1983

The Oral Interview as a Predictor of Academic Performance in a Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program

M. Nicholas Meier
Grand Valley State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses

Part of the Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons

Recommended Citation

Meier, M. Nicholas, "The Oral Interview as a Predictor of Academic Performance in a Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program"
(1983). *Masters Theses*. 72.
http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/72

THE ORAL INTERVIEW AS A PREDICTOR

OF

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

IN A

PRESERVICE LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

by

M. Nicholas Meier

B.S., Indiana University, 1975

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate

School of Grand Valley State Colleges in partial

fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Public Administration

Seidman College of Business and Administration

1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

The oral interview is a standard technique used in the selection of police officers and the prediction of their subsequent academy and on the job performance. This study attempted to construct a model that could accurately predict academic performance from oral interview performance in a preservice law enforcement training program. Previous research in the use of the oral interview as a predictor of academic performance has produced conflicting results.

The sample in this study consisted of 159 candidates accepted by an oral interview board for training in a preservice police academy. Average academic performance was correlated to scores on an oral interview rating instrument consisting of nineteen subcategories using a Pearson Rank Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis.

The Pearson Rank Correlation demonstrated a statistically significant relationship between academic performance and oral interview performance. Multiple Regression Analysis was used in an attempt to construct a predictability model.

Results of the study reflected that:

1. No predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and average oral interview performance.

2. No predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and one of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

3. No predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between

average academic performance and two or more of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

4.   There exists a significant positive relationship between academic success, as measured by an average of 70% or higher, and acceptance by the interview board.

No model could be constructed which accurately predicted academic performance from oral interview scores. However, if the candidate was accepted into the training program by the oral interview board, academic success, as measured by an overall academic average of 70% or higher at the completion of the program, could be predicted. It is recommended that the oral interview be retained in the police selection process as an acceptable means of screening out inappropriate candidates.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Because of the sensitive nature of law enforcement, careful selec-

tion of only the most qualified candidates is of primary importance. A

need exists for a quality selection process in law enforcement that is

capable of screening out marginal and unacceptable candidates. In 1968,

the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of

Justice recognized the need for an acceptable selection process:

> Until reliable tests are devised for identifying and
> measuring the personal characteristics that contribute to
> good police work, intelligence tests, thorough background
> investigations, and personal interviews should be used by
> all departments as absolute minimum techniques to deter-
> mine the moral characteristics and the intellectual and
> emotional fitness of police candidates.[1]

The need was reiterated in 1973 when the National Advisory Council

on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals stated:

> Every police agency immediately should employ a for-
> mal process for the selection of qualified police appli-
> cants. This process should include a written test of
> mental ability or aptitude, an oral interview, a physical
> examination, a psychological examination, and an in-depth
> background investigation.[2]

Why is there a need for a reliable selection process? The National

Advisory Council on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals put it quite

succinctly when it reported:

---

[1]President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of
Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, (New York: E.P.
Dutton and Company, 1968), p. 280.

[2]National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and
Goals, Task Force Report: The Police, (Washington, D.C.: Government
Printing Office, 1973), p. 337.

> Police officers are subject to great emotional
> stress, and they are placed in positions of trust. For
> these reasons, they should be very carefully screened to
> preclude the employment of those who are emotionally un-
> stable, brutal, or who suffer from any form of emotional
> illness.[3]

Combined with the high cost of training the police officer candidate and

the potential liability factors to law enforcement management personnel,

the selection of only the best candidate is of primary importance.

The originator of the modern system of policing, Sir Robert Peel,

recognized the need for a quality selection process. In 1829, following

the enactment of the Metropolitan Police Act in London, he personnally

screened 12,000 applicants and selected only 1,000.[4]

The Selection Process

Today, virtually every police agency has some form of selection pro-

cess. The process may be simple or complex, and may range from a brief

application to a series of steps which may include written tests, poly-

graph examinations, interviews, and background investigations.

The primary purpose of the law enforcement selection process is to

acquire candidates who meet four general criteria. First, is he/she a

good candidate in general? The candidate must be stable and have not

been involved in past devient behavior which may reflect adversely on

the dr .tment. Second, is the candidate academically ready? He/she

must possess appropriate study skills obtained by successfully com-

pleting high school or a General Education Diploma. Third, is the

candidate physically and emotionally prepared for the rigors of a police

---

[3]Ibid., p. 338.

[4]Gary N. Holten and Melvin E. Jones, The System of Criminal
Justice, 2nd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1982), p. 110.

academy and police work? Finally, can the candidate function "on the street?" Will he/she be a good police officer?

Police agencies organize their selection process in terms of a "multiple hurdle approach."[5] The candidate must successfully pass each step in the process, sequentially, to avoid rejection. While the selection process may vary from agency to agency, most follow the following procedure:

1. Published vacancy notice, including minimum standards for employment

2. Written application

3. Civil Service Examination

4. Fingerprinting

5. Criminal and Traffic Records Check

6. Psychological, psychiatric, intelligence, and literacy tests

7. Physical Agility Test

8. Interview

9. Polygraph Examination

10. Background Investigation

11. Job Offer

12. Police Academy Training

13. Probationary Period

It can be noted that the process has both test and nontest methods of selection. Test methods include the civil service exam; psychological, psychiatric, intelligence, and literacy tests; physical agility tests; and the polygraph. The most widely used nontest methods of

---

[5] Wayne F. Cascio and Leslie J. Real, "The Civil Service Exam Has Been Passed: Now What?," in Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques, ed. Charles D. Speilberger, (New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1979), p. 115.

selection include educational standards, selection interviews,

background investigations, and written applications.[6] The purpose of

the test methods of selection is to evaluate the current status of the

candidate. The nontest methods, while more subjective, tend to observe

past behaviors and project them as predictors of future behavior.

In most steps of the selection process, agencies employ a "select

out" method, that is, rejecting the obviously unfit candidate who does

not meet the minimum requirements _ any given stage.[7] For example, a

person with a felony conviction would be removed from the selection pro-

cess at the "Criminal and Traffic Records Check" stage.

Once a group of candidates complete all stages of the selection pro-

cess, they are pooled on an eligibility list as acceptable for hiring.

The hiring agency may then switch to a "select in" method.[8] Since all

candidates possess the minimum requirements for employment, the most

qualified, or best of the best, will be selected in, or hired.

Unlike many other public and private agencies, the law enforcement

selection process does not terminate when the candidate is hired. The

candidate must complete from four to twenty-six weeks of formal police

academy training followed by up to one year of supervised (probationary)

on-the-job training. The candidate may be selected out for substandard

performance at any time during that period.

---

[6]Ibid., p. 116.

[7]J.M. Fabricatore, "Pre-entry Assessment and Training," in
Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques, ed. Charles
D. Speilberger, (New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1979), p.
78.

[8]Ibid.

Law Enforcement Training in Michigan

In the 1960's, the various political subdivisions in the United

States recognized a need for standardized training for law enforcement

officers. Laws were established in the States to mandate minimum train-

ing standards for entry level law enforcement officers. These laws es-

tablished control agencies such as Law Enforcement Officer's Training

Councils or Commissions on Law Enforcement Standards and Training. They

were charged with the task of establishing minimum requirements and stan-

dards of curriculum design for law enforcement officer's training pro-

grams. Michigan, as a result of Public Act 203, created the Michigan

Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council, responsible for the certifi-

cation of law enforcement officers in the State of Michigan.[9] The

responsibility of the Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training

Council is to arrange the availability of training to all law enforce-

ment agencies regardless of size and location in the State.[10]

In August of 1970, Governor Milliken approved Public Act 187 which

amended Public Act 203 to provide:

1. a minimum requirement for a basic training course at
    least 240 hours, and

2. requires the completion of the basic training curric-
    ulum for any officer employed after January 1, 1971,
    before the person is allowed to exercise the author-
    ity of a peace officer.[11]

_____

[9]Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council, Rationale
for the MLEOTC Basic Training Program, (Lansing: Department of State
Police, 1982), p. 1.

