

# **HIRING THE BEST CANDIDATE**

## **EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP**

**BY: Kenneth L. Gilliam  
Fire Chief  
Sandusky Fire Department  
Sandusky, OH**

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy  
as part of the Executive Fire Officer Program

March 1999

## ABSTRACT

Hiring new personnel was a problem for the Sandusky, Ohio Fire Department (SFD) because there was no research available to describe the characteristics of a successful fire fighters. The purpose of this research was to identify traits that predict success. This study used descriptive research to (a) identify the desirable traits, (b) determine the relative importance of the traits, (c) select indicators of these traits and, (d) develop a profile of the traits that maximizes the probability of success.

A survey of existing fire fighters was used to obtain data which asked for opinions about the priority of trait categories identified in the literature review and the value of trait indicators for each category. Secondary calculations were used to compare the relative importance of the trait indicators.

The most important findings of the research were that (a) the majority recognized the value of personality traits, physical fitness, and psychological fitness as predictors of success and, (b) the majority did not value educational background, technical certification, or community involvement as predictors of success.

Recommendations included (a) altering the hiring process to evaluate candidates based on the six categories identified in the literature review, (b) placing more emphasis on selection of candidates who exhibit the traits valued by existing fire fighters and, (c) educating existing fire fighters about the value of the trait categories and indicators they did not value.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**ABSTRACT..... 2**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS..... 3**

**INTRODUCTION..... 4**

**BACKGROUND & SIGNIFICANCE ..... 5**

**LITERATURE REVIEW..... 6**

**PROCEDURES..... 11**

**RESULTS..... 10**

**DISCUSSION..... 12**

**RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 14**

**REFERENCE LIST..... 22**

**TABLE 16.1 ..... 16**

**TABLE 17.1 ..... 17**

**APPENDIX A ..... 24**

**APPENDIX B..... 27**

**APPENDIX C ..... 33**

**APPENDIX D..... 39**

## INTRODUCTION

The Sandusky Fire Department (SFD) uses an approach for screening fire fighter applicants common throughout the Fire Service. SFD attempts to ensure quality recruiting with the use of aptitude tests, medical exams, physical fitness tests, psychological exams, and personal interviews conducted by the Civil Service Commission and SFD Senior Officers. In spite of this exhaustive process, personnel problems have emerged demonstrating the need for better predictors of fire fighter behavior and organizational compatibility. The problem SFD is faced with today is the lack of a clear description of characteristics required to succeed as an employee of the Sandusky Fire Department.

The purpose of this research is to identify the traits which maximize the probability each new fire fighter will exhibit successful future behavior. This study used descriptive research to answer the following questions:

1. What are the desirable traits?
2. What is the relative importance of the traits?
3. What are the indicators of these traits?
4. What is the profile of traits that maximizes the probability of success as an employee of the Sandusky Fire Department?

## **BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE**

The history of the Sandusky Fire Department reflects a high commitment to quality service as evidenced by customer surveys indicating service satisfaction. However, negative incidents have also occurred over the years resulting in high costs in time, money, and damage to the public trust. These periodic “credibility crises” have also negatively effected employee morale and commitment to the Department.

For many years SFD operated under a very autocratic form of leadership not unlike many other fire departments in the Country. Further, the department was slow to adjust to more participatory management styles as they became more accepted in the Fire Service. This generated an environment of hostility culminating in several acts of violence against a long standing Fire Chief. Although the Chief is long retired, the acts of violence are legendary in the oral history of the Department.

In 1978 SFD was placed under a court ordered consent decree requiring that minorities be represented on the Department consistent with the general population of the Community. The court order was certainly justified in that SFD was nearly one hundred percent white males. However, the resulting appearance of racism was damaging to the department image.

A sexual harassment suit was filed in 1987 by a female Captain who was also the first woman hired by the Department. After a long and bitter legal battle, the suit was not upheld and the Fire Department was not found guilty of harassment. The female Captain was found to be suffering from a mild emotional disorder and was placed on disability. The effect on department morale was devastating in that there was a general belief that the woman in question was quickly hired to create a more progressive image for the department without careful evaluation of her ability to succeed at the job.

With the resolution of the sexual harassment suit, the Department calmed down for several years and morale and commitment improved. Unfortunately, the calm did not last. In 1998 the department was rocked by the firing of a paramedic for substance abuse. This was immediately followed by the stunning arrests of two other fire fighters for off-duty felony sexual behavior.

All of the above described incidents were intensely reported by the radio, television, and newspaper media. Obviously, public scrutiny of such sensitive misbehavior dealt a massive blow to fire fighter morale and the public trust. Once again SFD finds itself in a crisis of credibility which demands a change in the hiring process to better predict future behavior and performance. Without change, productivity will fall and costs will rise as the Department struggles with the resulting conflict and the loss of public support.

However, before we can improve the hiring process, we must develop an understanding of the values of existing personnel with regard to ethics, organizational culture, receptivity to change, and interpersonal dynamics as discussed during the September 1998 Executive Leadership class at the National Fire Academy. Only by examining existing values and traits can we identify the candidate who is the best match to the personnel and quality service mission of the existing organization.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

A large body of literature exists relative to the selection of people for all types of employment. A query of the data base of periodicals at the Sandusky City Library revealed over 500 articles discussing the topic of predicting employee success. In general, the information in the material can be classified according to six major categories. These are (a) education background, (b) technical certifications, (c) psychological fitness, (d) physical fitness, (d) community involvement, and (e) personality traits. This

review of the literature will provide a sampling of the opinions typical in recent publications.

### **Educational Background**

The literature indicates a conflict in values and attitudes in the Fire Service with respect to educational credentials. There are those who are seriously questioning the advancement up the career ladder of personnel who possess formal educational skills but little or no fire fighting experience. “Why isn’t the fire service questioning the decision to appoint a non-fire person as chief?” (Meisinger, 1998, p. 30). A sexual discrimination suit will go to trial in Georgia involving a female Assistant Chief who was demoted for “lack of operational experience” (Brannigan, 1998, p. 24), in spite of a long demonstration of excellent administrative skills.

