand how law enforcement agencies are selecting their candidates to meet their individual needs it is necessary to examine some of these individual selection process steps and requirements.

The first part of the selection process is actually in the recruitment of individuals to apply to the agency in order to start the selection process. Recruitment standards in law enforcement are a relatively new idea but proper recruitment has shown to be extremely important. With the minimum requirements becoming more stringent and the importance of hiring a diverse group of officers, the application pool has become smaller and smaller so agencies must reach out into the community in order to sell their agency to potential candidates. By using a variety of recruitment efforts agencies will build their application pool and will then be able to be more selective when choosing which candidates to pursue (White & Escobar, 2008). The application process consists of individuals filling out a series of questions regarding their general information such as education level, residency, and prior work experience. This stage in hiring has also evolved greatly in the recent past as more and more agencies are putting their applications on line for easier access to potential candidates.

Once the application pool is set, every agency has a different sequence of the next steps in their process but in the end most of them involve some type of physical agility test, oral

interview board, background check or psychological exam and basic cognitive skills test in order to test the applicant's ability to read and write. The physical agility tests and oral interview boards can vary greatly on the depth that they go into. Some physical agility tests are simple test to make sure candidates meet certain weight and size requirements and can perform basic physical tasks and others are extensive tests to prove the overall physical fitness of the candidate. The procedures used by oral interview boards also vary depending on agency as some comprise of a few structured questions and other are extensive with open ended questions in order to dig deep into the candidates knowledge and past experiences.

The written test is one of the most used screening tools used by agencies as an attempt to test a candidate's intelligence or IQ (Sanders, 2003). This written examination is used to test the basic cognitive skills of a candidate, as studies have shown that the smarter an officer is the better they do in academy training (Sanders, 2003). One common test that is used by many agencies is the National Police Officer Selection Test (POST). This is a standardized written test, which tests the candidate's in reading comprehension, incident report writing, mathematics, and grammar (Standard & Associates, 2013). The written exam is often one of the first measuring tools used during a selection process, and has been show effective in identifying those candidates that are poor performers and acts more as a de-selection tool rather than a tool to select the qualified candidates or a tool to select those candidates that will be successful (Frank, Henson, Reynolds & Klahm IV, 2006).

A written exam can be a good starting point in the selection process as it lets an agency know if a candidate meets certain basic cognitive skill levels, however it often times fails to measure a candidate's non-cognitive skills. Assessment centers are becoming more common in the law enforcement selection process because of their ability to place a candidate in real life

situations to see how they react. Candidates can be placed in a variety of situations, all designed to test a different aspect of their ability. For instance, a candidate can be placed in a tactical situation to rate their ability to observe different things happening, or in an interview situation to rate their ability to talk to a victim, or be given a short project and presentation to rate their ability to speak publicly. Assessment centers have the ability to be designed around an individual agency's needs and what they are looking for in a future LEO. Once the exercises are designed to measure what characteristics the agency feels will best meet their needs, the agency will then select the assessors who will be responsible for observing the candidates and grading their performance during the events. This allows agencies to see how candidates perform in actual job related tasks and can help minimize the weight that is placed on simple written examinations or subjective oral interview panels (Jetmore, 2010).

Two other important screening mechanisms are an extensive background check with a follow-up interview and the psychological examination. With a proper background check, agencies have the ability to determine a great deal about the applicant and possibly find any ethical concerns they may have. Background interviews commonly address among others, prior residencies, employment history social contacts and drug use. The important aspect of the background check is to verify the information the applicant provided in his or her application package. Background checks typically include psychological tests and polygraph examinations. Agencies often outsource this task to a licensed psychologist that reviews the background and criminal history of the applicant and combine this with the use of a personality test, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Test (MMPI), to determine if applicants show things like mental stability, bad judgment, addictive tendencies or other characteristics that would be detrimental to the functionality of a law enforcement officer (Areaya, 2011).

Along with requiring extensive background and psychological exams and requiring applicants to meet sometimes stringent physical requirements, many agencies also have minimum levels of educational attainment set for their applicants. Again, education requirements are relatively new to the field of law enforcement and even though it has been, and still is, a widely disputed aspect of law enforcement, there is no doubt in the importance of knowledge. Along with Vollmer, who strongly supported the education of officers, the argument for well-educated officers has also come from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement. In 1967 this commission recommended that "police would reform their role to adapt to a changing society," (Rydberg & Terrill, 2010 pp. 95). Much of the adaptation revolved around the increasing complexity of not only society but the law enforcement officer's daily tasks.

Even though it has been over 40 years since the push for well-educated officers, there are still many agencies that do not feel this is an important qualification for their officers. This can be seen in the fact that in 2003 less than 1% of law enforcement agencies actually required a four-year bachelor's degree to be hired as an entry level LEO (Bruns, 2010). Even though only a small fraction of agencies require a four-year degree, approximately 98% of them have some form of educational requirement, which can range from just a high school diploma to a four-year degree. Some of these educational minimums are actually mandated by the individual states, as there are ten states that require a minimum of a two-year Associate's degree or 60 college credits in order to be a certified LEO. There are 39 states that mandate a high school diploma and only one state, Nevada, that has no state mandated educational requirement (Bruns, 2010). Even though there are state required levels of educational attainment, these are just mandated minimum requirements and it is generally up to the individual agencies if they want to impose greater educational demands on their potential candidates.

Are these requirements effective?

