

**The Bill Blackwood
Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas**

**Mandatory Emotional Intelligence (EI) Assessment During Law
Enforcement Hiring Process**

**A Leadership White Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Required for Graduation from the
Leadership Command College**

**By
Rene Alvarez**

**Georgetown Police Department
Georgetown, Texas
October 2020**

ABSTRACT

The law enforcement profession has used traditional assessment processes in which we have historically hired officers that are either smart, physically fit, or a combination of both. But, they do not typically do a thorough job assessing the officer's human relation skills. Law enforcement needs to include a standardized process that also measures an officer's "people skills" via an emotional intelligence assessment instrument.

Law enforcement organizations should include emotional intelligence assessment instruments as part of the hiring process. EI is a skill that can be learned, and it makes officers more effective and leads to them having a better work-life balance. EI improves the service delivery for both the external interactions and the internal interactions. EI assessment instruments have been scientifically researched, vetted and successfully used in the private industry with positive results to assess job performance. This testing should become part of every hiring process and it should also become a tradition into the future. Law enforcement organizations should not lower their standards or change what is currently working for them but they should include this type of testing to capture the area of the process that is missing, which is people skills.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	
Introduction	1
Position	3
Counter Arguments	9
Recommendation	20
References	24

INTRODUCTION

The law enforcement profession has applicants go through a very thorough hiring process. This is not a profession that typically hires based solely on a work application. Most organizations are hoping to find that perfect employee, the “cream of the crop”. Using traditional assessment processes, the law enforcement profession has historically hired officers that fit into one of three categories: smart, physically fit, or a combination of both, smart and physically fit.

Most law enforcement hiring processes start with a submission of an application which is typically highly scrutinized. It is then typically followed by a written exam or a civil service entrance exam. If an applicant passes this written exam, they are then asked to perform a physical agility or obstacle course. They are also asked to complete an extensive background gathering packet. Once the applicant passes the physical and background portions it will typically be followed by an oral board made up of varied departments or police personnel. If the applicant passes the oral board they are, in most processes, asked to submit to a psychological and medical exam, and in some cases, a lie detector test. And assuming the applicant passes these last two steps, they will subsequently be extended a job offer.

If the applicant can manage to get through this gauntlet of the hiring process, the presumption is that the organization has selected a worthy candidate from the masses of applicants. One researcher summarized hiring processes in a simplistic form. Hiring processes help organizations methodically gather information on select applicants. This information can then be used as base line information to further explore and select the best candidate that fits the organizational needs, and gives the organization a good

starting point to help assure that they are making good decisions versus potentially disastrous hiring decisions. These potentially disastrous decisions can have incredibly large negative impacts on the organization both financially and liability (Brennan, 2016). These processes become tools for an organization to make as best as an informed opinion and decision about a candidate that can with the information gathered.

But in this array of varied exams and evaluations, one area that the law enforcement hiring process does not do a thorough job assessing is the area of the officer's people skills, the ability to interact and communicate effectively with other humans. The predominant theme in law enforcement day-to-day operations at the front-line level is talking to citizens, suspects, witnesses, other law enforcement personnel, and many other important people, day in and day out. Goleman, author of several books on emotional intelligence (EI), also referred to as emotional quotient (EQ), summarizes that a person must be competent and able to manage two areas to function successfully in society: personal and social competencies and these competencies entail four emotional intelligence domains: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2004).

These four areas can be measured using an EI assessment instrument. To get a better picture of the person that is being hired, law enforcement organizations need to assess for candidates that also have strong skills and abilities in the control of their thoughts, emotions and impulses as well as having strong, effective ability talking to people and, lastly, having the motivation and empathetic characteristics much needed in this line of profession. These EI assessment tools are measurable and quantifiable. Successful law enforcement organizations need to include a thorough, standardized

process that also measures an officer's emotional intelligence. Law enforcement agencies should include emotional intelligence assessment instruments as part of their hiring process.

POSITION

Emotional intelligence (EI) assessment instruments as part of law enforcement hiring processes would cause the organization to embrace this concept as a valuable skill and improve their professional culture. EI is a necessary human relations skill all officers should have and develop during their career to create positive leadership habits and to promote within the department. EI needs to be defined for officers to begin to understand just how important it is.