Others suggest this trend may be due to a lack of appropriate skills within the ranks of existing personnel. “Because the nature of the job has changed so much in the last few decades, so has the skill set that municipalities are looking for. According to this line of thinking, fire chiefs are, and should be hired as, fire service managers more than anything else” (Stribling, 1998, p. 86).

Lack of necessary skills is further underscored by those who suggest that basic literacy skills necessary for effective communications may be lacking in the Fire Service. “The modern definition of literacy includes more than just reading level, as it incorporates other communications skills as well. Some feel the fire service has much room for improvement in these areas” (Crow, 1998, p.64). This problem often manifests itself in poor quality run reports which can create legal problems for a fire department (Sovick, 1998).

### **Technical Certification**

Unlike formal educational background, there seems to be less disagreement about the value of

technical training and certifications specific to emergency services. In fact there is criticism of the Fire Service for using aptitude instead of job related knowledge in hiring processes. Steve Lutz states “At many paid departments, we hire people off the street who have no job-related experience, knowledge or skills. We hire them on a loose and variable set of aptitudes” (Lutz, 1998, p. 39). He further believes that fire related certifications are reliable predictors of future success and should be required as prerequisites to hiring (Lutz, 1998).

Articles on successful job hunting strongly indicate that there is universal preference for candidates with technical credentials. These authors recommend acquiring paramedic and fire fighting certifications in advance of applying for positions with paid departments (Ward, 1997). Others describe certifications as a method to ensure competence (Coleman, 1998, Marinucci, 1998, Sherburne, 1998).

### **Psychological Fitness**

There are many reports about fire fighters which underscore the need for careful evaluation of psychological fitness before hiring. The fatal shootings of four fire officers by a fellow fire fighter in April of 1996 demonstrates that failure to evaluate can have disastrous consequences. (No author, Fire Chief, May 1998, p. 8)

As a result of such horrifying incidents, fire departments are using various psychological testing methods. However, some warn that this type of testing is being overemphasized. The testing results must be evaluated based on the traits specifically identified as necessary for success in the job. “Some obvious traits would be the ability to operate in a living environment, to resolve conflict, to follow instruction, and to function during emergencies” (Bob, 1998, p. 136).

It is interesting to note that professions such as law enforcement have long recognized the need to

identify psychological traits that predict success. A police psychologist writes “For nearly 30 years psychologists have attempted to identify objective, job-related psychological domains. The evaluation must measure the fit between the officer’s psychological traits and characteristics, and the role he is being asked to perform as a peace officer” (Trompetter, 1998, p. 97).

### **Physical Fitness**

Testing of physical abilities as a predictor of success enjoys support in the literature but there is also the advice to exercise caution. This element of the screening process is particularly susceptible to challenge based on the Americans with Disabilities Act and allegations of sexual bias (Schneid, 1997).

Again the most important consideration is that the fitness level required is validated as essential to successful performance of the job. “While sociological considerations in hiring do warrant attention, such decisions should be made after the first cut, which should be based solely on an applicant’s ability to do the job” (Davis, 1998, p. 16). However, great care must be exercised in that some physical skills are not necessary to perform successfully. For example, the use of the so-called agility test is legally dangerous. Agility is the ability to make a rapid change in direction. This is a skill rarely required in performing fire fighting job functions. (Davis, 1998)

### **Community Involvement**

There is considerable discussion of the value of community involvement as a predictor in the future success of fire departments in the United States. This idea is based on trends that suggest a return to the concept of core communities. “A trend that will affect the way we do things is the reawakening desire among Americans to feel that they are part of a community” (Bruegman, 1997, p. 23).

Fire Service delivery of Emergency Medical Services will further expand the scope of community

involvement in the provision of prevention based programs. “Our expanded scope should include gun safety, gang violence, and all manner of specific health issues that confront our hometowns” (Singer, 1998, p. 12). “Its precisely the same logic we use as firefighters, recognizing the good of the community over the security of our jobs” (Singer, 1998, p. 13).

### **Personality Traits**

There is a consistent theme running through most of the current literature on the subject of hiring qualifications. Emphasis is shifting away from selecting candidates primarily on the basis of technical skills and background. As Richard Scheig states “Even the most technical job is at best 20 to 30 percent technical. The distinguishing factors between outstanding workers and barely acceptable ones can often be found in their behavioral approach to the other 70 percent to 80 percent of the job” (Scheig, 1995, p. 11).

One reason for the increased emphasis on the so-called “soft skills” is the move toward a more team based approach to all elements of business. To operate as an effective team, the member must share values and exhibit behaviors that are consistent with the goals of the team. To hire personnel who possess these characteristics it is necessary to identify the characteristics of existing members who are successful. “Finding people who fit your organization is a complex task. It pertains to selecting those people who resonate with you on values, vision, and mission, those who are competent to work in the jobs and roles you have available now (Laabs, Krefft, 1998, p.2). “Very few people fail in their jobs because they can’t do them technically. The soft skills are the hard ones” (Hirschman, Meulen, 1998, p.81). Technical skills and knowledge can be measured relatively easily, but leadership and other important interpersonal skills need more thoughtful questions to gage (Kador, 1997). “No matter how

skilled a job candidate is, it's the less obvious behavioral competencies like being able to work under pressure and having strong communication skills that enable employees to grow with an organization” (Caudron, 1997, p. 20).

In summary, the reviewed literature identifies six major trait areas to be evaluated in predicting the potential success of a fire fighter candidate. Those responsible for candidate selection must consider (a) educational background, (b) technical expertise, (c) psychological fitness, (d) physical fitness, (e) community involvement, and (f) personality traits (soft skills). While the literature places strong emphasis on the soft skills, the relevance of all trait areas as predictors of success should be based on an evaluation of the traits possessed by existing successful members of the organization.

## **PROCEDURES**

### **Definition of Terms**

Trait Category. For purposes of this research a trait category is one of six groupings of trait indicators used to evaluate the potential for success of a fire fighter candidate.

Trait Indicator. For purposes of this research a trait indicator is a qualitative or quantitative measurement used to determine if a candidate possesses the skills desired in a particular trait category.

### **Research Methodology**

This research was designed to achieve four outcomes relative to improving the hiring process to better predict the potential for success of each candidate.

The first desired outcome was to determine which traits are perceived as desirable by existing personnel. This outcome was achieved through a survey instrument which allowed existing fire fighters to

evaluate each of the six trait categories identified in the literature review.