[10]Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council, Policy
and Procedures Manual, (Lansing: Department of State Police, 1976), p.
i.

[11]Ibid.

The Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council, rather than operating a central police academy, entered into contractual agreements with various police agencies, colleges, and universities to provide the minimum training curriculum for both inservice and preservice candidates.

Regional Basic Training Academy System

The Regional Basic Training Academy System was designed to provide training to law enforcement officer candidates who have been hired by an agency, and who must meet the minimum training requirements before being sworn to practice law enforcement in Michigan. The following police agencies, colleges, and universities currently provide Regional Basic Training Academy service: Delta College, Detroit Police Department, Flint Police Department, Kalamazoo College, Lansing Community College, Macomb Community College, Michigan State Police, Northern Michigan University, and Oakland Community College.

In addition, the Regional Basic Training Academies provide training to non-employed candidates, known as "buy-ins," if they pay their own expenses and possess a minimum of 60 semester hours or 90 quarter hours of college credit. The "buy-ins" must obtain employment within one year following the completion of the training or lose eligibility for certifiability.[12]

Preservice Training Programs

The Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council also recognized a need for training highly qualified and educated law enforcement certifiability over a two year period. Several state colleges and

---

[12]Ibid., p. 4.3.

officer candidates other than inservice and buy-ins. In furtherance of this objective, they provided for a system of preservice programs whereby future law enforcement officers could complete both their degree and universities entered into contracts with the Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council to provide that service. They are: Ferris State College, Grand Rapids Junior College, Grand Valley State Colleges, Kalamazoo Valley Consortium, Kellogg Community College, Kirtland Community College, Lake Superior State College, and West Shore Community College.

Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council policy requires that the preservice candidate complete the minimum curriculum requirements within a two year period and obtain employment within one year after the completion of the training.[13] The proceduers for administering the training curriculum vary from institution to institution and are classified as being two year programs, one year programs, and intense programs.

In the two year programs, the minimum curriculum is offered as part of regular academic classes over a two year period. The candidates then graduate from that college with certifiability and a degree. They then have one year to find employment or lose eligibility for certifiability.

The one year programs operate in a similar fashion except the candidates complete the minimum curriculum over a period of one year.

The intense program, operated by Grand Valley State Colleges, offers the curriculum over a fourteen week period each summer. The program also allows candidates to complete their degree requirements else-

---

[13]Ibid.

where. Similar to the one and two year programs, graduates have only one year to complete their degree and find employment or lose eligibility for certifiability. Grand Valley State Colleges has operated a preservice program since 1974.

Law Enforcement Training at Grand Valley State Colleges

Program Operation

The Grand Valley State Colleges Law Enforcement Training Program consists of the following five academic courses:

1. Special Operations and Training for Law Enforcement Officers

2. Physical Training, Defensive Tactics, First Aid, and Firearms

3. Criminal Investigations

4. Patrol and Traffic Administration and Procedures

5. Michigan Criminal Law

Students attend classes five days a week for fourteen weeks. In addition to completing the above classes satisfactorily, candidates must meet the following requirements in order to be recommended as "certifiable" as a police officer in the State of Michigan:

1. Attend 90% of academic classes

2. Attend 100% of firearms classes

3. Maintain a 70% overall academic average

4. Pass a physical fitness test consisting of the following:
   a. 100 sit-ups
   b. 50 push-ups
   c. Two minutes of leg lifts
   d. Ten minutes of forward and backward rolls
   e. Two and one-half mile run in 25 minutes or less

5. Pass a comprehensive defensive tactics examination

6. Complete a class notebook

7. Accumulate no more than ten demerit points for sub-
   standard behavior.

The above requirements for certifiability are on a pass/fail basis
and do not effect the overall academic average. Thus, it is possible to
pass all academic course work, but still be denied certifiability.

The training staff consists of a Coordinator, Assistant Coordina-
tor, instructors for each academic class, and specialty instructors as
needed.

Periodic examinations are given in each course along with specific
examinations in first aid and firearms. Test construction is at the dis-
cretion of the instructor and generally consists of a combination of
true-false, matching, multiple choice, and short answers.

Selection Process

The Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice Law Enforcement Training
Program's process of selection is typical of the "select out" procedure
previously described. The process will disqualify the unfit candidate.
The responsibility for "selecting in" rests with the potential employing
agency. The selection process consists of six parts:

1. Pre-application screening of candidates

2. Written application

3. Criminal and traffic records check

4. References

5. Medical examination

6. Oral interview

Like other law enforcement agency selection processes, Grand Valley
State Colleges candidates face the multiple hurdle approach. The candi-
date must successfully complete each step before being accepted into the

program. Criteria and requirements for each step in the process are described below:

Prescreening

Interested candidates usually contact the Program Coordinator or a faculty member in the School of Public Service. Candidates are briefly questioned to determine whether or not they meet the minimum entry requirements for preservice status established by the Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council. Those accepted are then sent an application form. Of approximately 200 inquiries received each year, 150 are selected out at this stage.

Application

The written application consists of four parts. Part one is a survey of the candidate's demographic data: personal history, school and employment records, military history, and personal references. Part two consists of releases of information, medical examination form, release of liability, and statements that the candidate meets the minimum standards for preservice certifiability as established by the Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council. Part three is a list of criteria which the candidate must pass in order to be recommended for certifiability as a police officer. These requirements include the previously described pass/fail requirements for certifiability. Part four directs the candidate to complete a fingerprint card and submit it to the Program Coordinator so that any criminal history may be obtained.

Criminal and Traffic History Check

Criminal histories, if any, are obtained from the Michigan State Police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Candidates with a previous felony conviction are selected out. Misdemeanor convictions are discussed at the time of the interview. The candidate's driving history

is also obtained from the Secretry of State. Any traffic record is also discussed with the candidate at the time of the interview.

References

The candidate supplies two reference letters, one from a law enforcement officer and one from a college level professor. Additional references listed on the written application form may also be contacted by the Program Coordinator.

Medical Examination

Candidates submit a physician's statement certifying he/she is free from any physical defects which would tend to hinder performance as a law enforcement officer.

Oral Interview

The final stage in the selection process, the oral interview is conducted by a panel of three or four criminal justice practitioners. Typical panels consist of the Program Coordinator and two or three law enforcement officers of command rank. The candidate appears before the board for approximately one hour and the board determines the candidates potential for a law enforcement career.

The interview is basically unstructured, and board members are free to pursue any line of questioning that they feel is appropriate to determine the candidate's suitability for a law enforcement career.

The oral board elicits information about the candidate that may not have been evident in the other selection stages. Often, candidates who appear satisfactory in the application stage may be determined to be unacceptable. Thus, the oral board attempts to select out socially unacceptable candidates as well as those who are not suited emotionally for a career in law enforcement.

Once the interview is completed, the panel members individually score the candidate on nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument. The criteria and analysis of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument are discussed in Chapter III.

Following the individual scoring of the candidate, the panel members discuss their opinions in reference to the candidate's acceptability. Some candidates will be accepted, others rejected for cause. Approximately 15-20% of the candidates fall into a "gray area"--not totally acceptable or totally rejectable. These are the candidates who would probably be successful in the training, but would not be marketable in law enforcement due to their background. Examples of those candidates are those who have abused alcohol or drugs in the past, have poor driving records, multiple recent misdemeanor arrests, or questionable ethical or moral values. These candidates are confronted with their potential problems and an attempt will be made to "counsel" them out of the program. The final decision to enter the program will rest with the candidate.

As a result of the selection process, a group of qualified candidates will be admitted into the summer Law Enforcement Training Program.

Introduction to Subsequent Chapters

This study will focus on the construction of a model which will predict academic average performance from oral interview performance. This model, if successful, will have implications in the selection of police officer candidates at Grand Valley State Colleges and will generalize to the law enforcement community as a whole. Chapter II will introduce the problem to be resolved in this study, present hypotheses and null hypotheses, and establish the criteria for a predictability model. The Chapter will also introduce research studies in the prediction of aca-

demic performance from oral interview scores within the law enforcement community and other disciplines.