EI is described as "the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thoughts, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 22). Mayer and Salovey were amongst the first researchers of emotional intelligence as a subset of the study of social intelligence and coined the term emotional intelligence. Police researcher Barath (2016) wrote that EI has many consistent definitions, coming from various sources. She summarized these various definitions and explained EI is primarily involved with the successful ability of understanding and recognizing feelings, motivation, and emotional management and most importantly, not only applying this within ourselves, but using this ability with others as well.

It is important that law enforcement organizations demand that personnel have or develop these EI skills, termed as competencies. These competencies transfer from

one to the other and are dependent of one another. The first competency is personal competency. Personal competency is comprised of two domains identified as self-awareness and self-management. Self-awareness domain has components that deal with emotional self-awareness. Self-management domain has components such as achievement orientation, adaptability, emotional self-control, and positive outlook.

The second competency is social competency. Social competency is comprised of two domains identified as social awareness and relationship management. Social awareness domain has components such as empathy and organizational awareness. Relationship management domain has components such as conflict management, coaching and mentoring, influence, inspirational leadership, and teamwork (Barath, 2016).

One of the many skills a successful law enforcement officer must possess is the ability to be a member of a team. This membership can be as a follower or a leader and must be able to transition between the two effectively and regularly. This is true functioning in an internal organization team, or externally with the community or other partners that law enforcement organizations regularly interact with. Many police organizations are introducing EI training at the recruit level. One such organization is the Ontario Police College. This is done in an effort to get the new officers to be aware of EI and its importance at the beginning of their career and to encourage them to continue to harness, develop and foster this important skill, throughout their career (Barath, 2016). Law enforcement personnel, or potential law enforcement personnel, should develop these four domains.

Another area that having EI skill is important is in officer's work-life balance. One study that measured the effects of EI on police officers' work-life balance indicated that EI is critical to work-life balance, but it also examined the organization's role of support as a moderator of this relationship. The study showed that EI was a significant predictor of work-life balance confirming the findings of two other research projects that have studied and confirmed the importance of EI and work-life balance. There have been studies that have found that EI is important for female employees to achieve a good work-life balance and another study that specifically studied the female employees of India which also found that EI is an important factor in balancing between work and family life in their country (Kumarasamy, Pangil, & Mohd, 2016). This research also confirmed the findings that organizational support is highly important in strengthening the relationship between EI and work-life.

Effective and efficient police officers must have a work-life balance and to do this, they must be skilled in EI and able to control emotions to meet the day to day operations of police work. For this to foster, organizations should provide support in the forms of peer counseling, individual and spousal/family counseling, critical incident training and programs, positive organizational changes and restructuring hiring and training programs (Kumarasamy, Pangil, & Mohd, 2016).

Law enforcement organizations can also encourage leadership and management skills to the line level officers, commit to measuring performance and productivity that concentrates on working hard, issue rewards for the jobs well done, establish parental leave policies, and consider many other creative approaches to increase work-life balance. These organizational approaches mitigate the stressful lifestyle change of

police work and help officers sustain their commitment and motivation towards their work.

Officers in today's policing world need to be highly motivated, have highly developed communication skills, and be able to manage relationships with all people they interact with for the success of the organization and to meet the needs of the community. Participants of this study overwhelmingly indicated that EI was among one of the most important factors that affected their work-life balance (Kumarasamy, Pangil, & Mohd Isa, 2016). Police organizations need to include EI assessment instruments as part of their hiring process, but more importantly, understand their role in the support of officers enhanced work-life balance.

Another reason law enforcement organization should include EI assessment instruments in their hiring process is because EI improves service delivery from the officer to the citizen and employee-supervisor interactions can be improved, resolved or avoided. Emotional intelligence is comprised of the four domains. Of the four domains, self-awareness is the most important. Even though they all interact and are dependent of each other, without a strong foundation in self-awareness, the other three domains cannot be properly developed if they do not have this domain (Tarallo, 2015).