As the field of law enforcement continues to evolve, the selection process and hiring requirements have evolved along with it. With the evolution process, it is important to continually evaluate these changes for their effectiveness in order to ensure the selection process and new requirements placed on the applicants are effective in selecting the best future LEO. Although it is very difficult to measure the effectiveness of some of the newer screening mechanisms, there are some different aspects we can look at in order to measure the importance of some of the qualities that the law enforcement field are currently looking for. When examining the idea of measuring effectiveness of the requisites of the law enforcement hiring process, it is important to understand some of the requisites and the processes to measure them are more subjective than others. One of the more subjective processes is the physical agility test. The physical agility test is an often argued part of a selection process because it is very debatable if a person that can run a seven minute mile is a better law enforcement officer than a person that runs a nine minute mile. This is especially true when one takes into account the current policing philosophy of community and problem solving policing that relies on a person's critical thinking abilities and not how fast they can run for an extended period of time. Another consideration for the physical test is that in order for it to be both valid and defensible in court the agency must be able to show objective proof that the exercises performed can be linked to actual job tasks performed during the job. A study, however, found that LEOs rarely run for a distance more than 80 meters, even though the running test was 366 meters (Sherpard & Bonneau, 2002). This example shows the liability that agencies bring upon themselves because in this case anyone who failed this portion of the agility test would likely have a viable lawsuit against the agency. Another option could be a simple medical physical evaluation which can often prove if the

candidate is physically able to handle the demands of the job and would be less likely to eliminate a good candidate because they cannot perform an exercise that in reality does not have bearing on their abilities to be a successful LEO.

One of the most debated requirements in law enforcement is the educational attainment of officers. There are many benefits of requiring higher education but there are also many downsides that come with it. According to White & Escobar, 2008, some of the benefits include;

- college educated officers will be older and more mature when entering the job,
- policing is becoming a more complex profession and college educated students have the knowledge necessary for critical thinking and problem solving,
- candidates with a degree in criminal justice can bring more in depth knowledge of the field to the job,
- those who attend college classes are more likely to interact with other cultures, customs and belief systems, helping them in the diversity needed for impartial police work

Of course, these benefits are hard to measure but a study done by Rydberg & Terrill, 2010, has shown that an officer's education level is significantly related to the probability of the officer using force in any given situation. Officers that have some college education are less likely to use force than officers without any college education. This can also be accompanied by Bruns' earlier mentioned study that officers with at least a two-year college education had significantly less citizen's complaints than officers without higher education. As we have seen from the evolution of policing, the idea that officers with higher education are less likely to resort to using force and receive fewer complaints from citizens is a significant improvement from an era when the police were often faced with backlash and resistance from different groups of people based largely in part on their excessive force and discrimination against the minorities public.

Even though there are many benefits that are directly related to the rising educational attainment requirements, there are also several disadvantages that stem from the highly debated educational requirements. A serious issue that needs to be addressed is that of

discrimination. It is a well-argued idea that higher educational attainment favors that of white males (Krueger, Rothstein & Turner, 2005) and when law enforcement agencies require higher education for employment they must understand they may be limiting the ability for minority applicants to apply. Along with the diversity concerns with education requirements one must recognize that law enforcement is and always should be a civil service career. This means an officer's salary is rarely going to match that of many private sector jobs where employees are often compensated with monetary bonuses for a good production year. Those with higher education may become frustrated with limitations from supervisors and lack of advancement opportunities present in most agencies (Bruns, 2010; Whetstone, 2000). Law enforcement officers also face irregular work hours and some agencies only offer limited mobility due to budget constraints and the makeup of the department with smaller agencies facing higher turnover rates as officers leave for larger agencies with more opportunities. Those with college education can find these obstacles too much and their effort and job satisfaction can suffer causing them to leave the field in search for a 9-5 job with better pay and less danger and stress. According to a report from the U.S. Department of Justice, 2004, not only do higher education requirements limit the applicant pool but it also found that higher education requirements also increase turnover and attrition rates.

Problems with the law enforcement selection process

Understanding that the selection process has become just as complex as modern day law enforcement, there has to be negative aspects of the complexity to go along with the benefits. One of the most obvious side effects of the current selection process is the amount of time that it takes to complete an entire hiring sequence. With so many steps involved and the in depth inquiry into each candidate's background, the selection process can be lengthy and costly. With

the extensive training that is required to bring new officers on line and the amount of turnover that can be involved with law enforcement, it is very difficult to keep functioning staff levels when it takes several months to hire a new employee. A study by the National Institute for Justice found that it takes 8 to 11 months to screen/select and train new LEOs (Ashcroft, Daniels & Hart, 2004). When many agencies are forced to hire reactively it is extremely important that the process is efficient and effective as to not waste time and money in selecting the wrong candidates and in order to get that new LEO on the street as soon as possible in order to serve the community without delay. In order for the selection process to be efficient and effective it must be designed to measure the qualities of a LEO that are most important to the job as it is designed and those qualities that are going to be the most relevant in actually predicting the future performance of a candidate.

The written exam is a key component of many law enforcement agencies even though its validity in predicting the future performance of a LEO is often questioned based on the scoring system, cultural biases, and the amount of variations in the tests (Cox, Mccamey & Scaramella, 2013). The scoring system for example raises large validity questions especially when agencies select candidates that will move onto the next phase of the process based solely on their written exam scores, sometimes eliminating a candidate because of one point. The difference of one or two points is minimal in the grand scheme of an entire selection process when the difference of up to 10 points indicates only a minor difference between candidates (Cox, Mccamey & Scaramella, 2013). There are also questions of the written exam's validity based on the notation that testing its effectiveness in predicting work performance of a LEO is very difficult. One way to test the validity of a written exam would be for an agency to hire all those who took the exam regardless of their score, and who passed the other tests in the selection process, then measure

their performance over an extended period of time. This obviously creates a large amount of liability for the agency because if someone who failed the test performs in a way that injures someone or violates their rights, the agency could be held liable for hiring an unqualified candidate (Cox, Mccamey & Scaramella, 2013). Although other ways may exist to test the validity of the written exam it is becomes difficult because an agency would have to alter their current hiring practices or look at previously hired officers that did not undergo the current process. Either way there are several things to consider because of the time that would have to elapse in order to measure the performance of each officer to ensure they are being measured under the same guidelines and experience level.