The second desired outcome was to rank the traits according to existing fire fighters opinions about relative importance. This outcome was achieved through a survey instrument in which fire fighters were asked to prioritize each trait category as a predictor of success.

The third desired outcome was to identify relevant trait indicators for each major trait category. This outcome was achieved through a survey instrument which asked fire fighters to assign a value to each trait indicator identified in the literature review.

The fourth desired outcome was to create a profile of traits that maximize probability of success with the Sandusky Fire Department. This outcome was achieved through an analysis of the combined responses of all fire fighters in the survey.

### **Survey Instrument**

A survey instrument was developed consisting of two sections. Section One provided internal demographic information while Section Two asked the respondent to evaluate six trait categories. (See Appendix A)

Questions 1.1-1.2: Internal Demographics. These questions provided simple demographic information to determine if the respondent was an officer or non-officer and level of seniority. This was used to determine if there was a difference in perception based on years of service and/or rank.

Questions 2.1 through 2.6: Trait Preferences These questions were designed to measure how existing fire fighters valued candidate traits identified in the literature review. The six major categories provided were (a) education background, (b) technical certification level, (c) psychological fitness, (d) physical fitness, (e) community involvement and, (f) personality traits. Respondents were asked to rank

the categories from one to six with one the highest and six the lowest value. Respondents were permitted to assign the same value to more than one category and/or a zero if they believed the trait had no value at all.

Questions 2.1 through 2.6: Trait Indicators. These questions measured the fire fighters opinions about the relative degree of importance of each trait indicator using a scale of high value (HV), low value (LV), or no value (NV).

Comments. Respondents were offered an opportunity to write in additional trait indicators or trait categories and to add comments for clarification of their responses.

### **Sample Selection**

Surveys were distributed to each of the three firefighter shifts by the Fire Chief during regular scheduled work hours. The survey was displayed via transparency to each group of firefighters in three separate sessions. The Fire Chief explained both the purpose of the research and how to complete the survey instrument. This process resulted in 44 completed surveys. One survey was eliminated due to failure to complete properly. Of the remaining 43, 13 of the respondents were officers and 30 non-officers. The total of 44 respondents equals 83% of the 53 total fire fighters presently employed by the department. The remaining nine personnel (17%) were not available due to absence from sickness, vacation, etc.

### **Limitations**

The use of presently employed personnel to develop a successful fire fighter profile is based on the assumption that all personnel are successful. Since there was a small number of respondents who had recently received corrective performance reviews, the results may not perfectly reflect successful

employee values.

The value of personality traits may have been influenced by a large amount of negative publicity about criminal charges against two existing personnel. This may have resulted in greater emphasis on personality than would be typical in less controversial circumstances.

Survey questions were designed solely by the author without benefit of a research model.

### **Data Integrity and Statistical Analysis.**

Simple counting of the responses to questions 1.1 and 1.2 was used to determine the number of respondents in each categories of rank and seniority. Respondents were divided in five year increments of service and whether they were officers or non-officers.

In questions 2.1 through 2.6 averaging and percentages were used to determine the relative values assigned by personnel in the rank and seniority categories established in Section One. The response data were used to determine an average numerical ranking for all trait categories and a percentage value for each specific trait indicator.

All data were entered into a spreadsheet that listed and totaled the number of responses in each category. These 30 pages of data were subsequently condensed into three summary analysis for all personnel, non-officers, and officers. This allowed for comparison between rank and years of service to determine if there was a difference in values assigned to the trait categories. (See Appendix C and D)

Next, a spreadsheet was prepared that consolidated all the information into a summary compilation of all respondents' opinions. This analysis was performed to link the topics of concern with one of the four desired outcomes of the research methodology. (See Appendix B)

## RESULTS

All results are tabulated in Appendix B, C and D. Appendix B depicts the consolation of total response of all personnel, Appendix C non-officers, and Appendix D officers. The statistical and analytical results are narrated below.

### Statistical Findings

Of the 43 respondents, 13 were officers and the remaining 30 were non-officers.

Among non-officers, eleven had 0-5 years of service, nine had 5-10 years of service, three had 10-15 years of service, four had 15-20 years of service, and 4 had 20 or more years of service.

Among officers, two had 5-10 years of service, three had 10-15 years of service, two had 15-20 years of service, and six had 20 or more years of service.

### Answers to Research Questions

#### Question 1: Desired Traits

The respondents clearly indicate that they value the trait categories of personality, physical fitness, and psychological fitness in predicting the future success of a fire fighter candidate. Educational background and technical certifications are of limited value in that only a high school diploma and fire fighter certifications reflect high value averages greater than 50%. Further, eight of the 43 respondents listed community involvement as having zero value with the remainder averaging 25% or less in high value ratings. All of the zero values came from the ranks of non-officers. There were no zero values listed in any of the other trait categories.

#### Question 2: Relative Importance of Traits

The answer to this question varies somewhat according to which portion of the sample

population is considered. Trait categories were ranked as follows in Table 16.1:

Table 16.1 <u>Non-Officers</u>	<u>Officers</u>	<u>All Fire Fighters</u>
Personality	Personality	Personality
Physical Fitness	Physical Fitness	Physical Fitness
Technical Certifications	Education	Psychological Fitness
Psychological Fitness	Psychological Fitness	Education
Education	Technical Certifications	Technical Certifications
Community Involvement	Community Involvement	Community Involvement

### Question 3: Trait Indicators

Each respondent provided evaluations of specific trait indicators for use in measuring a candidate's qualifications in each trait category. Table 17.1 (next page) indicates the percentage of high value ratings according to respondent grouping. N/A indicates less than 50% high value.

### Question 4: Probability of Success

The respondents indicate that their preferred candidate should possess a qualification profile with the following priorities and values:

1. Positive personality traits indicated by (a) criminal background check, (b) references, and (c) interviews.
2. Physical fitness as indicated by (a) physician evaluation, (b) Combat Challenge performance, and (c) general appearance.
3. Psychological fitness as indicated by (a) background check, (b) psychologist evaluation and, (c) references.
4. Educational background as indicated by possession of high school diploma.