If an officer has a low self-awareness domain, logically it would be difficult for that officer to admit mistakes if they have low self-awareness. An officer that cannot admit mistakes can create liability situations for the organizations and can make their own personal life more stressful. In a contextual environment of law enforcement, an officer possessing self-awareness would know their general behavior pattern when responding to the many types of situations that they face, such as communicating with difficult

people, dealing with demanding supervisors or high stress situations, and knowing how their emotions can influence their behavior. These officers would be able to admit mistakes (Al Ali, Garner, & Magadley, 2012).

When dealing with the domain of social awareness, it has the component of empathy. An officer that displays higher levels of empathy can be aware of the feelings of victims, witnesses, and citizens. Not only are they aware of the feelings, but they are able to understand and appreciate these feelings as well. In doing so, they can see and experience the perspective from that other person's point of view (Al Ali, Garner, & Magadley, 2012).

Officers with empathy typically and genuinely are interested and care for others. Empathy is a needed domain for effective collaboration and team building. Having empathy also allows officers to listen to the need of others such as co-workers, supervisors, and other team members. This allows the officer to understand or help other team members, even if decisions of the team are contrary to them (Tarallo, 2015).

As one police researcher on the topic of Recruiting for Emotional-Social Intelligence stated, "It is believed that people possessing high EQ's have better personal relationships outside of work, interact with their co-workers more productively, are less likely to engage in self- destructive behaviors and are a positive influence for those around them" (Nunez, 2015, p. 8). One of the most important reasons to recruit and hire officers with high levels of EI is to employ an organization that has personnel that can interact with their communities more professionally and genuinely by being able to manage their emotions through a strong awareness of their personal and social competencies. Further education, preferably testing, in the area of EI for existing

officers also could potentially lower the possibility for these officers to engage in organizational and self-destructive behaviors, or possibly suicide (Nunez, 2015).

One police organization that has implemented EI as part of their culture is the Denver (CO) Police Department (“Building an Emotionally Intelligent Agency,” 2018). Denver Police Department (DPD) has included EI in all recruits training for the last five years, starting in 2013. The department also includes training in EI to all corporals, sergeants and field training officers. DPD recognized that many interactions where officers were dealing with problematic citizens and interactions where supervisors were dealing with difficult employees, and vice versa, could be resolved, avoided, or improved if officers and supervisors improved their EI (“Building an Emotionally Intelligent Agency,” 2018).

DPD incorporated a contemporary field training officer model, referred to as “police training officer model” which includes EI as one of the core competencies that a new officer learns when in the new officer training program (“Building an Emotionally Intelligent Agency,” 2018). One of the discoveries the department has made is that although they teach EI at all levels, one domain they cannot teach is self-awareness, a critical foundation to EI. Self-awareness needs to be a competency that an officer is inherently natural in or has learned over an extended period. This supports the notion of seeking and recruiting officers with higher levels of EI using an EI assessment instrument.

The collective domains of EI are often referred to as emotional maturity, which translates to understanding how to control one’s emotional response and recognizing emotionally volatile situations when dealing with others. Historically, successful officers

have referred to the then unknown skill as a “soft” skill, or common sense, but now research and forward thinking, progressive departments know it as emotional intelligence (“Building,” 2018). It is imperative that the law enforcement profession embrace the EI movement by recruiting for individuals with high levels of EI and incorporate EI into their organizational training and culture.

COUNTER ARGUMENTS

Opponents of implementing emotional assessment instruments as part of their hiring process feel that the law enforcement traditional culture will not accept it. The culture of law enforcement tends to be cynical by nature, specifically, leading to question the validity and integrity of the instrument. Such thinking generates beliefs that the EI assessment instrument would not be a legitimate tool in assessing job performance, to include the cynicism that the applicant would be able to fake EI to score higher. Another culture aspect of law enforcement is the strong belief in tradition. Such new assessment instrument would question established hiring procedures and current assessment tools, making change not easily accepted.

Validity and integrity oppositions are a legitimate concern for law enforcement. Police officers’ integrity is the one most important thing that an officer can never lose in this profession. The same is true of an organization.