When assessing the current makeup of the law enforcement field it is important to understand the tasks and mandates of the modern day LEO before trying to design a selection process. By comprehending what an agency is looking for in their officers they can then design a process that actually tests candidates on their ability to perform the job as it is designed. Unfortunately there are many selection process measuring tools that are used but are not effective in measuring the candidates ability to perform the job. For instance, no longer are LEO only tasked with traffic enforcement and arresting "bad guys". The job of a LEO has become much more complex and the job designs and functions include requirements like:

- Ability to analyze situations quickly and objectively and to determine proper courses of action to be taken.
- Ability to develop a working relationship with other allied agencies.
- Ability to remain calm in tense or hostile situations. (Rock County WI, 2013)
- Using logic and reasoning to identify the strengths and weaknesses of alternative solutions, conclusions or approaches to problems.
- Monitoring/Assessing performance of oneself, other individuals, or organizations to make improvements or take corrective action.
- Bringing others together and trying to reconcile differences.
- Persuading others to change their minds or behavior (O*Net, 2010).

When agencies are using job designs with these types of required skills and abilities of an officer they must look at their selection process in order to determine if their selection process is actually measuring a candidate's ability to perform these functions.

By understanding the aspects of job analysis and design it is clear that the scoring system of a written exam is not the only aspect of this measure tool that can call its validity into question. The design of a written exam is also very important to make sure that the written exam is able to actually test a candidate's ability to perform the job as it is designed. The design of the written exam can differ greatly based on the company that researches and designs the test. Some agencies can select and pay a company to analyze their specific job description and functions to come up with an individualized exam, but this can be costly and time consuming. Most agencies however, will select a generic written exam that is designed for the "overall" job function of a LEO. This is cause for concern because not every agency is looking for the same characteristics in the candidates they will hire. This means they are putting their agency at the mercy of the test writer to design a test that will test for the candidates that fit a generic model of a LEO. For instance, one company's written exam, currently in use and endorsed by 25 state Police Chief Associations, is designed to measure "the basic cognitive skills necessary to successfully perform the job," (Standard & Associates, 2013). This test is used to measure the candidate's arithmetic, reading comprehension, grammar and incident report writing skills, in order to predict if the candidate can succeed in law enforcement. This is significant as many current job descriptions and designs have no elements that discuss the ability to do simple mathematical equations. Also according to the testing website this is contradictory to their description of the test because as they discuss the importance of a proper job analysis they state, "For example, a test of mathematics skills requiring candidates to solve simple algebraic equations may not be

appropriate for entry-level law enforcement applicants..." (Standard & Associates, 2013, para. 2). So as this particular company contradicts themselves as to what is needed in an entry level written exam, it is essential to find ways to test candidates on the ability to perform the job as described in an agency's job description, based off their job analysis, and be cautious on placing a lot of weight on a written test that may not measure the candidates for their ability to perform the job functions as they are outlined in the individual agency's job description.

The selection process as a whole also has to combat the idea that a smarter cop makes a better cop. As mentioned earlier, the higher a candidate's IQ is the better they are likely to do during their pre-service academy training but an issue that arises is the idea that classroom performance does not always equate to actual on the job performance especially in a field such as law enforcement. Studies have shown that even though a low IQ can be linked to poor performance there is no such link between high IQ and good work performance. In particular, Sanders (2003) writes that the POST has been proven to be successful at identify those candidates who are going to be poor performers, however it does not have the ability to identify and differentiate between those with moderate and great cognitive skills. Dayan, Kasten and Fox, 2002, also found, in arguing for assessment centers in a selection process, that there was a low correlation between cognitive skills test scores and on the job performance. Their findings showed that the low correlation was based largely on the fact that these cognitive skills have little to do with the success of a LEO and it is the non-cognitive skills such as social skills, personality traits, and interpersonal skills that are truly what determines the success a LEO will have.

The non-cognitive skills that Dayan, Kasten and Fox write about are the similar to the ones established in several other studies about the characteristics that make successful LEOs and

are the ones that the selection process should focus on. These are the skills that are needed in order for a LEO to perform the job as it has been designed in the modern policing models like COP and POP. The current use of cognitive skills tests, physical agility tests, and subjective interviews in the law enforcement selection process fail to accurately measure these qualities. Assessment centers in the law enforcement selection process have been shown effective in measuring the important non-cognitive characteristics and appear to carry more validity than the written examination but they come with a high cost.

Emotional Intelligence

What is emotional intelligence?

After recognizing some of the problems that are presented with the current selection process in the law enforcement field it is important to find ways to adapt the current process in order to meet the needs of modern law enforcement. One of those ways that was previously mentioned is the use of assessment centers in order to test the non-cognitive skills of a candidate; however, assessment centers can be extremely costly to properly design. Even though this is only an upfront cost, assessment centers are extremely manpower intensive to conduct, which results in a high monetary cost to sustain because of the cost associated with paying personnel to proctor the process. As an alternative to assessment centers agencies may be able to test some of the same non-cognitive abilities of a candidate in a more simple and cost effective manner, by testing a candidate's Emotional Intelligence (EI). EI is a concept which Daniel Goleman writes about in his book *Emotional Intelligence*, which was originally published in 1995. Goleman explains that an individual's traditional IQ only counts for approximately 20 percent of a person's life success, which leaves 80 percent to other personal characteristics. Some of these characteristics are one's ability to "motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to

control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one's mood and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope" (Goleman, 2006, p. 34). These characteristics can help someone identify things to look for in individuals that are high in EI.

Goleman, 2006, also utilizes a direct quote from Aristotle in the beginning of his book in an attempt to explain how it is not just the emotion of a person but how that emotion is used that makes up EI; "Anyone can become angry-that is easy. But to be angry with the right person, to the right degree, at the right time, for the right purpose, and in the right way-that is not easy" (p. xviii).

Goleman also writes about 4 major components of EI, which help to explain what EI is and why it may be more important than an individual's traditional IQ. The first of these components of EI is self-awareness. Self-awareness in EI is how an individual can have a strong understanding of their own emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives. By an individual recognizing how they are feeling themselves, they have the ability to comprehend how that feeling is going to affect them and if they are high in EI, they will also have the ability to manage their emotions in order to keep them from getting out of control. This is especially true with feelings such as anger and sadness, and those who have a higher level of EI will often be aware of these feelings and do not obsess about them, therefore the mood or feeling does not linger (Goleman, 1995). This is opposite to those who become engulfed in their moods and allow them to control their emotional life because they either do not understand what is making them feel the way they are feeling or they simply accept the mood they are in, whether it is a good mood or bad mood, and do little to change it.