Chapter III will overview the methodology of the study. Included in this chapter are the sample, academic average performance, oral interview performance and the criteria for scoring the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

Chapter IV presents the results of the study. It will indicate several predictability models, or lack thereof, as well as the validity of the hypotheses.

CHAPTER II: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What is the contribution that can be made to the law enforcement
community in general, and the Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice Law
Enforcement Training Program in particular, by undertaking this study?
There is a question as to whether or not the Grand Valley State Colleges
Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program's oral interview process is
a valid predictor of academic performance. Ideally, a high score in the
oral interview would predict a high score academically. If a standard-
ized, reliable, and valid predictor of academic performance from oral
interview scores can be accomplished, a saving in time and training
expense can be realized by both the applicant and the law enforcement
agency. The Grand Valley State Colleges Law Enforcement Training Pro-
gram's Oral Interview Rating Instrument, as it currently exists, is stan-
dardized, but is it reliable and valid? Can it predict academic perfor-
mance? If the oral interview is to be used as a standard in police can-
didate selection, it must be trustworthy. Sherrid summed up the current
status of the police selection process when he stated, "no police selec-
tion method has as yet been tested sufficiently to demonstrate that it
can effectively screen out undesirable applicants among police
recruits."[14]

Springbett suggested that in order to improve selection techniques,
studies must be conducted in two directions:

-----

[14]Samuel D. Sherrid, "Changing Police Values," in Police Selec-
tion and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques, ed. Charles D. Speilberger.
(New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1979), p. 168.

1. In reliability and validity to check their effec-
   tiveness, and

2. Of the measuring instruments to provide a basis for
   their systematic improvement.[15]

The oral interview is one of the most widely used methods of police

candidate selection.[16] Thus, this research will focus on the reliabil-

ity and validity of the current oral interview selection process in the

Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice Law Enforcement Training Pro-

gram's prediction of academic performance.

Previous research in the preservice setting has indicated that the

current rating of candidates predicts academic success, but the conclu-

sion reached stated that the rating instrument could be improved.[17]

In order to validate the predictive value of the Grand Valley State

Colleges Law Enforcement Training Program's Oral Interview Rating Instru-

ment, an attempt will be made to construct a model which meets three cri-

teria:

1. A statistically significant sample at the $p < .05$
   level.

2. A predictive validity of .70 or higher as reflected
   by the value of R^2.

3. Similar multiple regression patterns of subcatego-
   ries by sample and year.

Hypotheses proffered in this research are:

---

[15] B.M. Springbett, "Factors Affecting the Final Decision in the Employment Interview," Canadian Journal of Psychology 12 (1958): 13.

[16] Wayne F. Cascio and Leslie J. Real, "The Civil Service Exam Has Been Passed: Now What?," in Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques, ed. Charles D. Speilberger. (New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1979), p. 120.

[17] Nicholas Meier, "An Evaluation of the Oral Interview as a Predictor of Candidate Academic Performance in a Preservice Policy Academy," an unpublished paper.

1. That a predictability model can be constructed which

   shows a significant positive relationship between

   average academic performance and average oral inter-
   view performance.

2. That a predictability model can be constructed which
   shows a significant positive relationship between
   average academic performance and one of the nineteen
   subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instru-
   ment.

3. That a predictability model can be constructed which
   shows a significant positive relationship between
   average academic performance and two or more of the
   nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating
   Instrument.

4. That there exists a significant positive relation-
   ship between academic success, as measured by an
   average of 70% or higher, and acceptance by the
   interview board.

Conversely, null hypotheses proffered in this research are:

1. That no predictability model can be constructed
   which shows a significant positive relationship
   between average academic performance and average
   oral interview performance.

2. That no predictability model can be constructed
   which shows a significant positive relationship
   between average academic performance and one of the
   nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating
   Instrument.

3. That no predictability model can be constructed
   which shows a significant positive relationship
   between average academic performance and two or more
   of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview
   Rating Instrument.

4. That there exists no significant positive relation-
   ship between academic success, as measured by an
   average of 70% or higher, and acceptance by the
   interview board.

Review of the Literature

Several research projects have been identified which address the

use of the oral interview in the prediction of academic performance in a

police academy. Four research projects identified have used candidates

already hired by agencies and who are completing the police academy as part of their employment. One study has been identified that addressed the issue of predicting academic performance from oral interviews in a preservice setting. Other studies have been identified that address the prediction of academic performance from oral interviews in a non-law enforcement setting.

A study conducted by DuBois and Watson in 1948 on 129 police recruits in the St. Louis, Missouri, Police Academy concluded that there was no significant correlation between scores of recruits on the oral interview and their performance in the police academy.[18] Bertram, in a 1975 study of 51 patrolmen recruits, found, "The oral interview, although demonstrating some minimal correlation with performance, failed to add significantly to any of the criterion measures in the study."[19] Tiemann evaluated effectiveness of the oral interview in police academy academic performance in Colorado. Even though the oral interview did not predict academy scores, it may have effectively eliminated poor applicants. Ideally, Tiemann stated, all candidates, good and bad, should be accepted, but the infeasibility of that procedure was recognized.[20] Hess, in a 1971 study of 122 Cincinnati patrolmen, found that the oral

---

[18] P.H. DuBois and R. K. Watson, "The Selection of Patrolmen," Journal of Applied Psychology 34 (1950): 91.

[19] Francis David Bertram, "The Prediction of Police Academy Performance from Police Recruit Screening Measures" (Ph.D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1975), p. 133.

[20] H.A. Tiemann, Jr., Patrol Selection Research-Final Report (Rockville, Maryland: National Criminal Justice Reference Service, [1972]), p. 1.

interview was not related to police academy score.[21] In fact, Hess

noted, the oral interview "failed completely as a predictor vari-

able."[22] In a 1981 study of preservice law enforcement training pro-

gram candidates, a Pearson Correlation of .3626 was reported between aca-

demic performance and oral interview performance. Significance was at

the p>.01 level. Based on the results, the author indicated a predict-

ability model might be constructed.[23]

In research conducted using students in the Graduate Program of

Social Work at Boston University, the interview alone did not predict

academic performance. However, when the interview was combined with a

standardized rating scale, it significantly increased the rater's abil-

ity to determine the potentially successful candidate from the unsuccess-

ful one.[24] Another study conducted on students admitted to the

Master's rogram in Applied Psychology at Cleveland State University

found a significant correlation between the oral interview and Graduate

School grade point average.[25]

---

[21]Lee R. Hess, "Police Entry Tests and Their Predictability of
Score in Police Academy and Subsequent Job Performance" (Ph.D. disserta-
tion, Marquette University, 1972), p. 50.

[22]Ibid. p. 74.

[23]Meier, p. 15.

[24]Merle Sherman, "The Selection of Students at a Graduate School
of Social Work: A Study of the Incremental Value of a Pre-admission
Interview, and the Use of Undergraduate G.P.A. and M.A.T. in Identifying
the Successful and Unsuccessful Student" (Ph.D. dissertation Brandeis
University 1968), p. 20.

[25]Louise Federici and James Schuerger, "Prediction of Success in
an Applied M. A. Psychological Program," Education and Psychological
Measurement 34 (Winter 1974): 950.

The interview was indicated to be a significant predictor of grade

point average in a high school setting. The students were rated on

their response to fourteen questions. There was a significant correla-

tion between interview rating score and grade point average in the last

year of study.[26] Gough and McCormack conducted a study in 1967 of 163

students who had applied for a foreign study program at the University

of California at Berkley. Their findings indicated that the two best

predictors of overseas academic performance were the interview and pre-

program grade point average.[27]

In a study of selective admissions processes for students in the

Health Education Program at Ohio State University, the interview alone

was not a significant predictor of academic performance. However, when

the interview scores were combined with the applicant's previous grade

point average, there was a significant correlation for prediction.[28]

Sharma and Warrier, in research conducted on 41 students admitted to an

all India Institute of Management, reported there was no relationship

between the oral interview and academic performance.[29]

Can the use of the current Oral Interview Rating Instrument in the

selection of candidates for the Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice

[26] J.J. Asher, D. Wilson, and R. Kirlin, "Interview as a Predictor of High School Grades," Psychological Reports 30 (1972): 588.