Bringing a new change to an organization requires much vetting process for the culture to accept. EI assessment instruments have been scientifically researched, vetted and successfully used in the private industry with positive results to assess job performance. These EI instruments, used along with other assessment instruments is a proven indicator of successful job performance. EI assessment instruments include

recognized tests such as the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQi), Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), and the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) (Conrad, 2008). These are a sample of ability and/or trait-based tests. These tests are a starting point for an organization to begin their research on which type test they could begin to use to identify specific areas in potential recruits for high EI and match for their organization. In a brief summary of the tests, the EQi measures how people assess their own EI, the MSCEIT measures their own EI strengths, and the ECI measures how others assess one's EI (Conrad, 2008).

Using an EI assessment instrument in the hiring process has proven effective in demonstrating job performance, along with much research in the area. One example of this is a study the United States Air Force conducted on EI and job performance. This was one of the largest studies involving the U.S. military (Tarallo, 2015). The study revealed the Air Force was having an issue in retaining recruiters assigned to the recruiting offices, indicating that they had a 50 percent turnover rate of recruiters in these offices. The Air Force implemented an EI initiative to resolve this issue. This EI initiative was so effective that recruiter retention went up significantly to 92 percent in one year as a result of this initiative. The first step of this initiative was to study the common EI qualities and skills of their existing top recruiting officers. This was then followed by using the information gathered in the first step to develop an assessment instrument to use in their selection process of new recruiters. The last step was to use this assessment instrument to evaluate, assess and select for these desired characteristics in the enlistment of the new recruiters (Tarallo, 2015). Nunez (2015) states of this same Air Force initiative and study, "The immediate gain was a saving of

\$3 million annually. These gains resulted in the Government Accounting Office submitting a report to Congress, which led to a request that the Secretary of Defense order all branches of the armed forces to adopt this procedure in recruitment and selection” (p. 10,11).

Another such example from the private industry of using EI assessment instruments in the hiring process was the L’Oréal Company. The L’Oréal Company study revealed that an EI assessment process was used for their hiring process. The process sought out prospective sales people that had a high level of EI. After selecting people from this process with high levels of EI for their sales staff, the company reported that this initiative contributed to their company sales increasing by \$2.5 million (Tarallo, 2015). Nunez (2015) reported of the same L’Oréal study, “These agents outsold other salespeople by \$91,370 for a net revenue increase of \$2,558,360. He added that high EQ employees had 63% less turnover during the first year than those selected in the typical manner” (p. 10).

In another such study from the private industry, this one related to sales agents for an undisclosed national insurance company, it was reported that a comparative analysis was conducted between agents that were low on EI competencies versus agents that were high on EI competencies. The study examined EI competencies such as self-confidence, initiative and empathy. The results revealed that the agents that were high in EI competencies averaged approximately \$114,000 worth of policy sales, and the agents that were low on EI competencies averaged approximately \$54,000 in sales (Nunez, 2015). The types of results that these studies indicate around job performance, motivation, and productivity would be a beneficial and desirable effect for

law enforcement organizations. Using EI assessment instruments in the hiring process could be an indication of similar results.

When it comes to the subject of the capability of faking a personality type assessment instrument, or scientifically termed as response distortion, research shows that it is possible to fake personality testing. Research done by researchers Day and Carroll (2008) defined faking as, "A conscious attempt to portray oneself favorably by purposely engaging in behaviors such as minimizing one's faults, exaggerating one's virtues, or misrepresenting one's attributes or qualifications" (p. 762). There has been much research showing that individuals that take personality tests fake their responses so that they can make themselves a more desirable candidate to employers. It is evidently clear that faking is a problem when an accurate assessment about a person's personality is an integral part of a selection process (Day & Carroll, 2008).

It goes without say that faking can have serious implications on organizational decisions. Although it is possible to fake in these EI assessment instruments, there are strategies and recommendations to reduce faking. When comparing two of the more effective and distinct EI assessment instruments, the MSCEIT and the EQ-i, the following research has been shown. This research was conducted using various methods of motivation, simulated job application processes, simulated non-applicant process, various instruction in controlled environments, and using realistic context and psychological engagement.