## 5. Technical certification as indicated by Fire Fighter I &amp; II certifications.

Table 17.1	<u>Non-Officers</u>	<u>Officers</u>	<u>All Personnel</u>
<u>Personality:</u>			
References	80%	85%	84%
Interviews	80%	77%	79%
Criminal Ck.	100%	86%	95%
<u>Physical Fitness</u>			
PhysicanEval.	93%	77%	88%
Combat Chal.	63%	62%	63%
Gen. Appear.	67%	n/a	60%
<u>Psychological Fit.</u>			
Psych. Eval.	80%	70%	77%
References	73%	62%	72%
Background Ck	93%	92%	93%
<u>Education</u>			
High School	100%	93%	98%
<u>Technical Cert.</u>			
FF I&II	73%	50%	65%
EMT-B	57%	n/a	n/a
EMT-A	53%	n/a	n/a
EMT-P	50%	n/a	n/a
<u>Community</u>	n/a	n/a	n/a

## DISCUSSION

Comparison of the literature review with the results of the research indicate a mixture of agreement and disagreement. The fire fighters general agreed with the value of personality traits, psychological fitness, and physical fitness as predictors of success. However there was less recognition

of the value of educational background, technical certification, and community involvement.

The fire fighters clearly recognized the need to select personnel who share values and attitudes which promote cooperation and trust. The so-called soft skills identified in the literature review (Laabs, Kraft, 1998) were rated as the highest priority trait category by the fire fighters. Trait indicator ratings were strongly in the high value range (79-84%) except for credit checks which achieved only 46% high value. The author can only conclude that the fire fighters viewed past debt payment performance to be a result of unforeseen economic misfortune rather than a measure of honesty or dependability.

Physical fitness was second only to personality traits as a predictor of future success according to the fire fighters. The literature review also valued physical fitness but with caution since there is a risk of violating the Americans with Disabilities Act whenever fitness testing is used (Schneid, 1997). This caution seemed to be shared by the fire fighters who rated physician evaluation at 88% high value against 63% high value for the Combat Challenge fitness test.

Psychological fitness was third for all respondents in the research as a predictor of future success. While this result generally agreed with the literature review, the fire fighters placed greater value on background checks as a trait indicator while the literature emphasized psychological testing (Trompetter, 1998). The fire fighters indicated a greater level of trust for the opinions of past teachers and coworkers (93% HV) than for testing (77% HV).

The results demonstrated that the fire fighters hold attitudes about formal education that are identified as troublesome in the literature review. The fire fighters rated educational background as the fourth most important category. Of the four trait indicators, only the high school diploma received a majority high value (98%). The higher level education indicators received low value ratings

demonstrating a lack of understanding of the value of formal education. This is consistent with the findings in the literature review indicating a conflict of values in the modern Fire Service (Meisenger, 1998). Fire fighters typically support the idea of appointing chiefs with strong emergency operations experience but these people often lack the necessary education to meet the challenges of an executive position (Brannigan, 1998).

Somewhat surprisingly, the fire fighters viewed technical certifications as next to last in value. Only Fire Fighter I & II certifications received greater than 50% average high value for all respondents. This result is contrary to the findings of the literature review where certifications were seen as reliable predictors of success (Lutz, 1998). This result suggests that fire fighters believe that job related technical skills can be acquired after hiring through department provided training programs.

The fire fighters were very much in disagreement with the literature with respect to the value of community involvement. The literature stressed the return to community values and the concept of core communities (Bruegman, 1997). The fire fighters rated community involvement at the bottom of the six trait categories and there were no high value averages greater than 25%. This result is consistent with a common departmental belief that fire fighters' personal lives are not relevant to job performance.

The implication of these results for the Sandusky Fire Department are that caution must be exercised in the application of the successful fire fighter profile developed in the research. While the literature recommended using existing successful personnel to develop the hiring profile, it also recommended that value be placed on all six categories. The fire fighters believed that more emphasis should be placed on personality traits, physical fitness, and psychological fitness, as predictors of success. This implies that existing personnel may not accept the better rounded individual who satisfies

all six categories. Thus, a more qualified candidate may be less compatible and therefore less successful.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this study was to identify traits which will maximize the probability of success for a new fire fighter. Implementation of a hiring process that uses these traits as the criteria for hiring will require a two pronged approach. Since the fire fighters do not completely agree with the literature review findings, the Fire Chief must (a) alter the hiring process to reflect the priorities of the fire fighters while (b) educating the fire fighters as to the value of the three categories that received low value ratings.

The hiring process should be modified to accurately measure indicators for all six trait categories. Categories then need to be weighted according to the priorities identified by the existing personnel in the research. This weighting should reflect the greater value of personality traits, physical fitness, and psychological fitness depicted in the research. As recommended by the literature, interview questions should be restructured to elicit descriptive information from the candidate about previous experiences in like situations. Also, extensive background checks should be performed including interviews with former teachers, coaches, and employers to gain “real life” information about the candidates’ previous behavior and physical/psychological fitness.

Awareness training should be offered concurrent with implementation of the new hiring process. This training should be offered in an environment of open discussion between the Chief and the fire fighters using the data generated in this study. This will provide greater insight for the Chief in understanding the values of existing personnel while promoting fire fighter acceptance of the value of education, certifications, and community involvement. Greater understanding and acceptance of all

successful fire fighter trait categories will then increase the potential for compatibility and, therefore, the success of new fire fighters.

## REFERENCE LIST

Bob, C. (1998, March). A proactive approach to the psychological test. *Fire Engineering*, pp. 135-136.

Brannigan, V. (1998, October). Discrimination case is duties versus qualifications. *Fire Chief*, pp. 24-28.

Bruegman, R. (1997, January). 21st century, dead ahead. *Fire Chief*, pp. 23-28.

Caudron, S. (1997, August). Hire for attitude: its who they are that counts. *Workforce*, pp. 20-27.

Coleman, R. (1998, August). Putting in the keystone. *Fire Chief*, pp. 74-78.

Crow, A. (1998, March). Illiteracy in the fire service. *Fire Chief*, pp. 62-69.

Davis, P. (1998, February). When testing job applicants, what's a chief to do? *Fire Chief*, pp. 16-17.

Fire Chief. (1998, May). Former firefighter sentenced to death in Mississippi shootings. *Fire Chief*, p. 8.