[27] Harrison G. Gough and William A. McCormack, An Exploratory Evaluation of Education Abroad (Berkley: University of California, [1967]), p. 64.

[28] Phil Heit, Geraldine Johnson, Linda B. Meeks, and Cindy Paxton, "A Selective Admissions Process as a Predictor of Academic Success in Health Education," Journal of School Health 48 (1978): 149.

[29] Baldev R. Sharma and S.K. Warrier, "Selection of Future Managers: Relevance of Admission Procedures," Management and Labour Studies 3 (1977): 44.

Law Enforcement Training Program's Police Academy accurately predict academic performance? Previous research produces conflicting answers. The goal of this study will focus on the use of a specific oral interview rating instrument to predict academic performance in a Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program. If the Oral Interview Rating Instrument is validated, it will improve candidate selection at Grand Valley State Colleges and have general implications for improved selection standards in the law enforcement community.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample utilized in this study consisted of 164 candidates accepted into the Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program in the years 1978 through 1982. Of the 164 candidates, five academic reports were missing. The missing candidates were all academically successful. The three missing candidates in 1981 suffered injuries and no academic report was completed since their certifiability was pending. One candidate in 1982 withdrew from the certifiability program but did successfully pass the academic courses. The file of the missing candidate in 1978 could not be located.

Of the 159 candidates in the sample, 139 were male and 20 were female. Six were black and one was Hispanic. All candidates had completed at least 45 hours of college credit prior to entry into the program.

Table 3.1 reflects an analysis of candidates entering by year, candidates graduating, candidates failing, and missing cases.

TABLE 3.1

ANALYSIS OF CANDIDATES ENTERING,
GRADUATING, FAILING, AND MISSING CASES BY YEAR

Year	Entering	Graduating	Failing	Missing
1978	38	36	1	1
1979	37	37	0	0
1980	35	35	0	0
1981	32	29	0	3
1982	22	21	0	1
Total	164	158	1	5

Academic Average Performance

Average academic performance for each candidate in this study was

obtained from the Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council

Student Evaluation, Form TC-12, which was completed by the Program Coor-

dinator at the end of the training program. Form TC-12 appears in

Figure 3.1. The average academic score was determined using the follow-

ing formula:

Academic Average (five classes)	90%
Weekly quizzes	5%
Class notebook	5%
Total	100%

Academic averages in each academic class was computed by averaging

the three to five periodic examinations given by the individual instruc-

tors. The total average for all five classes was then determined and

that score accounted for 90% of the total academic average.

Five percent of the total academic average was determined by the

candidate's performance on eleven to thirteen weekly quizzes. These

Figure 3.1 Form TC-12

TC-12 (Rev. 7-80)

Original — MLEOTC
Copy — Coordinator
Copy — Trainee Agency

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council
7426 North Canal Road, Lansing, Michigan 48913

Trainee	School Code GVSC 883
Law Enforcement Agency Preservice	Dates 5/17/83 through 8/17/83

WRITTEN EXAMINATION	GRADE (%)
Special Operations and Training	
Criminal Investigations II	
Patrol and Traffic Administration	
Michigan Criminal Law	
Firearms, First Aid, Physical Training, Def. Tac.	
Self Tests	
Notebook	
Average Score (90% Examinations) (5% Notebook; 5%Self Tests)	
First Aid Examination	
Firearms Examination	

Academic Class Ranking _____ out of _____

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Week	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat	Hours Absent
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							

TOTAL HOURS ABSENT ....

FIREARMS:

Scored _____ out of 250 possible points on the MLEOTC Basic Revolver Course.

☐ Did not qualify   ☐ 215 points—sharpshooter

☐ 175 points—qualified   ☐ 232 points—expert

☐ 187 points—marksman   ☐ 245 points—distinguished expert

Manufacturer's Name _____Smith and Wesson_____

Model Name or Number _____Model 10_____

Calibre _____.38 Special_____

Firearms Class Ranking _____ out of _____

GENERAL REMARKS:

REQUIREMENTS FOR PHYSICAL TRAINING AND DEFENSIVE TACTICS WERE MET:

☐ Yes   ☐ No (explanation required)

THE ABOVE NAMED TRAINEE IS CERTIFIED AS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING THE BASIC TRAINING COURSE OF THE MICHIGAN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TRAINING COUNCIL.

_____   _____
Date   Coordinator

quizzes were prepared each week by a different "squad" of class members and then taken by the entire class.

The final five percent of the academic average was determined by the completion of two notebooks. One notebook consisted of the handout material given the candidate over the course of the program. The second was a compilation of class notes. Each night, the candidate would re-draft his/her rough class notes into a final printed or typewritten form. The notebooks were evaluated by the Program Coordinator monthly.

Oral Interview Rating Instrument

Interview scores were tabulated as a result of scoring nineteen sub-categories on the Oral Interview Rating Instrument (Figure 3.2). The highest possible score is 100 points. The Oral Interview Rating Instrument was developed by Dr. Neil C. Chamelin of the University of Georgia.[30] It was adopted for use at Grand Valley State Colleges Pre-service Law Enforcement Training Program in 1978.

The Instrument has never been empirically tested for validity even though it was used extensively by Florida police agencies in the late 1960's and early 1970's.[31] According to Dr. Chamelin, the nineteen subcategories and corresponding point values were,"based upon the best thinking and experience of the people involved."[32] He stated further that, "to avoid potential challenges stemming from the use of this type of form, I would think a validation study would be appropriate. . ."[33]

---

[30] Information in a letter to the author from Dr. Neil C. Chamelin, September 9, 1982.

[31] Information in a letter to the author from Dr. Neil C. Chamelin, October 27, 1982.

[32] Information in a letter to the author from Dr. Neil C. Chamelin, September 9, 1982.

[33] Ibid.

GRAND VALLEY STATE COLLEGES
PRE-SERVICE LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM
ORAL INTERVIEW RATING FORM

NAME OF APPLICANT:_____

DATE OF INTERVIEW_____ TIME OF INTERVIEW_____

TOTAL POINTS_____ EXAMINER'S SIGNATURE_____

Instructions: Please rate each of the listed qualities of the appli-
cant on each of the following bases: Column 1-POOR; Column 2-BELOW
AVERAGE; Column 3-AVERAGE; Column 4-ABOVE AVERAGE; Column 5-OUTSTAND-
ING. Circle the applicable number and write it on the corresponding
line in the add column. Add the scores to arrive at an overall total.
Maximum is 100 points. Please sign the form.

	FACTORS	COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3	COLUMN 4	COLUMN 5
1.	Appearance/Demeanor.........0		1	2	3	4
2.	Ability to Communicate (Voice,Speech,Gestures).....0		1	2	3	4
3.	Response Under Pressure.....0		1	3	4	6
4.	Willingness to Make Decisions...................0		1	3	4	6
5.	Composure...................0		1	2	3	4
6.	Honesty in Answering Questions...................0		1	2	3	4
7.	Ability to Inspire Con- fidence and Respect.........0		2	4	6	8
8.	Self-Confidence.............0		1	2	3	4
9.	Judgement...................0		2	4	6	8
10.	Ability to Meet and Deal WithPeople..................0		1	3	4	6
11.	Attitude Toward Minority Groups......................0		1	2	3	4
12.	Enthusiasm..................0		1	2	3	4
13.	Maturity....................0		1	3	4	6
14.	Professional Attitude.......0		2	4	6	8
15.	Initiative..................0		1	3	4	6
16.	Willingness to Accept Responsibility..............0		2	4	6	8
17.	Attitude Toward Department Personnel...................0		0	1	2	2
18.	Preparation for Position....0		1	2	3	4
19.	General Fitness for Position....................0		1	2	3	4
	TOTALS	____	____	____	____	____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Figure 3.2 Oral Interview Rating Form

It should be noted that certain subcategories such as ability to meet and deal with people, judgement, maturity, and willingness to accept responsibility, carry higher values than other subcategories. These are characteristics that should be developed and refined in the candidate prior to entry into the training program. Low point subcategories, such as attitude toward department personnel, can be addressed and improved during the training process.