According to Goleman, (2004), self-aware people are cognizant of their strengths and weakness, which leads them to be welcome to constructive criticism, having an understanding of

their limitations and usually have a high level of self-confidence based on their firm knowledge of their own capabilities. It is these self-aware people that seldom set themselves up to fail because they know when to seek assistance when needed and are not afraid to be candid about a mistake that was made.

Being aware of your emotions is only part of EI; one must be able to manage their emotions in order to benefit from the ability to being aware of their emotions. Self-management is the second component of EI and focuses on an individual's capability to not only understand their emotions but also regulate them. This is best seen with anger, as Goleman, (2006), notes that anger has been found to be the emotion that people are the worst at controlling. Those who are without self-management often lack the temperance to restrain their emotions to avoid excess emotional outburst or uncontrollable levels of a certain feeling. Self-management is not just restraining negative moods and feelings it is also managing the positive feeling and emotions and uses those as a way to motivate oneself. Self-management allows a person to set high personal standards and seek to achieve those standards by constantly tracking their progress and setting goals that challenge themselves and seek performance improvements (Goleman, 2002).

The first two components of EI deal directly with the individual and how they understand and control their own emotions, but the third component, social awareness, focuses on how the individual can read the emotions of others. The main concept of social awareness empathy as it relates to a person's ability to read and share the emotions of another, usually by nonverbal cues. This skill is directly related to self-awareness and self-management because if someone is unable to recognize their own emotions they will surely not be able recognize the emotions of another person (Goleman, Boyatzis, Mckee 2002). Reading other people's emotions also allows for the individual to react and control the emotions of others. As a component of social awareness this

allows for things like organizing groups and leading those groups, negotiating solutions, mediating conflicts, or being able to read one's emotions and building a rapport based off those emotions (Goleman, 2002).

The final component of EI brings the other three components together in order to form the component of relationship management. Few people can possess high levels of relationship management without possessing self-awareness, self-management, and social awareness. According to Cherniss and Goleman, (2001), those with high levels of relationship management are individuals that possess characteristics such as charisma or leadership and skills like motivation/persuasion and conflict management. Individuals that can monitor themselves and the impressions they are giving to others and adjust their social impression, are able to constantly be sure they are expressing the emotion and message they are trying to get across.

Emotional Intelligence in Law Enforcement

Once there is a firm comprehension of what EI and its components are, it is easier to look at the job of a modern day LEO and see the importance EI plays as a characteristic that every LEO should possess. Every component of EI (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management) can be seen in the daily duties of a LEO and by understanding how they facilitate the LEO to perform in almost every facet of their job it will show why law enforcement should incorporate EI into their selection process.

The normal duties of a LEO can change depending on several different aspects, to include; the size of the agency, the size of the community they serve, their current assignment, or the current method of policing in which the agency practices, but there are some characteristics that every LEO needs to possess regardless of their working environment. Temperance is one of those characteristics that is essential for a successful LEO based on the daily duties and tasks that

a LEO faces. Temperance allows a person self control and moderation, which is extremely important in law enforcement because it is not a question of if a LEO is going to experience anger, sadness, stress, and annoyance in their job it is a question of when they are going to experience these feelings. In the daily duties of a LEO, they may have to deal with a suicide scene, an intoxicated subject who is threatening them, or a large vehicle crash on a busy highway with multiple injuries, there is no doubt that the officer is going to have any one of these feelings and it is extremely important that they have the temperance to control these feelings in a way that is going to allow them to perform their duties safely and efficiently. This is directly related to the first two aspects of EI (self-awareness and self-management) because it is going to be up to the individual LEO to recognize when they are getting angry or sad and up to them to control this emotion while performing their duties. Studies have shown that officers with high levels of self control are more likely to stay composed in stressful situations and refrain from things like inappropriate levels of force, to include excessive or unwarranted force, or unethical behavior (Turner, 2009). Self-awareness in LEO has also shown important as it is those officers with high self-awareness that are able to understand the emotions they are feeling and when they need to address those feelings in a personal level. This can be when they are feeling stressed or sad from a particular call they have the ability to recognize when they need to take a step away from the call or job in order to compose themselves and their emotions (Turner, 2009). It is those LEOs that have the ability to handle these types of emotions that are able to sustain the rollercoaster of emotions that come along with a career in law enforcement because they have the emotional capacity to understand when they are feeling the motions that are detrimental to themselves or others and have the awareness to manage those emotions in a non-destructive way.

Comprehending and managing one's own emotions is only half of EI and only part of why EI is important in law enforcement. When a LEO is high in EI they also have the ability to work well in teams and to problem solve. These skills have become more important with the evolution in policing and the development in policing models such as COP and POP. One of the key components of COP is the ability of the LEO to recognize the underlying problems of a community and find ways to address those problems in order to resolve them effectively, not just tackling the outlying results of the problem. For instance, if there is a large drug problem in the neighborhood the easiest solution maybe arresting those who are providing the drugs on the street, but this is only a temporary solution to the problem because there will almost always be someone else to step in to the role of the drug dealer. A more permanent solution to this problem could come from gathering the landlords in the community and begin to enforce different housing codes in order to point the neighborhood, as a whole, into a position by displacing those who choose to participate in the drug trade out of the neighborhood. The difference between the officer who looks at this particular situation as one that can be solved by arrests and one that solves it by understanding what is the root cause of the problem is one that possesses the ability to problem solve.