Hirschman, C. (1998, March). Playing the high stakes game. *HRMagazine*, pp. 80-84.

Kador, J. (1997, June). Ask the right questions. *Datamation*, pp. 59-60.

Laabs, J. (1998, November). Pick the right people. *Workforce*, pp. Not available.

Lutz, S. (1998, July). New program will help identify quality recruits. *Fire Chief*, p. 39.

Marinucci, R. (1998, August). Something borrowed, something new. *Fire Chief*, p. 68.

Meisinger, R. (1998, March). Mentoring and the "backdoor fire chief". *Fire Chief*, pp.30-32.

Scheig, R. (1995, May). How to hire the right people. *Supervision*, pp. 10-12.

Schneid, T. (1997, April). ADA: questions that can and cannot be asked during an employment interview. *Fire Engineering*, pp. 153-154.

Sherburne, F. (1998, August). A seal of approval. *Fire Chief*, pp. 80-84.

Singer, M. (1998, January). A plan of action for the next 30 years. *Fire Chief*, pp. 12-13.

Sovick, M. (1998, March). Rescue your writing. *Fire Chief*, pp. 70-72.

Stribling, D. (1998, March). More than one path to the top. *Fire Chief*, pp. 86-88.

Trompetter, P. (1998, October). Fitness for duty evaluations. *The Police Chief*, pp. 97-107.

Ward, M. (1997, August). The 8 secrets of getting hired. *Fire Chief*, pp. 62-66.

## APPENDIX A

OPINION SURVEY  
SANDUSKY FIRE DEPARTMENT  
JANUARY 1999

The Fire Chief is requesting your assistance in completing the following survey as part of an effort to improve our hiring process. It is our desire to create hiring criteria which maximize our ability to pick the candidate with the greatest potential to succeed. Current literature on this subject suggests that one of the key components of success is comparing the candidates' traits against the profile of traits of a "successful fire fighter". This profile is not the same in all fire departments because values differ. Therefore, your opinions are needed to develop a "successful fire fighter" profile for the Sandusky Fire Department.

Please complete the following survey to the best of your ability. Your responses will be analyzed for use in evaluating future fire fighter candidates. You are not required to give your name.

## Section 1. Internal Demographics

## 1.1 Years of Service with the Sandusky Fire Department

- 0-5 Years
- 5-10 Years
- 10-15 Years
- 15-20 Years
- Over 20 Years

## 1.2. Rank

- Officer
- Non-Officer

## Section 2. Trait Preferences

Please begin by first prioritizing the six major trait categories defined in 2.1 through 2.6. Rank your choices according to your opinion of which categories you think are most important to success as a fire fighter. Place a number in the space provided using the number one to indicate highest priority and rank the remainder in ascending order. If you believe any of the provided categories have no value at all you may enter a zero for that category. If you believe there are traits of importance which are not reflected in the six categories provided, you may write in additional choices and number according to priority.

After you prioritize the major categories, go back and evaluate the trait indicators listed as subheadings. If you believe the indicator has high value enter HV. If you believe the indicator has low value enter LV. If you believe the indicator has no value, enter NV.

- 2.1. Educational Background as indicated by:  
High School Diploma

Associate Degree  
 Bachelor Degree  
 Master Degree  
 Other:

- 2.2. Technical Certification Level as indicated by certifications for:  
 FF I & II  
 EMT B  
 EMT A  
 EMT P  
 Haz-Mat Technician  
 Advanced Rescue Training (any type)  
 Non-emergency vocational training  
 Other:
- 2.3. Psychological Fitness as indicated by:  
 Evaluation by Psychologist or Psychiatrist  
 References from previous employers  
 Past Behavior indicated in background check  
 Other:
- 2.4. Physical Fitness as indicated by:  
 Evaluation by Physician  
 Combat Challenge  
 Hobbies  
 General appearance  
 Other:
- 2.5. Community Involvement as indicated by:  
 Membership in civic organizations  
 Involvement with Schools  
 Participation in organized sporting events  
 Public Participation in music, theater, etc.  
 Other:
- 2.6. Positive Personality Traits such as honesty, loyalty, dedication, friendliness, cooperativeness, humility, dependability etc. as indicated by:  
 References from teachers, employers, and personal acquaintances  
 Responses to personal interview questions  
 Criminal background check  
 Credit check  
 Other:

Additional Categories (optional):

Survey Analysis (All Respondents)

Total Respondents = 43

Section 2: Trait Preferences

2.1 Educational Background as indicated by: High School Diploma, Associate Degree, Bachelor Degree, Masters Degree, or other.

Years of Service	No. of Re-sponse	Average Priority 1 to 6	Value	H.S. Diploma	Assoc. Degree	Bachelor Degree	Masters Degree	Other
0-5	11	3.55	HV	100%	45%	27%	9%	
			LV	0%	55%	73%	91%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
5-10	11	2.91	HV	100%	50%	18%	0%	HV Vocational
			LV	0%	50%	82%	45%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	55%	
10-15	6	2.67	HV	83%	50%	17%	17%	
			LV	0%	0%	17%	0%	
			NV	17%	50%	66%	83%	
15-20	5	3.8	HV	100%	40%	40%	40%	
			LV	0%	40%	40%	40%	
			NV	0%	20%	20%	20%	
Over 20	10	3.7	HV	100%	20%	10%	0%	
			LV	0%	70%	60%	60%	
			NV	0%	10%	30%	40%	
Average for all Respondents		3.33	HV	98%	39%	17%	5%	
			LV	2%	53%	60%	42%	
			NV	0%	8%	23%	53%	
Total	43			100%	100%	100%	100%	