Screening board members rate the candidate by column, from poor (Column 1) through outstanding (Column 5). Scores are totaled by column, and then columns combined for an overall score.

Criterion For Scoring Oral Interview

Criterion for determining performance in each subcategory was never formally established by Dr. Chamelin. He stated, "Interviews were basically unstructured . . . however, the board ended up following a fairly established pattern with much flexibility allowed for each rater to pursue any area desired by question."[34] Grand Valley State Colleges oral interview boards also have followed a general pattern. Through the use of criteria questionnaires completed by board members, and observation of the interviews, general criteria for each of the nineteen subcategories has been established.

IS 01: Appearance and Demeanor

The candidate should be neatly dressed, tidy, hair combed, cleanly shaven, and free of body odor. He/she should stand erect and carry him/herself in such a manner so as to make an impression on the board member and others. Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

---

[34] Information in a letter to the author from Dr. Neil C. Chamelin, October 27, 1982.

IS 02: Ability to Communicate

Can the candidate express him/herself well? Are thought patterns clear and well organized? Are there physical or cultural speech patterns that inhibit clear, concise speech? Can the candidate receive questions, formulate a response, and communicate an answer adequately. Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

IS 03: Response Under Pressure

Pressure is increased by a board member taking a position that is contrary to a statement the candidate has made. This, coupled with the existing stress of the interview board, should assist in determining how comfortable the candidate is. Does the candidate waiver in his/her decision making or become flustered by the interview board? Maximum score in this subcategory is six points.

IS 04: Willingness to Make Decisions

Does the candidate make decisions that are morally and ethically correct and maintain that decision even if a board member counters the decision with criticism? Maximum score in this subcategory is six points.

IS 05: Composure

The candidate is observed under situations of stress. Is the candidate easily flustered or does he/she remain calm and unwaivering in his/her responses? Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

IS 06: Honesty in Answering Questions

Does the candidate give the interview board answers he/she feels the board wants to hear, or are the answers his/her true feelings. This can be determined by the subtle signs of dishonesty exhibited by the candidate such as looking away, a change in facial expression or skin

color, dry mouth, or fidgeting. Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

IS 07: Ability to Inspire Confidence and Respect

This is one of the last items to be determined. The rater asks him/herself, "If I were a citizen with a complaint, would I respect and be confident with this person and the answers to my problem." Maximum score in this subcategory is eight points.

IS 08: Self Confidence

Is the candidate assured of him/herself? What makes the candidate think that he/she will be a good police officer? Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

IS 09: Judgement

Does the candidate weigh all the possibilities and implications before making a decision? Will he/she bend to pressure and make unsound decisions? What would they do in enforcing borderline criminal or civil violations? Maximum score in this subcategory is eight points.

IS 10: Ability to Meet and Deal with People

What is the overall impact of the candidate's interaction with the board? Is he/she assertive without being overly aggressive? Are his/her mannerisms, confidence, sincerity, honesty, mores, and standards of conduct acceptable? Maximum score in this subcategory is six points.

IS 11: Attitude Toward Minority Groups

Has the candidate had any past conflicts with minority group members? Could he/she work with a minority or a member of the opposite sex? Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

IS 12: Enthusiasm

Why did the candidate choose a career in law enforcement? Does he/she approach and interact with the board in a positive manner? Is

the candidate dedicated to a career in law enforcement or is this just a temporary goal? Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

IS 13: Maturity

Is the candidate "well rounded" in his/her life experiences? Does the candidate respond in a logical and rational manner, based on standards of prudence, yet correct in spite of public/board opinion? Has he/she experienced personal growth from past life experiences. Maximum score in this subcategory is six points.

IS 14: Professional Attitude

Does the candidate have a realistic understanding of his/her role in the law enforcement profession? Can he/she maintain high ethical, moral, and value systems in spite of the temptations that face the police officer? Has the candidate had any contact with police officers in the past such as traffic stops or calls for service? Was that contact positive or negative? What would the candidate have done differently in those contact situations? Maximum score in this subcategory is eight points.

IS 15: Initiative

How does the candidate indicate a desire for a law enforcement career? For non-law enforcement college students, has he/she oriented him/herself to the fundamentals of the law enforcement profession independently? Have past achievements come easily or were they earned through diligence and hard work? Has funding been from parents or has the candidate worked to support him/herself? Maximum score in this subcategory is six points.

IS 16: Willingness to Accept Responsibility

The candidate is given a hypothetical situation in which a decision must be made (when to arrest, when to use force). The candidate is then

confronted by a board member. Often an error is pointed out. Does the candidate accept his/her error and the potential discipline that may result? Has the candidate made mistakes in the past, was he/she disciplined, and did he/she accept the punishment? Maximum score in this subcategory is eight points.

IS 17: Attitude Toward Department Personnel

Will the candidate work to promote more honest and worthy values in law enforcement, or will he/she have misplaced loyalty? Will he/she support those in the department who are right in the face of opposition by politicians and pressure groups? Maximum score in this subcategory is two points.

IS 18: Preparation for Position

When did the candidate first decide to become a law enforcement officer? Has he/she pursued a lifestyle consistent with that career objective? Has the candidate prepared academically by taking criminal justice courses? Has the candidate taken the time to accompany a police officer on routine patrol? Is he/she well oriented to the requirements and responsibilities of the position? Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

IS 19: General Fitness for Position

This is a summation of all criteria necessary for a career in law enforcement. This includes both physical and mental stability and ability to function effectively as a police officer. Maximum score in this subcategory is four points.

Analysis of the Data

Data for this research were obtained from candidate files of the Law Enforcement Training Program. Academic average and oral interview subcategory average scores were entered on a master data sheet (Figure 3.3). To maintain confidentiality, candidates were identified by year and number. Where several oral interview rating forms existed, the average score on each subcategory was entered.

Raw data were entered into the Grand Valley State Colleges Honeywell computer. An analysis of the data was then conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. A Pearson Rank Correlation was utilized in analyzing average academic score to total average interview score by sample and year. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine subcategory ranking and weighting in developing a predictability model.

FIGURE 3.3

MASTER DATA SHEET

Student I.D. _____   _____
                    YEAR   NUMBER

Academic Average Score _____
Oral Board Average
     1. Appearance/Demeanor . . . . _____

     2. Ability to Communicate. . . . . _____

     3. Response Under Pressure . . . . _____

     4. Willingness to Make Decisions . . . . . . _____

     5. Composure . . . . _____

     6. Honesty in Answering Questions. . . . . . _____

     7. Ability to Inspire Confidence and Respect _____

     8. Self-Confidence . . . . _____

     9. Judgement . . . . _____

    10. Ability to Meet and Deal With People. . . _____

    11. Attitude Toward Minority Groups . . . . . _____

    12. Enthusiasm. . . . . _____

    13. Maturity. . . . . _____

    14. Professional Attitude . . . . _____

    15. Initiative. . . . . _____

    16. Willingness to Accept Responsibility. . . _____

    17. Attitude Toward Department Personnel. . . _____

    18. Preparation for Position. . . . . _____

    19. General Fitness for Position. . . . . _____

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Analysis of Academic Averages

Class academic averages ranged from a high of 90.773 to a low of

77.374. Candidate academic averages ranged from a high of 95.45 to a

low of 63.90. Academic average for the entire sample was 84.778. A sum-

mary of academic average and score ranges by sample and year is

reflected in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1

ACADEMIC AVERAGE BY SAMPLE AND YEAR

Sample/Year	Academic Average	High	Low
Sample	84.778	95.45	63.90
1978	77.374	86.00	63.90
1979	81.871	89.60	74.20
1980	87.664	93.92	81.99
1981	90.773	95.45	80.42
1982	90.272	94.07	80.92

Analysis of Oral Interview Score Averages

Class interview score averages ranged from a high of 63.89 to a low

of 55.49. Candidate interview scores ranged from a high of 92.30 to a

low of 36.70. Average interview score for the sample was 60.10. A sum-

mary of average interview scores and score ranges appears in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2

INTERVIEW AVERAGE BY SAMPLE AND YEAR

Sample/Year	Interview Average	High	Low
Sample	60.10	92.30	36.70
1978	55.49	88.00	41.00
1979	58.80	85.00	36.70
1980	62.56	92.30	42.00
1981	63.98	89.00	46.00
1982	61.05	79.00	46.00

Analysis of Subcategory Averages

An analysis of subcategory averages by sample and year is reflected in Table 4.3. In addition, maximum score by subcategory is indicated.