The MSCEIT is described as an ability-based, cognitive model and the EQ-i is described as a trait-based, non-cognitive model. What the research shows is that an ability-based EI assessment instrument such as the MSCEIT is preferable over a trait-

based, self-report type instrument such as the EQ-i. The research indicated that the MSCEIT test showed less susceptibility to faking than the EQ-i. The researchers articulated that for an EI test to be labeled as a true measurement assessment instrument, the test should 'act' like an intelligence measure. The MSCEIT provided the evidence needed for the construct validity of this test. EI should be considered, measured and used as an ability that cannot be faked. Pertaining to this requirement, the research showed that the participants were unable to increase their scores on the MSCEIT. The opposite findings were discovered of the EQ-i. The participants were able to significantly increase their scores, confirming it is solely a non-ability measurement of EI (Day & Carroll, 2008).

One strategy given was to warn applicants not to fake on personality measures of an EI assessment instrument. Empirical data has shown that warning applicants not to fake are an effective means of reducing the amount and level of faking that may occur. In an organizational setting, when selecting or hiring, the fear of getting caught or the consequences of getting caught faking has proven to control the amount of response distortion that occurs. Evidence indicates that the mere presence of management or the impression of management scales alone did not reduce faking (Day & Carroll, 2008).

Another strategy given, specifically to MSCEIT, was to identify 'experts' in emotion versus the consensus EI applicant test takers. Meaning, it is possible that a person that is an 'expert' in emotions would possibly be able to fake successfully on an MSCEIT. Although the research shows that this research group was not able to increase their score on the MSCEIT, it is conceivable that these 'experts' might be able

to. This becomes a concern if this 'expert' in EI does not necessarily have EI, meaning, that an 'expert' may know the correct answers and have high knowledge, but not necessarily behaving in an EI manner and showing low levels of ability (Day & Carroll, 2008).

The MSCEIT was demonstrated in this research to have the construct validity needed to dispute the integrity issues opponents may have. This high level of integrity is like traditional ability tests. This empirical evidence in this study is valuable for organizations who are currently using or considering using EI assessment instruments. This evidence can help inform decisions pertaining to which type EI assessment instrument to use and provides information about the appropriateness of organizations using these instruments for hiring selection processes (Day & Carroll, 2008).

The strong belief in tradition when it comes to hiring processes is also a valid concern for law enforcement organizations. Such new assessment instrument would question established hiring procedures and current assessment tools, making change not easily accepted. The idea of using EI assessment instruments in the hiring process is important, but most importantly it is intended to be used along with the existing tests, instruments, and hiring processes. The intention is to not replace the current processes or to rely solely on the EI assessment instrument to make hiring decisions. The criteria that organizations are looking for in potential applicants using traditional hiring methods is not different from what an EI assessment instrument would be used for, the only difference is that it now can be measurable and quantifiable.

There has been much research that indicates that EI assessment alone is not a valid indicator of job performance, but people with high EI have higher or improved job

performance than those that do not have high EI, particularly in occupations with high emotional job needs, such as law enforcement where high needs to manage their own and other's emotions is necessary as part of their job (Al Ali, Garner, & Magadley, 2012). EI is essential for police since the job is largely based on positive human contact through effective communication. The officer must have personal attributes that are critical for police officer positions such as the ability to recognize emotions, ability to express emotions, the ability to have empathy (which is critical when dealing with witnesses and victims), the ability to monitor emotions, ability to regulate and control emotions, ability to value themselves and have self-concept (especially when dealing with the negative environments that they operate in including how the media can sometimes portray them), ability to perform on a team, ability to problem solve, the ability to resolve conflict effectively and the ability to regulate their own reactions to others and varying situations (Al Ali, Garner, & Magadley, 2012).