The culmination of high levels of EI is that of a person that can put all the aspects of EI together to not only manage themselves but has the ability to manage the emotions of others. Ebrahim Al Ali, Garner and Magadley, 2011, found that police performance is largely incumbent on the LEO ability to not only manage their own emotions but also the emotions of others because of the great deal of public contact that LEOs have in their daily duties. They explain that the ability to "interpret another's emotional state particularly from non-verbal cues is significant for consistent communication..." (p. 2), which is a major factor in the performance of a good

LEOs. With their understanding of EI, Ebrahim Al Ali, et al., 2011, looked at job performance of 310 police officers and found that EI was significantly associated with the police officer's performance in the areas of problem solving, communication, and team work.

Daniel Goleman has claimed in many of his writings that EI is directly related to an individual's performance in both a personal and professional life because of the qualities that an individual with high EI possesses. The qualities that Goleman writes about include; understanding one's own emotions and managing those emotions, empathy, teamwork, leadership, recognizing and managing the emotions of others, and good communication skills. Although this list of skills is not completely indicative of a LEO, and are skills that any employer would likely strive for their employees, these skills are particularly important to the modern day LEO given the increasing demands of the profession in this ever changing and evolving field.

Emotional Intelligence as a Predictor of Performance

It is easy to see why EI can be a great characteristic in an individual to assist them in a social setting, but recent research has also examined what EI can do for an individual when they apply it in a school and work setting. Studies have shown that EI has the ability to predict things like leadership, stress, and job performance (Iliescu, Ilie, Ispas & Ion, 2012). While academic IQ is also a predictor of school and job performance, Goleman (1995), brings to light how EI is an important factor in the success of even the smartest individuals. Goleman discusses the idea that even in a work group of the scientist and engineers that are all regarded as the top performers in their field, there are certain individuals that stand out as the leaders of their group. This is because those top performers are the ones that have the ability to motivate themselves and others and work best in the groups. This is a non-scientific observation, but it is one that helps show how EI can explain some of the differences between even the smartest individuals and as a

measuring tool to find those individuals who will excel in work groups. There are also more scientific studies that have examined how EI can be used to measure and predict future performance.

For instance, according to Bourey and Miller, 2001, 90% of success in leadership is attributable to emotional intelligence and people with greater levels of emotional intelligence handle stress better and lead healthier lives. Emotional Intelligence has been linked to the ability to mediate groups of people and the ability to read not only your own emotions but also read and manage the emotions of others. Daniel Goleman, 1998, also found that by looking at technical skills, traditional IQ, and emotional intelligence; emotional intelligence is twice as important in successful job performance than the other aspects at all levels, from management to line staff. There are also studies that have looked at the limitations of other types of job performance tests, to include testing traditional IQ. These studies suggest that only 10 to 30 percent of an individual's future work performance can be measured by just their traditional IQ (MacCann, Matthews, Zeidner & Roberts, 2003). The idea of using EI as a predictor of work performance and success has not gone unnoticed as many different groups have chose to examine the ability of EI tests in predicting the future performance of an individual in different types of settings.

One particular study, examined the relationship between EI and medical students as it relates to their performance in interpersonal academic performance. Libbrecht, Lievens, and Carette (2014), knew that research has shown effective communication and interpersonal sensitivity between doctors and patients have direct impacts on the outcomes of treatments. With this understanding they also found that medical schools are unable to test these skill either in entrance examines or in written exams during courses. By understanding that communication, empathy, and interpersonal relationships are core components of EI, Libbrecht et al., wanted to

see if by testing student's EI they would be able to predict those students who would excel in what they termed "bedside manners". Their belief was that the higher the student's EI was, they would have better abilities like understanding the causes of other people emotions, thus being able to empathize with their patients better. By doing this the researchers felt the medical students would be more equipped to offer the social support their patients would need and they would be able to develop closer interpersonal relationships. Libbrecht et al., 2014, also wanted to examine the ability of the EI test above other predictors of performance usually used as measuring tools during the selection process into medical school.

For this study, the researchers used two EI measuring tools, the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding (STEU) and the Situational Test of Emotional Management (STEM). Both the tests focus on the situational judgment abilities of the individual to assess the content of a particular emotional situation then develop the right course of action based on the emotion displayed. (Other types of EI measuring tools will be discussed at length in a later section). In their findings Libbrecht et al., 2014, found the EI was a valid predictor of interpersonal academics and was not directly related to the intellectual performance of a student. This means that by utilizing an EI test as part of the admissions process, medical schools would add another tool to better select the potential students that would be more prepared for the interpersonal aspect of medical school, not just the intellectual book work.

This example helps demonstrate the idea that while academic or tradition IQ can predict future intellectual performance, EI can and should be used as a way to measure and predict the future performance of an individual as it deals with their interpersonal and relationship management skills. The question that arises when attempting to measure a characteristic quality

of an individual is, “Is there a valid, reliable, and fair measuring tool that measures the characteristic?”

As EI becomes more prominent in the academic and business world there have been more and more EI measuring tools designed in order to assess an individual’s level of EI. There are two main categories of EI measuring tools; mixed models and ability models. One of the reasons there are different categories of measuring tools is because EI is still considered by many to be personality traits and not a form of intelligence, which would have to be measured as a form of cognitive ability. The mixed models include The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) and Schutte Self-Report Inventory (SSRI). This particular exam focuses on the test taker self-reporting their thoughts based off the questions in the exam. The exam questions include questions in which the reader would read a situation or statement of emotion and rate themselves on how close that statement meets their own emotional feelings (MacCann et al., 2003). The most obvious downfall to these types of self-report tests is that the validity of the exam can be called into question because the reader is not being tested on any given skill but only on how they feel given any of the situations or emotional statements. As with many of the other personality tests that are being used in selection processes today, it is not difficult for the test taker to fake or alter their answers in order to deceive the test in order to receive a desirable score or outcome (MacCann et al., 2003; Libbrecht, Lievens & Carette, 2014). Another criticism of mixed model measuring tools is that they tend to focus more on personality traits of the test taker and fail to look at emotional intelligence as a form of intelligence, as the name would imply it is. The negative aspect to this is that there are many personality tests available that have been proven valid and reliable in testing personality traits and the mixed model EI tests are only

supporting these other personality tests and not actually testing for an individual's EI (MacCann et al., 2003).