TABLE 4.3

SUBCATEGORY AVERAGE BY SAMPLE AND YEAR

Subcategory	Sample	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	Maximum Score
01	2.78	2.23	2.65	3.21	2.96	3.02	4
02	2.61	2.27	2.61	2.66	2.87	2.79	4
03	3.34	3.06	3.16	3.49	3.55	3.57	6
04	3.34	2.99	3.34	3.62	3.44	3.35	6
05	2.55	2.56	2.52	2.70	2.70	2.70	4
06	2.89	2.46	2.98	3.12	2.98	2.99	4
07	4.21	3.95	4.05	4.32	4.67	4.17	8
08	2.50	2.37	2.41	2.54	2.65	2.62	4
09	4.46	4.16	4.28	4.81	4.72	4.34	8
10	3.43	3.27	3.35	3.57	3.64	3.32	6
11	2.45	2.26	2.37	2.52	2.72	2.45	4
12	2.58	2.43	2.62	2.57	2.78	2.51	4
13	3.50	3.42	3.32	3.58	3.77	2.48	6
14	4.65	4.24	4.59	4.71	5.18	4.63	8
15	3.30	3.15	3.12	3.49	3.38	3.43	6
16	4.61	4.23	4.58	4.82	4.68	4.80	8
17	1.62	1.68	1.65	1.45	1.73	1.60	2
18	2.67	2.54	2.69	2.71	2.74	2.70	4
19	2.67	2.54	2.52	2.69	2.74	2.60	4

Average Academic Performance versus Oral Interview Performance

Hypothesis 1 proffered that a predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and average oral interview performance. A Pearson Rank Correlation analyzing the relationship of average interview scores to average academic scores was conducted. The results are reflected in Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.4

PEARSON RANK CORRELATION OF
ACADEMIC AVERAGE TO TOTAL INTERVIEW SCORE
BY SAMPLE AND YEAR

Sample/Year	Pearson Rank Correlation	Significance
Sample	.3090	$p < .01$
1978	-.0103	N.S.
1979	.0973	N.S.
1980	.3326	$p < .01$
1981	.4729	$p < .01$
1982	-.3597	$p < .01$

Pearson Rank Correlations were statistically significant for the sample and years 1980, 1981, and 1982. 1982 reflected a negative correlation. 1978 and 1979 samples were not statistically significant.

Since the Pearson Rank Correlation was positive and significant for the sample, a prediction model was constructed using multiple regression analysis. The results are reflected in Table 4.5.

TABLE 4.5

CORRELATION OF ACADEMIC AVERAGE TO
TOTAL INTERVIEW-SCORE

Subcategory	Model Constant (Intercept)	Slope	R^2	Significance
Sample	73.02466	.19556	.09551	p<.01
1978	*	*	*	*
1979	78.82378	.04827	.00946	N.S.
1980	83.23785	.07975	.11064	N.S.
1981	78.79362	.18721	.22365	p<.01
1982	100.4802	-.35968	.12937	N.S.

*Insignificant for Correlation

Correlations were statistically significant for the sample and year 1981. 1979, 1980, and 1982 samples were not statistically significant. The 1978 sample was insignificant for correlation. R^2 ranged from .00946 (1979) to .22365 (1981). Thus R^2 values failed to meet the criteria for predictive validity and hypothesis 1 is rejected in favor of the null.

Average Academic Performance versus Single Subcategory Performance

The second hypothesis proffered that a predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and one of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument. Table 4.6 reflects the most accurate single subcategory predictor by sample and year.

TABLE 4.6

MOST PREDICTIVE SUBCATEGORY BY SAMPLE AND YEAR

Sample/Year	Most Predictive Subcategory	Model Constant (Intercept)	Slope	R^2	Significance
Sample	IS 06	71.80996	4.486654	.14052	$p<.01$
1978	IS 12	83.32537	-2.458209	.10223	N.S.
1979	IS 07	75.28208	1.575539	.13200	$p<.05$
1980	IS 14	83.26849	.9324000	.17191	$p<.05$
1981	IS 16	79.14378	2.439684	.30580	$p<.01$
1982	IS 08	99.20899	-3.409041	.19911	$p<.05$

Findings indicated statistical significance for the sample and all years except 1978. R^2 ranged from .10223 to .30580. R^2 for the sample was .14052, failing to meet the criteria for predictive validity. Results also indicated that there was no consistency in the most predictive subcategory by sample or individual year. Hypothesis 2 failed to meet the necessary criteria and is rejected in favor of the null.

Academic Average Performance versus Multiple Subcategory Performance

The third hypothesis proffered that a predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and two or more of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument. Table 4.7 summarizes the predictability model that was constructed for the sample indicating interview subcategory predictors from highest to lowest. Subcategory IS 19 could not be correlated due to insufficient statistical tolerance. Maximum R^2 was .28520.

TABLE 4.7

PREDICTABILITY MODEL FOR SAMPLE

| Subcategory | Model | | R^2 | Significance |
	Constant (Intercept)	Slope		
IS 06		2.751801	.14052	p<.01
IS 01		1.670344	.17718	p<.01
IS 17		-2.669366	.19824	p<.01
IS 03		1.497315	.21929	p<.01
IS 10		-1.011570	.23100	p<.01
IS 18		1.190545	.24288	p<.01
IS 11		2.023880	.25143	p<.01
IS 12		-2.021721	.26239	p<.01
IS 02		1.215533	.26603	p<.01
IS 08		-1.303631	.26941	p<.01
IS 07		.9171265	.27202	p<.01
IS 09		-.6351824	.27587	p<.01
IS 15		-.8279749	.27874	p<.01
IS 14		.5887777	.28178	p<.01
IS 13		-.5365050	.28339	p<.01
IS 05		.7349424	.28461	p<.01
IS 04		.2796142	.28506	p<.01
IS 16	70.72863	-.1200231	.28520	p<.01
IS 19	*	*	*	*

*Tolerance level insufficient for computation

Tables 4.8 through 4.12 reflect the results of the multiple regression analysis for individual years. The highest R^2 obtained while still maintaining a statistically significant model was 1981 with an $R^2 = .68292$.

TABLE 4.8

PREDICTABILITY MODEL FOR 1978

Subcategory	Model Constant (Intercept)	Slope	R^2	Significance
IS 12		−1.824049	.10223	$p < .05$
IS 06		7.903475	.26529	$p < .01$
IS 05		−3.965327	.34349	$p < .01$
IS 08		3.984743	.39632	$p < .01$
IS 18		2.651186	.43352	$p < .01$
IS 11		−3.041347	.47795	$p < .01$
IS 04		−1.887188	.51755	$p < .01$
IS 10		−2.827928	.55086	$p < .01$
IS 16		−1.622931	.58661	$p < .01$
IS 13		1.067079	.60597	$p < .01$
IS 17		1.792350	.62458	$p < .01$
IS 03		−1.109551	.63225	$p < .01$
IS 15		−1.119298	.64026	$p < .01$
IS 07		.7335699	.65023	$p < .01$
IS 14		− .3993221	.65145	$p < .05$
IS 19		.7235865	.65224	$p < .05$
IS 09		.2848444	.65295	$p < .05$
IS 02		− .4164371	.65433	$p < .05$
IS 01	81.28681	− .2531066	.65458	N.S.