Category Rank 4

2.2 Technical Certification Level as indicated by certifications for: Firefighter I & II, EMT-B, EMT-A, EMT-P, Haz-Mat Technicians, Advanced Rescue Training, Non-emergency Vocational Training, Other.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>FF I&amp;II</u>	<u>EMT-B</u>	<u>EMT-A</u>	<u>EMT-P</u>	<u>Haz-Mat Adv.</u>		<u>Non-Emergency</u>
								<u>Tech</u>	<u>Rescue</u>	
<b>0-5</b>	11	3	HV	82%	82%	55%	55%	18%	18%	0%
			LV	9%	9%	36%	36%	64%	45%	91%
			NV	9%	9%	9%	9%	18%	37%	9%
<b>5-10</b>	11	2.63	HV	91%	45%	45%	64%	9%	9%	27%
			LV	9%	55%	45%	36%	64%	64%	45%
			NV	0%	0%	10%	0%	27%	27%	28%
<b>10-15</b>	6	4.3	HV	16%	33%	34%	17%	0%	16%	0%
			LV	50%	16%	33%	33%	50%	33%	33%
			NV	34%	51%	33%	50%	50%	51%	67%
<b>15-20</b>	5	4.2	HV	60%	20%	40%	20%	0%	20%	0%
			LV	20%	20%	40%	60%	60%	40%	60%
			NV	20%	60%	20%	20%	40%	40%	40%
<b>Over 20</b>	10	4.1	HV	50%	40%	30%	50%	20%	20%	30%
			LV	40%	50%	50%	40%	70%	60%	50%
			NV	10%	10%	20%	10%	10%	20%	20%
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>3.5</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>16%</b>
			<b>LV</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>53%</b>
			<b>NV</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Category Rank      5

**2.3 Psychological Fitness as indicated by: evaluation by psychologist or psychiatrist, references from previous employers, past behavior indicated by background check.**

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Eval. By Psychologist/ Psychiatrist</u>	<u>References from prev. employers</u>	<u>Background Check</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	3	HV	55%	100%	91%	HV Talk w co-workers
			LV	45%	0%	9%	
<b>5-10</b>	11	3.5	HV	91%	82%	91%	
			LV	9%	18%	9%	
<b>10-15</b>	6	2.5	HV	83%	66%	83%	HV Past instructors
			LV	17%	17%	17%	
			NV	0%	17%	0%	
<b>15-20</b>	5	2.4	HV	100%	40%	100%	
			LV	0%	40%	0%	
			NV	0%	20%	0%	
<b>Over 20</b>	10	2.4	HV	70%	50%	100%	
			LV	20%	40%	0%	
			NV	10%	10%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>2.9</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>93%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>5%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Category Rank      3**

2.4 Physical fitness as indicated by: evaluation by physician, Combat Challenge, hobbies, general appearance, other.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Evaluation by Physician</u>	<u>Combat Challenge</u>	<u>Hobbies</u>	<u>General Appearance</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	2.5	HV	100%	82%	9%	64%	HV Comprehensive min. phys. Testing
			LV	0%	18%	55%	36%	
			NV	0%	0%	36%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	11	2.7	HV	100%	64%	9%	64%	HV Any organized fitness program
			LV	0%	36%	55%	36%	
			NV	0%	0%	36%	0%	
<b>10-15</b>	6	3	HV	50%	10%	0%	66%	Pref. Phoenix Test HV Outside agency for medical screens
			LV	40%	40%	83%	17%	
			NV	10%	50%	17%	17%	
<b>15-20</b>	5	2.6	HV	100%	40%	20%	60%	HV Comprehensive testing criteria
			LV	0%	40%	40%	20%	
			NV	0%	20%	40%	20%	
<b>Over 20</b>	10	2.3	HV	80%	80%	0%	40%	
			LV	20%	20%	100%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	10%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>2.6</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>60%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>7%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank 2

2.5 Community involvement as indicated by: membership in civic organizations, involvement in schools, participation in organized sporting activities, public participation in music, theatre, etc.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Civic Organization</u>	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Organized Sporting Events</u>	<u>Music/Theatre</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	4.71	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	Softball player
			LV	45%	36%	36%	27%	
			NV	55%	64%	64%	73%	
<b>5-10</b>	11	5.3	HV	18%	27%	9%	9%	
			LV	55%	36%	36%	45%	
			NV	27%	37%	55%	46%	
<b>10-15</b>	6	4.4	HV	17%	17%	17%	33%	HV Volunteering at church etc.
			LV	33%	33%	33%	17%	
			NV	50%	50%	50%	50%	
<b>15-20</b>	5	5	HV	60%	60%	20%	0%	HV Willingness to live in City
			LV	20%	20%	60%	80%	
			NV	20%	20%	20%	20%	
<b>Over 20</b>	10	5.33	HV	10%	20%	30%	10%	HV Church
			LV	80%	80%	70%	80%	
			NV	10%	0%	0%	10%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>4.95</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>10%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>50%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>40%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank      6

**2.6 Positive Personality Traits such as honesty, loyalty, dedication, friendliness, cooperativeness, humility, dependability, etc. as indicated by: references from teachers, previous employers, and personal acquaintances; responses to personal interview questions; criminal background check; credit check; other.**

<b>Years of Service</b>	<b>No. of Re-sponse</b>	<b>Average Priority 1 to 6</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>References from teachers, employers, acquaintances</b>	<b>Resp. to pers. inter. questions</b>	<b>Criminal Background Check</b>	<b>Credit Check</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>0-5</b>	11	1.7	HV	100%	91%	100%	36%	
			LV	0%	9%	0%	55%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	9%	
<b>5-10</b>	11	2.3	HV	91%	82%	100%	45%	
			LV	9%	9%	0%	36%	
			NV	0%	9%	0%	19%	
<b>10-15</b>	6	1.8	HV	67%	50%	83%	33%	HV Past Instructors
			LV	0%	16%	0%	17%	
			NV	33%	34%	17%	50%	
<b>15-20</b>	5	1	HV	80%	100%	100%	60%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	40%	HV Drug testing
			NV	20%	0%	0%	0%	HV Drug testing
<b>Over 20</b>	10	1.7	HV	70%	70%	90%	60%	
			LV	30%	30%	10%	40%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>1.8</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>46%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>37%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>17%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Category Rank 1**

**APPENDIX C**  
**Survey Analysis (Non-Officers)**

**Total Respondents = 30**

**Section 2: Trait Preferences**

**2.1 Educational Background as indicated by: High School Diploma, Associate Degree, Bachelor Degree, Masters Degree, or other.**