The criticism of the mixed model EI tests do not make them useless as they can still be used as a supplement with personality tests to measure some characteristics of EI, they have too many flaws in order for them to be used in a selection process. The more complete types of measuring tools for EI are categorized as the ability model of tests. There are several different ability model tests to include the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), and the aforementioned STEU and STEM. The ability model tests are designed to actually measure an individual's performance or skills, unlike the mixed model tests that rely on self-reporting to measure results. The MSCEIT was originally designed to be used as a "rate-the-extent" measuring tool in which the test takers would be asked to rate the appropriateness of an emotion based on a provided situation (MacCann & Roberts, 2008). This measurement style forced the individual to use their skills in reading situations and emotions in order to correctly identify if the particular emotion is warranted in the situation. This was a major development in testing for EI because it solved one of the major faults of the mixed model tests in which the test taker would be able to fake the answers and it actually tested for many of the EI components.

However, after time the MSCEIT was found to also have its faults when researchers began looking at the validity of the test. One of the concerns that were raised about the MSCEIT was the way in which the actual test was scored. The thought came when trying to figure out what the right answer to the individual questions was going to be and how to justify that answer. In this case, the creators of the test determined they would use "experts" in the field of EI and psychology in order to determine the most appropriate answer. This raised a question of objectivity because the creators had to assume that they experts knew the right answer, the

writers of the emotional statement knew what the experts were looking for, and that the general public would agree on the right answer (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso & Sitarenios, 2003).

Questions on the method of scoring on the MSCEIT were also raised because of the use of consensus scoring and the “rate-the-extent” scoring in certain areas of the test. With consensus scoring there was a negative skew with the score because on the “easier” questions there were a larger number of people who got the answer right and with the “harder” questions only a small number of participants answered correctly. This led to researchers being able to identify those with low levels of EI but made it much more difficult to identify those participants with high levels of EI (MacCann et al., 2003). The concern with the “rate-the-extent” portions of the test is that with a rate the extent type of question, the taker is asked to identify the degree to which a person should be feeling an emotion in a given situation and their answer is scored as a distance away from the experts answer. This creates an issue because the taker is given the right answer and only has to understand to what degree the emotion is appropriate where as a multiple choice test would require the taker to both understand the correct emotion and to what extent the emotion is appropriate (MacCann & Roberts, 2008).

Once the flaws of the MSCEIT were recognized, researchers began to look into designing different tests in order to address some of the issues that plagued other EI tests. The resulting tests were the previously mentioned STEM and STEU. The STEM was specifically designed to use both multiple-choice and rate-the-extent formats in order to prevent the negative skew of the "harder" answers and also provided researchers an opportunity to examine whether there was a stronger relationship between EI and the takers cognitive abilities (MacCann & Roberts, 2008). The STEU was designed in order to address MSCEIT's issue of consensus scoring by using a specific theory of emotions in order to determine the right answers (MacCann & Roberts, 2008).

While looking at the validity of these two tests, 4 criteria were used in order to determine if these tests were a viable option for testing for EI. The criteria included:

- The tests should positively relate to other intelligence tests
- The EI tests should relate more strongly to other EI tests compared to other types of intelligence tests, in order to show that the test is differentiating from EI and other groups of intelligence
- The test should rate the takers ability to facilitate appropriate emotions in a particular situation
- The test should only correlate to a personality test to the extent that other intelligence test do, which is generally at .30 or less (MacCann & Roberts, 2008).

With these criteria the researchers were able to test the STEM and STEU and their ability to measure EI. The results of the research showed the two tests showed reasonable evidence as EI measurement tools (MacCann & Roberts, 2008). Although there are still questions that were raised in this study it is important to note that the STEM and STEU separated the aspects of EI by producing one test the specifically looked at the takers ability to manage emotions and another test to examine the takers ability to understand emotions. This can be a great development in the area of measuring EI because it not only looks at EI as a cognitive ability but it also begins to break it down into the different aspects, in order to pin point the skills of the individual.

Another aspect of any test that is used to measure a quality of or the performance of an individual, is whether or not that test is bias to any particular group of individuals. This is especially important if the test is going to be used in a selection process, like the EI test is being implied for use in a law enforcement position. In their development and study of the STEM and STUE, MacCann and Roberts, 2008, tested different samples of the population in order to determine if there were any questions of bias between groups of people and they found that in both the STEM and STEU there were no significant differences between genders and their scores. They however did find that when the age of the individual was examined the older

participants did have higher scores on the tests. They believed one possibility for this was because of the higher level of education found in those who participated in this particular portion of the study compared to the first sample taken, which was from a group of undergraduate students. Another possibility for the higher scores could be the maturity level of the older individuals, as it would be hard to argue that as individuals grow and gain more life experience they don't develop a better understanding of their own emotions and how to react and manage those emotions.

Although there is research on EI as a predictive tool, it is relatively new and limited in terms of the biases that may be present when using it as a selection tool. The fact that multiple studies have shown no gender differences in the current EI tests is promising (Iliescu, et al., 2012; MacCann et al., 2003; MacCann & Roberts, 2008). One study has reviewed the ethnic/culture concerns in using an EI test as a component in a selection process and found that there was no ethnic or cultural concerns regarding a biases for minority groups (Van Rooy, Alonso & Viswesvaran, 2004). Another study also showed that EI has criterion validity as a measurement tool for salespeople, public servants, CEO's of public hospitals and showed no bias based on gender or age (Iliescu, et al., 2012) Considering gender and race and two of the major concerns for any entity attempting to administered a fair selection process, these studies provide a positive outlook for the use of EI tests as part of a fair and valid law enforcement selection process.