TABLE 4.9

PREDICTABILITY MODEL FOR 1979

Subcategory	Model Constant (Intercept)	Slope	R^2	Significance
IS 07		3.315710	.13200	p<.05
IS 15		- .9011767	.26256	p<.01
IS 10		-3.080162	.31977	p<.01
IS 12		3.011899	.34204	p<.01
IS 19		-2.778759	.39002	p<.01
IS 04		-2.903469	.43123	p<.01
IS 18		.1352454	.45121	p<.01
IS 02		-3.091720	.46535	p<.01
IS 06		-2.9674115	.47420	p<.05
IS 13		1.214813	.48267	p<.05
IS 05		3.198414	.49116	p<.05
IS 09		1.853560	.50633	N.S.
IS 16		1.364365	.51261	N.S.
IS 03		-1.514070	.52483	N.S.
IS 14		- .6243657	.53307	N.S.
IS 11		- .6478191	.53606	N.S.
IS 17		-1.064902	.53877	N.S.
IS 01	92.49065	- .4205239	.54033	N.S.
IS 08	*	*	*	*

*Tolerance level insufficient for computation

TABLE 4.10

PREDICTABILITY MODEL FOR 1980

Subcategory	Model Constant (Intercept)	Slope	R^2	Significance
IS 14		.1212837	.17191	$p<.05$
IS 17		-2.620915	.26977	$p<.05$
IS 01		- .9450077	.30449	$p<.05$
IS 18		.3487593	.34786	$p<.05$
IS 05		.4180001	.37032	$p<.05$
IS 19		-1.404743	.39770	$p<.05$
IS 13		.7164016	.40995	$p<.05$
IS 11		-2.727954	.42323	$p<.05$
IS 06		1.813258	.44125	N.S.
IS 08		1.254258	.44822	N.S.
IS 10		-1.009009	.45521	N.S.
IS 15		- .7176431	.46121	N.S.
IS 04		.8219982	.46722	N.S.
IS 02		-1.140598	.46969	N.S.
IS 12		1.417120	.47381	N.S.
IS 03		.7878217	.47851	N.S.
IS 09		.1677525	.48004	N.S.
IS 16	89.29876	.1561039	.48051	N.S.
IS 07	*	*	*	*

*Tolerance level insufficient for further computation.

TABLE 4.11

PREDICTABILITY MODEL FOR 1981

Subcategory	Model Constant (Intercept)	Slope	R^2	Significance
IS 16		1.358986	.30580	p<.01
IS 11		-3.273639	.41224	p<.01
IS 05		-1.171308	.52702	p<.01
IS 18		1.782641	.55368	p<.01
IS 03		-3.222651	.57711	p<.01
IS 04		.4294480	.61164	p<.01
IS 13		.8645170	.63385	p<.01
IS 12		.9565574	.65085	p<.01
IS 06		4.388273	.65987	p<.01
IS 17		-5.037466	.66679	p<.01
IS 19		-3.427384	.67017	p<.01
IS 01		-1.685611	.67480	p<.05
IS 09		1.591920	.67980	p<.05
IS 08		3.013830	.68292	p<.05
IS 15		- .7517417	.68798	N.S.
IS 10		.8977413	.69269	N.S.
IS 07		.8396810	.69433	N.S.
IS 14		1.141416	.79601	N.S.
IS 02	82.91262	-1.193403	.69839	N.S.

TABLE 4.12

PREDICTABILITY MODEL FOR 1982

Subcategory	Model Constant (Intercept)	Slope	R^2	Significance
IS 08		-3.176148	.19911	p<.05
IS 04		7.767166	.25424	N.S.
IS 03		10.48278	.30303	N.S.
IS 10		-5.120692	.33581	N.S.
IS 16		20.16624	.36804	N.S.
IS 18		-5.323960	.40306	N.S.
IS 17		-6.803396	.43369	N.S.
IS 05		-6.492553	.47116	N.S.
IS 15		-12.98146	.48943	N.S.
IS 14		4.494793	.50730	N.S.
IS 11		26.74959	.52919	N.S.
IS 01		20.57057	.54507	N.S.
IS 12		-3.872341	.61416	N.S.
IS 07		-18.04121	.63585	N.S.
IS 13		-10.74792	.71739	N.S.
IS 19		12.12791	.87552	N.S.
IS 09	-3.831828	-2.549663	.88723	N.S.
IS 02	*	*	*	*
IS 06	*	*	*	*

*Tolerance level insufficient for further computation.

Table 4.13 is a comparison of the hierarchial predictive validity of sub-categories by sample and individual year. It is noted in this table that the ranking of predictor subcategories by sample and year is inconsistent, which indicates that no subcategories are accurate predictors of academic performance. Thus, hypothesis three is rejected in favor of the null.

TABLE 4.13

COMPARISON OF PREDICTIVE SUBCATEGORIES
BY SAMPLE AND YEAR

Sample	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
IS 06	IS 12	IS 07	IS 14	IS 16	IS 08
IS 01	IS 06	IS 15	IS 17	IS 11	IS 04#
IS 17	IS 05	IS 10	IS 01	IS 05	IS 03#
IS 03	IS 08	IS 12	IS 18	IS 18	IS 10#
IS 10	IS 18	IS 19	IS 05	IS 03	IS 16#
IS 18	IS 11	IS 04	IS 19	IS 04	IS 18#
IS 11	IS 04	IS 18	IS 13	IS 13	IS 17#
IS 12	IS 10	IS 02	IS 11	IS 12	IS 05#
IS 02	IS 16	IS 06	IS 06#	IS 06	IS 15#
IS 08	IS 13	IS 13	IS 08#	IS 17	IS 14#
IS 07	IS 17	IS 05	IS 10#	IS 19	IS 11#
IS 09	IS 03	IS 09	IS 15#	IS 01	IS 01#
IS 15	IS 15	IS 16	IS 04#	IS 09	IS 12#
IS 14	IS 07	IS 03	IS 02#	IS 08	IS 07#
IS 13	IS 14	IS 14	IS 12#	IS 15#	IS 13#
IS 05	IS 19	IS 11	IS 03#	IS 10#	IS 19#
IS 04	IS 09	IS 17	IS 09#	IS 07#	IS 09#
IS 16	IS 02	IS 01	IS 16#	IS 14#	IS 02*#
IS 19	IS 01	IS 08	IS 07*#	IS 02#	IS 06*#

*Tolerance level insufficient for further computation.

#Not significant at the p<.05 level.

Academic Success versus Acceptance by Interview Board

The final hypothesis proffered is that there exists a significant positive relationship between academic success, as measured by an academic average of 70% or higher, and acceptance by the interview board. Table 4.13 shows the correlation between academic success and oral board acceptance.

TABLE 4.14

CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC SUCCESS
AND ORAL BOARD ACCEPTANCE

Sample/Year	% Success
Sample	99.37%
1978	92.30%
1979	100.00%
1980	100.00%
1981	100.00%
1982	100.00%

Results of this analysis show that successful performance in the oral interview is an accurate predictor of academic success. Of the 159 candidates accepted, only one failed academically. Thus, the fourth hypothesis is accepted and the null is rejected.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Because law enforcement is a sensitive occupation and law enforce-
ment officers are subject to multiple corrupting influences, the need
for a quality predictive selection process has been recognized by numer-
ous Presidential and governmental commissions including, but not limited
to, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of
Justice and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Stan-
dards and Goals.