Researcher Sanders (2003) states, "One of the most frequently tested traits in the selection process is intelligence or cognitive ability. Generally policing research tends to support the idea that smarter officers do better in the training academy, however, this may not be related to actual on-the-job performance" (p. 314). Intelligence testing is an effective way of identifying those that have low abilities, but this test alone does not predict an applicant that will have a good job performance, but solely predict ability, meaning that a high intelligence quotient (IQ) score cannot predict good school or work performance, but on the contrary, a low IQ score can predict poor school or work performance. So, essentially, cognitive tests should be supported with other testing and assessment to find the best candidates.

One of the ways this is done in law enforcement hiring processes is to pair cognitive testing with psychological testing. Psychological testing has been used to try and predict job performance by assessing personality traits. The three most commonly used psychological tests used in law enforcement are the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the California Personality Inventory (CPI), and the Inwald Personality Inventory (IPI) (Sanders, 2003). The MMPI is the most frequently used of the three and the IPI was specifically created for police applicants, and the other two are designed for general psychological assessments for many occupations.

Psychological testing is a very frequent and commonly accepted practice in police hiring processes. Prediction with these tools is difficult. Ash et al. goes on to say, "While the MMPI is the most commonly used psychological test, research results regarding effectiveness have been mixed (Ash et al., 1990)" (as cited by Sanders, 2003, p. 319). Aylward states "The predictive value of psychological tests such as the MMPI, CPI, and IPI has been called "at best sketchy" (as cited by Sanders, 2003, p. 319). Research has shown that psychological assessments are acceptable at predicting good police performance, but they are not entirely reliable for this assessment and will have little value at which applicant will make a good police officer.

Research goes on to say such things as MMPI does not have the ability to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful police officers, MMPI is not able to assess for police job performance because it is not designed specifically for police work or test for police related skills, and these type tests tend to be more apt to identify and eliminate those applicants that possess severe personality abnormalities that are undesirable to police work as opposed to identify job performance (Sanders, 2003).

Applicants can further be eliminated in the hiring process with back ground checks or oral boards for past job history, lack of integrity, drug use, or criminal behavior.

Assessment centers can be used to measure ability as it relates to the job, have been validated and have been used successfully. When all these various types of assessments are used together, it can enhance the selection process greatly to distinguish the people that are not desirable. One of the major deficiencies of using assessment instruments for organizations in their hiring processes is the lack in ability to test and measure for desirable personality attributes that can also predict job performance (Sanders, 2003).

One way of doing this is to keep the processes in place that law enforcement organizations are already using and simply include EI assessment instruments to the existing process. Researcher Adetula (2016) found that emotional intelligence ability measurement single handedly can predict job performance in most cases, but it cannot predict job performance of law enforcement. He found that social intelligence ability measurement is a much stronger predictor of job performance for law enforcement on its own, much better than emotional intelligence. Adetula (2016) also found that cognitive intelligence ability measurement is one of the best predictors of job performance alone. He states, "Finally, this study concludes that when emotional, social, and cognitive intelligence are considered separately, their individual contributions may not be reliable as a significant predictor of job performance, but when considered jointly, they make a higher predictive contribution to job performance" (Adetula, 2016, p. 161-162). When a law enforcement organization is seeking effectiveness in the hiring process for the selection of the most desirable applicants, the research shows that

social, emotional, and cognitive intelligences and abilities are not strong alone, but when they are combined they are a strong indicator of job performance (Adetula, 2016).

Opponents to EI assessment instruments in the hiring process also feel the cost is too high to implement such a change to their existing processes. The existing processes are already very expensive and complex. Adding an additional EI assessment instrument can significantly change the associated cost and budget set aside for a hiring process. Assessing for EI during a hiring process can also seem to be a difficult, additional task to an already complex process. In general, organizations do not do a good job of evaluating for EI in applicants. Organizations typically do not screen for EI abilities, this EI data is not easily extrapolated from their existing data on an individual, and organizations are rarely trained on what to look for or how to retrieve this information. However, it is possible to hire individuals with higher levels of EI, without costly 'personality tests' or hiring firms, if we simply design good questions intended to gather information around EI abilities and skills. These EI designed questions can be used during initial interviews, oral boards, or anywhere strategically throughout a hiring process. It does not have to be expensive to adjust this in existing processes (McKee, 2016).