In looking at the predictability of EI in the performance of a LEO, there is also evidence that EI has incremental validity over both cognitive and personality traits because of the link between overall job performance and EI (Ebrahim Al Ali, et al., 2011). It has also been found that EI has a direct impact on integrity in policing (Aremu, Pakes & Johnston, 2011), and that

those with high EI have the ability to adapt with the understanding of themselves and their environment (Golman, 2006). This is especially crucial with the understanding of the evolution of policing as previously discussed and the idea of the constant introduction of new technology, new policing techniques, and policing models that require the modern day LEO to adapt to the ever changing field of law enforcement.

Additional Hiring Factors

Like many other fields, law enforcement has evolved immensely since its inception due to things like technology, changing laws, hiring practices, and advancements in policing strategies. Along with these changes have come challenges for police administrators to keep current with the times and not let their agencies fall behind in providing the services needed by the community they serve. One important change that law enforcement has made in order to help keep up with the modern policing strategies was develop a new post-academy field training program that has incorporated many of the strategies of COP and POP into the training program and was designed especially for policing in the 21st century. The Police Training Officer (PTO) program was developed through federal funding in the late 1990's, and represents the first major change in law enforcement training in 30 years (Saville, 2006). The PTO program was designed in order to engrain new LEO with problem-solving skills, leadership, and sense of community before they get a solo-patrol assignment.

The PTO program utilizes adult style learning principals along with problem based learning in order to achieve the objectives of the training program. Some of the techniques that are used in the program are the use of journaling in order for the trainee to reflect on the things they have learned and to identify their individual skill set along with their strengths and weakness. By the trainee recording, in their own words and thoughts, how their training is

progressing, they can facilitate the learning process by the use of self-evaluation and problem solving (Saville, 2006). One of the core concepts that is examined in the PTO program is the trainee's EI. EI is used extensively in the journaling process as the trainee is expected to evaluate themselves and their strengths and weaknesses and truly understand how they feel they are performing. It is also a major component in the problem based learning style of the PTO program because EI has been shown to be so important in the problem solving process.

The PTO program has progressed from the first test agencies and has been proven to produce LEO newly off training that have problem solving skills, leadership, and an understanding of community that is rarely seen from LEOs so fresh out of the academy (Saville, 2006). So the question that should be asked is that if a new training program for LEOs relies so heavily on EI for the success of the trainee, why is law enforcement not utilizing EI as a selection tool? By measuring a candidate's EI, agencies would have another tool that can increase the chance of predicting those candidates that would have the best chance to successfully complete their training program.

Another aspect of the law enforcement selection process that cannot be over looked is the changing landscape of the younger generation. Several of the current selection process tools have been around for decades and have changed very little over time. What should to be realized is that with hiring Generation X and Y (those born between 1968 and 1999), law enforcement is not hiring the same type of people as when many of these selection tools were designed. The Traditional Generation (born before 1945) and the Baby Boom Generation (born between 1943-1965) were raised to respect authority, have loyalty for their employer and view work as a way of life. Generation X and Y view work more as a means to an end, value time away from work more than money earned at work, and have less loyalty to an employer and are more likely to

bounce from employer to employer seeking change and flexibility (Tolbize, 2008; Sharp 2012). Generation Y'ers are also expected to be more highly educated than any other generation, which can be a cause for concern after studies have found that the lower the education of a worker the higher their work ethic is. Generation Y'ers have also been raised to ask questions of authority, not to be disrespectful, but because they are not raised to immediately respect authority but that the authority must earn their respect (Tolbize, 2008).

Generational differences are important to understand when agencies look at selecting their future LEOs. Tolbize, 2008, suggests one way to approach hiring the younger generations is to “standardize interviewing using questions derived from job analyses, which yield a final indicative of how well prospective employees perform...” (p. 14). Although an EI test is not an interview per se, this type of test can achieve this because of the relationship that EI holds with the characteristics wanted in a LEO. As discussed earlier, the job analysis for a LEO mentions things like; problem solving skills, team work, mediation skills, and assessing performance of yourself and others. With all these skills being associated with one's EI, it is evident that adding an EI test into the selection process would assist agencies in finding candidates that possess the characteristics that are needed to be a successful LEO in today's modern policing.

With a full understanding of the evolution of policing, an overview of the current law enforcement hiring process, and the relationship between EI and law enforcement it is obvious that the selection process can be aided by adding an EI element. There are currently several options available in order to measure an individual's EI, with some being proven more reliable than others and more applicable to a selection process. Although more research is needed in order to fully understand how EI can be used as a performance predictive tool, current methods, to include the STEM and STEU, have been proven effective in measuring the EI of an

individual. When examining the law enforcement selection process as a whole, this, along with the promising potential of an assessment center, should be seen as the future in hiring new LEO that will be successful in the ever evolving field of law enforcement.

Conclusion

The law enforcement field has come a long way from the days of Sir Robert Peel and with the advances in technology and police practices there is no limit to what a new law enforcement officer can do given the right guidance from their agency. The most important aspect that the law enforcement field needs to understand is that the future of crime prevention is with the young officers that have yet to be hired. Agencies would benefit by seriously monitor their selection process to ensure they are hiring officers that fit the demographic of their population and the needs of their agency. August Vollmer stressed professionalism in the field of policing and the education of officers. His ideas were far advanced from their time but are alive and strong today with the ideas of COP and POP. Law enforcement agencies should understand that knowledge is power and with the increasingly complex policing strategies, the more education an officer has the better chance they have at succeeding in today's modern law enforcement field. The challenge to agencies is going to be finding the candidates that can meet these demands and do so with the efficiency that is needed in the tough economical times that every agency faces today. Even though it cost extraordinary amounts of money to test, select, and train new LEOs, the cost of hiring the wrong officer will always far outweigh the cost of a thorough and complete selection process that will truly test a candidates abilities and predict their future performance as a LEO.