The primary purpose of the police selection process in general, and
the oral interview at Grand Valley State Colleges in particular, is to
determine the candidate's suitability as a law enforcement officer and
to predict with some degree of certainty successful performance in the
police academy and later on the street. The Grand Valley State Colleges
Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program uses a "select-out" selec-
tion process, rejecting candidates who are unfit for a law enforcement
career. Hiring agencies will "select-in" the most suitable candidates
at the employment stage of the selection process.

The selection process and subsequent academy training of police
officers is a relatively recent phenomenon. Minimum entry requirements
and training standards were generally established on an individual state
wide basis in the 1960's and early 1970's. Michigan enacted Public Act
203 and Public Act 187 in 1965 and 1970 respectively. The Michigan laws
required minimum standards for entry and subsequent minimum standards of
training for law enforcement officers hired after 1971. A unique fea-

ture of the Michigan law is that it allows college student law enforce-
ment candidates, known as preservice students, to obtain the minimum aca-
demy training for certifiability prior to being hired by a law enforce-
ment agency. Grand Valley State Colleges entered into contract with the
Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council and has operated a
preservice program since 1974.

The Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice Law Enforcement Training
Program selects candidates who meet the minimum requirements for employ-
ment as law enforcement officers as established by the Michigan Law
Enforcement Officers Training Council. Since 1978, Grand Valley State
Colleges Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program has used an oral
interview board to assist in the selection of candidates. The value of
the oral interview in prediction of academic performance at Grand Valley
State Colleges has never been validated.

The preceding chapters have focused on the construction of a model
that would accurately predict academic performance from oral interview
scores. Previous research in the prediction of academic performance
from oral interview scores has produced conflicting results. The pur-
pose of this study was to aid the Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice
Law Enforcement Training Program's selection process and if it had been
successful, would have had significant implications for the selection of
police officers and the law enforcement community.

Four hypotheses proffered in this study were:

1. That a predictability model can be constructed which
   shows a significant positive relationship between aver-
   age academic performance and average oral interview per-
   formance.

2. That a predictability model can be constructed which
   shows a significant positive relationship between aver-
   age academic performance and one of the nineteen subcate-
   gories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

3. That a predictability model can be constructed which shows a signifizant positive relationship between average academic performance and two or more of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

4. That there exists a significant positive relationship between academic success, as measured by an average of 70% or higher, and acceptance by the interview board.

Conversely, null hypotheses proffered in this study were:

1. That no predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and average oral interview performance.

2. That no predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and one of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

3. That no predictability model can be constructed which shows a significant positive relationship between average academic performance and two or more of the nineteen subcategories of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

4. That there exists no significant positive relationship between academic success, as measured by an average of 70% or higher, and acceptance by the interview board.

In order to be accepted, an hypothesis must meet the following criteria:

1. A statistically significant sample at the $p < .05$ level.

2. A predictive validity of .70 or higher as reflected by the value of R^2.

3. Similar multiple regression patterns of subcategories by sample and year.

The sample consisted of 159 candidates entering the Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice Law Enforcement Training Program in the years 1978 through 1982. Academic averages in the training program were obtained from the Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council Form TC-12. Oral interview performance scores were obtained from the Oral Interview Rating Instrument completed on each candidate by the

Grand Valley State Colleges Preservice Law Enforcement Program's Oral

Interview Boards. The data was analyzed using a Pearson Rank Correla-

tion and Multiple Regression.

Findings in the study rejected hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 in favor of

the null. Hypothesis four was accepted. They are stated below:

1. No predictability model can be constructed which shows a
   significant positive relationship between average academ-
   ic performance and average oral interview performance.

2. No predictability model can be constructed which shows a
   significant positive relationship between average academ-
   ic performance and one of the nineteen subcategories of
   the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

3. No predictability model can be constructed which shows a
   significant positive relationship between average academ-
   ic performance and two or more of the nineteen subcatego-
   ries of the Oral Interview Rating Instrument.

4. There exists a significant positive relationship between
   academic success, as measured by an average of 70% or
   higher, and acceptance by the interview board.

These results demonstrate that the oral interview does not accu-

rately predict academic average performance within the accepted crite-

ria. It does predict academic success, as measured by acceptance by the

interview board and an academic score of 70% or higher in the training

program.

Although the oral interview does not predict academic performance,

it does predict academic success in the preservice setting. It is rec-

ommended that its use be continued. Other test methods should be inves-

tigated, i.e., intelligence, psychological, reading, and vocabulary, to

determine their value in academic prediction in the preservice setting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asher, J. J., D. Wilson, and R. Kirlin. "Interview as a Predictor of
    High School Grades." Psychological Reports 30, No. 2 (April
    1972): 588.

Bertram, Francis David. "The Prediction of Police Academy Performance
    and On-the-Job Performance From Police Recruit Screening Measures."
    Ph.D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1975.

Blum, Richard H. Police Selection. Springfield, Illinois: Charles
    C. Thomas, 1964.

Cascio, Wayne F., and Leslie J. Real. "The Civil Service Exam Has Been
    Passed: Now What?" In Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues
    and Techniques, pp. 115-41. Edited by Charles D. Speilberger.
    New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1979.

DuBois, P. H., and R. K. Watson. "The Selection of Patrolmen."
    Journal of Applied Psychology 34 (1950): 90-95.

Fabricatore, J. M. "Pre-entry Assessment and Training." In Police
    Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques, pp. 77-85.
    Edited by Charles D. Speilberger. New York: Hemisphere Publishing
    Corporation, 1979.

Federici, Louise, and James Schuerger. "Prediction of Success in an
    Applied M. A. Psychological Program." Educational and Psycholog-
    ical Measurement 34, No. 4 (Winter 1974): 945-952.

Gough, Harrison G., and William A. McCormack. An Exploratory Evalua-
    tion of Education Abroad. Berkley: University of California,
    1967.

Heit, Phil, Geralding Johnson, Linda B. Meeks, and Cindy Paxton. "A
    Selective Admissions Process as a Predictor of Academic Success in
    Health Education." Journal of School Health 48, No. 3 (March
    1978): 146-150.

Hess, Lee R. "Police Entry Tests and Their Predictability of Score in
    Police Academy and Subsequent Job Performance." Ph.D. disserta-
    tion, Marquette University, 1972.

Holton, Gary N., and Melvin E. Jones. The System of Criminal Justice.
    2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1982.

Information in a letter to the author from Neil C. Chamelin, September
    9, 1982.

Information in a letter to the author from Neil C. Chamelin, October 27, 1982.

Knights, Ronald M. "The Relationship Between the Selection Process and On-the-Job Performance of Albequerque Police Officers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1976.

Manasse, S. C. Police Consortium Test Validation Study-A Program Evaluation. Wilmington, Delaware: Delaware Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice, [1978].

Meier, Nicholas. "An Evaluation of the Oral Interview as a Predictor of Candidate Academic Performance in a Preservice Police Academy." (Typewritten).

Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council. Policy and Procedures Manual. Lansing: Department of State Police, [1976].

Michigan Law Enforcement Officer's Training Council. Rationale for the MLEOTC Basic Training Program. Lansing: Department of State Police, [1982].

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Task Force Report: The Police. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

O'Cleary, L. R. Selection and Promotion of the Successful Police Officer. Edited by R. J. King. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1979.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1968.

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

Sharma, Baldev R., and S. K. Warrier. "Selection of Future Managers: Relevance of Admission Procedures." Management and Labour Studies 3 (1977): 39-51.

Sherman, Merle. "The Selection of Students at a Graduate School of Social Work: A Study of the Incremental Value of a Preadmission Interview, and the Use of the Undergraduate G. P. A. and M. A. T. in Identifying the Successful and Unsuccessful Student." Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1968.

Sherrid, Samuel D. "Changing Police Values." In Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques, pp. 167-76. Edited by Charles D. Speilberger. New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Springbett, B. M. "Factors Affecting the Final Decision in the Employment Interview." Canadian Journal of Psychology 12 (1958): 13-22.

Tieman, Jr., H. A. <u>Patrol Selection Research - Final Report</u>.
    Rockville, Md.: National Criminal Justice Reference Service,
    [1972].