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>H.S. Diploma</u>	<u>Assoc. Degree</u>	<u>Bachelor Degree</u>	<u>Masters Degree</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	3.55	HV	100%	45%	9%	9%	
			LV	0%	55%	73%	36%	
			NV	0%	0%	18%	55%	
<b>5-10</b>	9	3	HV	100%	55%	22%	0%	HV Vocational
			LV	0%	45%	78%	55%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	45%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	2	HV	100%	66%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	34%	100%	100%	
<b>15-20</b>	3	3.67	HV	100%	0%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	66%	66%	34%	
			NV	0%	34%	34%	66%	
<b>Over 20</b>	4	3.75	HV	100%	25%	25%	0%	
			LV	0%	50%	25%	50%	
			NV	0%	25%	50%	50%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>3.27</b>	HV	<b>100%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>3%</b>	
			LV	<b>0%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>37%</b>	
			NV	<b>0%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>60%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Category Rank 4**

2.2 Technical Certification Level as indicated by certifications for: Firefighter I & II, EMT-B, EMT-A, EMT-P, Haz-Mat Technicians, Advanced Rescue Training, Non-emergency Vocational Training, Other.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>FF I&amp;II</u>	<u>EMT-B</u>	<u>EMT-A</u>	<u>EMT-P</u>	<u>Haz-Mat Tech</u>	<u>Adv. Rescue</u>	<u>Non-Emergency</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	3	HV	82%	82%	55%	55%	18%	27%	0%
			LV	9%	9%	36%	36%	64%	45%	64%
			NV	9%	9%	9%	9%	18%	28%	36%
<b>5-10</b>	9	2.67	HV	89%	45%	55%	55%	11%	11%	33%
			LV	11%	55%	45%	45%	67%	67%	67%
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	22%	22%	0%
<b>10-15</b>	3	3.67	HV	34%	34%	66%	34%	0%	34%	34%
			LV	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
			NV	33%	33%	34%	66%	100%	66%	33%
<b>15-20</b>	3	3	HV	66%	0%	34%	0%	0%	0%	0%
			LV	0%	66%	33%	66%	34%	34%	34%
			NV	34%	34%	33%	34%	66%	66%	66%
<b>Over 20</b>	4	4.5	HV	50%	75%	50%	75%	25%	25%	50%
			LV	50%	25%	25%	25%	75%	50%	25%
			NV	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	25%	25%
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		3.17	HV	73%	57%	53%	50%	13%	23%	30%
			LV	17%	30%	33%	37%	57%	65%	50%
			NV	0%	13%	14%	13%	20%	12%	20%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Category Rank      3

2.3 Psychological Fitness as indicated by: evaluation by psychologist or psychiatrist, references from previous employers, past behavior indicated by background check.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Eval. By Psychologist/ Psychiatrist</u>	<u>References from prev. employers</u>	<u>Background Check</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	3	HV	55%	100%	91%	HV Talk w co-workers
			LV	45%	0%	9%	
<b>5-10</b>	9	3.67	HV	89%	78%	89%	
			LV	0%	22%	11%	
			NV	11%	0%	0%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	2.3	HV	100%	100%	100%	HV Past instructors
			LV	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	
<b>15-20</b>	3	2.3	HV	100%	34%	100%	
			LV	0%	33%	0%	
			NV	0%	33%	0%	
<b>Over 20</b>	4	2	HV	100%	25%	100%	
			LV	0%	50%	0%	
			NV	0%	25%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>3.31</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>93%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>7%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank      5

2.4 Physical fitness as indicated by: evaluation by physician, Combat Challenge, hobbies, general appearance, other.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Evaluation by Physician</u>	<u>Combat Challenge</u>	<u>Hobbies</u>	<u>General Appearance</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	2.55	HV	100%	82%	0%	64%	HV Comprehensive min. phys. Testing Personal Hygiene
			LV	0%	18%	55%	36%	
			NV	0%	0%	45%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	9	2.67	HV	100%	55%	10%	67%	HV Any organized fitness program
			LV	0%	45%	45%	33%	
			NV	0%	0%	45%	0%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	2.67	HV	66%	34%	0%	66%	Pref. Phoenix Test HV Outside agency for medical screens
			LV	34%	33%	66%	0%	
			NV	0%	33%	34%	34%	
<b>15-20</b>	3	2	HV	100%	34%	34%	100%	HV Comprehensive testing criteria
			LV	0%	33%	33%	0%	
			NV	0%	33%	33%	0%	
<b>Over 20</b>	4	2	HV	75%	75%	0%	50%	
			LV	25%	25%	100%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>2.8</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>67%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>30%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>3%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank 2

2.5 Community involvement as indicated by: membership in civic organizations, involvement in schools, participation in organized sporting activities, public participation in music, theatre, etc.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Civic Organization</u>	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Organized Sporting Events</u>	<u>Music/Theatre</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	11	3	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	Softball player
			LV	36%	36%	36%	27%	
			NV	64%	64%	64%	73%	
<b>5-10</b>	9	4.78	HV	22%	34%	12%	12%	
			LV	44%	33%	33%	44%	
			NV	34%	33%	55%	44%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	2.67	HV	0%	34%	34%	34%	
			LV	34%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	66%	66%	66%	66%	
<b>15-20</b>	3	3.67	HV	34%	34%	34%	0%	
			LV	33%	33%	33%	66%	
			NV	33%	33%	33%	34%	
<b>Over 20</b>	4	4	HV	25%	25%	25%	25%	HV Church
			LV	75%	75%	75%	75%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		4.17	HV	16%	25%	21%	21%	
			LV	44%	35%	42%	41%	
			NV	40%	40%	37%	38%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank      6

**2.6 Positive Personality Traits such as honesty, loyalty, dedication, friendliness, cooperativeness, humility, dependability, etc. as indicated by: references from teachers, previous employers, and personal acquaintances; responses to personal interview questions; criminal background check; credit check; other.**

<b>Years of Service</b>	<b>No. of Re-sponse</b>	<b>Average Priority 1 to 6</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>References from teachers, employers, acquaintances</b>	<b>Resp. to pers. inter. questions</b>	<b>Criminal Background Check</b>	<b>Credit Check</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>0-5</b>	11	1.73	HV	100%	91%	100%	36%	
			LV	0%	9%	0%	45%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	19%	
<b>5-10</b>	9	2.56	HV	91%	78%	100%	44%	
			LV	9%	22%	0%	33%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	23%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	1.67	HV	66%	34%	100%	0%	HV Past Instructors
			LV	34%	66%	0%	34%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	66%	
<b>15-20</b>	3	1	HV	100%	100%	100%	100%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	HV Drug testing
<b>Over 20</b>	4	2.25	HV	25%	75%	100%	50%	
			LV	75%	25%	0%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>2.2</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>40%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>36%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>24%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Category Rank 1**