References

- Arcaya, J. M. (2011). Challenging the police de-selection process during the psychological interview: How gullibility spells hiring doom for the unwary. In *Handbook of police psychology* New York, NY: Rutledge Academic.
- Aremu, A. O., Pakes, F., & Johnston, L. (2011). The moderating effect of emotional intelligence on the reduction of corruption in the Nigerian police. *Police Practice and Research, 12*(3), 195-208.
doi: 10.1080/15614263.20103536724
- Ashcroft, J., Daniels, D. J., & Hart, S. V. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2004). *Hiring and keeping police officers* (NCJ 202289)
- Bourey, J., & Miller, A. (2001). Do you know your emotional iq. *Public Management, 83*(9), 4-10.
- Bruns, D. (2010). Reflections from the one-percent of local police departments with mandatory four-year degree requirements for new hires: Are they diamonds in the rough?. *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice, 7*(1), 87-108.
- Bush, G. Office of the President of United States of America, (2002). *The department of homeland security*. Retrieved from website: <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/book.pdf>
- Casambelis, C., & Lange, T. (2000). Developing a written examination for police officer selection. *26*(10), 9-12.
- Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select, measure and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups and organizations*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.
- Cox, S., Mccamey, W., & Scaramella, G. (2013). *Introduction to policing*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dayan, K., Kasten, R., & Fox, S. (2002). Entry-level police candidate assessment center: An efficient tool or a hammer to kill a fly?. *Personnel Psychology, 55*(4), 827-849. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00131.x
- Ebrahim Al Ali, O., Garner, I., & Magadley, W. (2011). An exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance in police organizations. *Journal of Police Criminal Psychology, 27*, 1-8.
doi: 10.1007/s11896-011-9088-9
- Frank, J., Henson, B., Reynolds, B., & Klahm IV, C. Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Service, (2006). *Selection and hiring of quality police officers* (2006-JG-EOR-6244)

- Golman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Dell.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R.E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, November-December, 93-102.
- Golman, D. (2006). *Emotional intelligence*. (10th Anniversary ed.). New York, NY: Bantam Dell.
- Huisey, F. S., & Goodwin, M. (2001). Fast track application process speeds hiring. *Police Practice*, 5-8.
- Iliescu, D., Ilie, A., Ispas, D., & Ion, A. (2012). Emotional intelligence in personnel selection: Applicant reactions, criterion, and incremental validity. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(3), 347-358.
- Jetmore, L. F. (2010, June 17). *Assessment center promotional testing*. Retrieved from <http://www.policeone.com/police-jobs-and-careers/articles/2083870-Assessment-center-promotional-testing/>
- Krueger, A., Rothstein, J., & Turner, S. (2005). *Race, income and college in 25 years: The continuing legacy of segregation and discrimination*. Unpublished manuscript, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Libbrecht, N., Lievens, F., & Carette, B. (2014). Emotional intelligence predicts success in medical school. *Emotion*, 14(1), 64-73.
doi: 10.1037/a0034392
- MacCann, C., Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2003). Psychological assessment of emotional intelligence: A review of self-report and performance-based testing. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(3), 247- 274.
- MacCann, C., & Roberts, R. D. (2008). New paradigms for assessing emotional intelligence: Theory and data. *Emotion*, 8(4), 540-551.
doi: 10.1037/a0012746
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the msceit v2.0. *Emotion*, 3(1), 97-105.
doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.3.1.97
- Moore, T. (2012, December 26). NYPD sue! surge in lawsuits vs. police department part of costly trend for the city. *New York Daily News*. Retrieved from <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/new-york-lawsuit-city-article-1.1227937>

- O*Net. (2010). *Summary Report for: Police Patrol Officers*. Retrieved from O*Net Online: <http://www.onetonline.org/link/summary/33-3051.01>
- Ortmer, P. J., & Meese III, E. (2010). *Leadership, ethics, and policing*. (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Rydberg, J., & Terrill, W. (2010). The effect of higher education on police behavior. *Police Quarterly*, 13(1), 92-120.
doi: 10.1177/1098611109357325
- Sanders, B. A. (2003). Maybe there's no such thing as a "good cop": Organizational challenges in selecting quality officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26(2), 313-328.
doi: 10.1108/13639510310475787
- Saville, G. (2006, November). Emotional intelligence in policing. *The Police Chief Magazine*, 73(11), Retrieved from http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1052&issue_id=112006
- Schmallegger, F. (2009). *Criminal justice today: An introductory text for the 21st century*. (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Scrivner, E. U.S. Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Service. (2006). *Innovations in police recruitment and hiring*
- Sewell, A. (2014, January 13). LA County Sheriff's legal settlements rise to \$43m. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.policeone.com/legal/articles/6734383-LA-County-Sheriffs-legal-settlements-rise-to-43M/>
- Sharp, K. (2012, August). Recruiting generation y. *Law and Order*, 60(8), 58-60.
- Shepard, R. J., & Bonneau, J. (2002). Assuring gender equity in recruitment standards for police officers. *Canadian Journal of Applied Physiology*, 27(3), 263-295.
- Standard & Associates. (2013). *Job task analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.stanard.com/public-safety/job-task-analysis>
- Taylor III, L. J., Moersch, B. J., & Franklin, G. M. (2003). Applying the theory of constraints to a public safety hiring process. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(3), 367-382.
- Tolbize, A. (2008). *Generational differences in the workplace*. Informally published manuscript, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

- Turner, T. W. (2009, August). Understanding the benefits of emotional intelligence for officer growth and agency budgets. *The Police Chief Magazine*, 76(8), Retrieved from http://www.policchiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1873&issue_id=82009
- Van Rooy, D. L., Alonso, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Group differences in emotional intelligence scores: Theoretical and practical implications. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 1-12.
doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2004.05.023
- Wexler, C., Wycoff, M. A., & Fischer, C. U.S. Department of Justice Office, Community Oriented Policing Services. (2007). *"good to great" policing: Application of business management principles in the public sector* (ISBN: 978-1-934485-02-6). Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.
- White, M. D., & Escobar, G. (2008). Making good cops in the twenty-first century: Emerging issues for the effective recruitment, selection and training of police in the United States and abroad. *International Review of Law Computers & Technology*, 22(1-2), 119-134.
- Whetstone, T. (2000). Getting stripes: Educational achievement and study strategies used by Sergeant promotional candidates. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, (2), 247-257.