Survey Analysis (Officers)

Total Respondents = 13

Section 2: Trait Preferences

2.1 Educational Background as indicated by: High School Diploma, Associate Degree, Bachelor Degree, Masters Degree, or other.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>H.S. Diploma</u>	<u>Assoc. Degree</u>	<u>Bachelor Degree</u>	<u>Masters Degree</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	0	N/A	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	2	2.5	HV	100%	50%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	50%	100%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	50%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	3.33	HV	66%	0%	34%	34%	
			LV	0%	66%	33%	0%	
			NV	34%	34%	33%	66%	
<b>15-20</b>	2	4	HV	100%	100%	100%	50%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Over 20</b>	6	3.67	HV	100%	17%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	83%	83%	66%	
			NV	0%	0%	17%	34%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>3.27</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>41%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>38%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank 4

2.2 Technical Certification Level as indicated by certifications for: Firefighter I & II, EMT-B, EMT-A, EMT-P, Haz-Mat Technicians, Advanced Rescue Training, Non-emergency Vocational Training, Other.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>FF I&amp;II</u>	<u>EMT-B</u>	<u>EMT-A</u>	<u>EMT-P</u>	<u>Haz-Mat Tech</u>	<u>Adv. Rescue</u>	<u>Non-Emergency</u>
<b>0-5</b>	0	N/A	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	2	3.5	HV	100%	50%	0%	100%	0%	0%	50%
			LV	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%	50%	0%
			NV	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	50%	50%
<b>10-15</b>	3	5	HV	0%	34%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
			LV	66%	33%	66%	66%	66%	66%	66%
			NV	34%	33%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%
<b>15-20</b>	2	6	HV	50%	50%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
			LV	50%	50%	50%	50%	100%	100%	100%
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Over 20</b>	6	3.83	HV	50%	17%	17%	34%	17%	17%	17%
			LV	33%	66%	66%	50%	66%	66%	66%
			NV	17%	17%	17%	16%	17%	17%	17%
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>4.23</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>17%</b>
			<b>LV</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>58%</b>
			<b>NV</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Category Rank      5

2.3 Psychological Fitness as indicated by: evaluation by psychologist or psychiatrist, references from previous employers, past behavior indicated by background check.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Eval. By Psychologist/ Psychiatrist</u>	<u>References from prev. employers</u>	<u>Background Check</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	0	N/A	HV	0%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	2	3	HV	100%	100%	100%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	2.67	HV	66%	34%	66%	
			LV	34%	33%	0%	
			NV	0%	33%	34%	
<b>15-20</b>	2	2.5	HV	100%	50%	100%	
			LV	0%	50%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Over 20</b>	6	2.67	HV	50%	66%	100%	
			LV	33%	34%	0%	
			NV	17%	0%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>2.69</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>92%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>0%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>8%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank      3

2.4 Physical fitness as indicated by: evaluation by physician, Combat Challenge, hobbies, general appearance, other.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Evaluation by Physician</u>	<u>Combat Challenge</u>	<u>Hobbies</u>	<u>General Appearance</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	0	N/A	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	2	3	HV	100%	100%	0%	50%	
			LV	0%	0%	100%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	3.33	HV	34%	0%	0%	66%	
			LV	33%	34%	66%	34%	
			NV	33%	66%	34%	0%	
<b>15-20</b>	2	3.5	HV	100%	50%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	50%	100%	50%	HV Comprehensive testing criteria
			NV	0%	0%	0%	50%	
<b>Over 20</b>	6	2.5	HV	83%	83%	0%	33%	
			LV	17%	17%	100%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	17%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>2.38</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>38%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>46%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>16%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank 2

2.5 Community involvement as indicated by: membership in civic organizations, involvement in schools, participation in organized sporting activities, public participation in music, theatre, etc.

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>No. of Re-sponse</u>	<u>Average Priority 1 to 6</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Civic Organization</u>	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Organized Sporting Events</u>	<u>Music/Theatre</u>	<u>Other</u>
<b>0-5</b>	0	N/A	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	2	5	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			LV	100%	100%	50%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	50%	50%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	4.67	HV	34%	34%	0%	34%	HV Church
			LV	33%	33%	66%	33%	
			NV	33%	33%	34%	33%	
<b>15-20</b>	2	4.5	HV	100%	100%	0%	0%	HV Live in City
			LV	0%	0%	100%	100%	HV Public Speaking
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Over 20</b>	6	5.3	HV	83%	17%	34%	0%	
			LV	17%	83%	66%	83%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	17%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>5.00</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>23%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>70%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Category Rank      6

**2.6 Positive Personality Traits such as honesty, loyalty, dedication, friendliness, cooperativeness, humility, dependability, etc. as indicated by: references from teachers, previous employers, and personal acquaintances; responses to personal interview questions; criminal background check; credit check; other.**

<b>Years of Service</b>	<b>No. of Re-sponse</b>	<b>Average Priority 1 to 6</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>References from teachers, employers, acquaintances</b>	<b>Resp. to pers. inter. questions</b>	<b>Criminal Background Check</b>	<b>Credit Check</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>0-5</b>	0	N/A	HV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>5-10</b>	2	1	HV	100%	100%	100%	50%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	50%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>10-15</b>	3	2	HV	66%	66%	66%	66%	HV Past Instructors
			LV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
			NV	34%	34%	34%	34%	
<b>15-20</b>	2	1	HV	50%	100%	100%	50%	
			LV	0%	0%	0%	50%	
			NV	50%	0%	0%	0%	HV Drug testing
<b>Over 20</b>	6	1.3	HV	100%	66%	83%	66%	
			LV	0%	34%	17%	34%	
			NV	0%	0%	0%	0%	
<b>Average for all Respondents</b>		<b>1.38</b>	<b>HV</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>62%</b>	
			<b>LV</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>31%</b>	
			<b>NV</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>			<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Category Rank 1**