McKee (2016) suggested that personality tests should not be used in place of EI tests. She also suggested not using a self-report test and emphasized that a 360-degree feedback instrument is not a replacement for EI assessment instruments as well. These types of devices can be used for development but not for evaluation purposes. She also went on to suggest that a good starting point is to get references and talk to them to get actual, specific, detailed descriptions of the applicant. When

interviewing the applicant, questions based on EI capabilities should be used, but more importantly do not allow the applicant to be vague and ask good follow up questions. A determination of how the applicant truly is and how they truly behave, is more important than what they think they are or what they would like to be (McKee, 2016).

Conrad (2008) states, "The first step to implement emotional intelligence is to develop interview questions designed to assess self-awareness, interpersonal skills, stress management, adaptability, optimism and level of happiness" (p. 108). He suggests this as a proactive and cost-effective approach early on to reduce the reactive response of having to deal with employees that have attitude problems and should have not been hired in the first place. He continues to suggest that these types of questions help set desired behavior. He also suggests implementing various related questions, such as having to do with how an applicant manages stress, or to describe when an applicant's empathetic ability was used with co-workers or customers to solve problems (Conrad, 2008).

Other recommendations from writer and researcher Bielaszka-DuVernay (2008) suggests interview questions to the applicant that pertain to the applicant's mood, conflict with peers, direct reports, or boss and including how it started and how it was resolved. There is an endless possibility of questions and there is not a set amount of questions. There are books written, such as the EQ Interview authored by Adele B. Lynn, that can help organizations develop EI type questions (Bielaszka-DuVernay, 2008). Tarallo (2015) adds that interviews should not be focused on determining an applicant's technical abilities, but most importantly on the applicant's experiences. It is important to ask applicants questions that demonstrate how the applicant used EI in the

past and to focus more on how the situation was handled and how they dealt with it, rather than trying to determine if the applicant demonstrates certain levels of competency or expertise.

But a much more important thing to consider when using EI interview questions during an interview to assess an applicant is the emotional intelligence of the interviewers. The interviewers must be strong in the area of emotional intelligence and they must be listening actively, using empathy during the interview, making sure they are aware of their own biases, and deciphering the responses for emotional intelligence competencies, components, and characteristics that are desirable to effectively operate in their organization successfully (Tarallo, 2015).

RECOMMENDATION

Law enforcement organizations that want to be innovative, progressive, and professional should consider including an assessment instrument that measures for emotional intelligence into their hiring process. Law enforcement operates in a world and time where transparency, accountability and positive community engagement are necessary for successful and effective organizations. Law enforcement organizations must now put a higher value on emotionally intelligent officers. These officers are able to better control conflicts that lead to stronger problem solving and creative conclusions. This higher level of emotional intelligence is safer and healthier to the officer, the citizen and the organization.

Although there has been limited research on the effectiveness of EI in policing, the existing research overwhelmingly supports that higher levels of EI, along with other traits and characteristics, account for higher job performance (Adetula, 2016). It goes

without saying that officers require higher levels of EI since the work of an officer predominately is based on human contact, effective teamwork, and high ability to deal with negative situations. Although each community is different, a fundamental skill all officers should have is the ability to effectively communicate and be able to simply work well with others. These qualities are important not only with external organizational interactions, but internal interactions as well (Al Ali, Garner, & Magadley, 2012).

Hiring processes using traditional methods do not need to change. All the various assessments currently used provide useful, valid information. All that is recommended is to include an assessment instrument that measures EI during the hiring process to complement the existing processes. This EI assessment instrument will work effectively with current methods, to include cognitive and psychological testing. Research shows that when these existing methods and EI testing are used together, it greatly increases the job performance predictability and gives a much higher predictability if an applicant will make a good police officer (Adetula, 2016). This increased job performance includes areas such as an enhanced community interaction with citizens and an enhanced quality of work-life balance for the officer. EI is a skill that can be learned, makes officers more effective and leads to them having a better work-life balance. EI improves the service delivery for both the external interactions and the internal interactions (Nunez, 2015).

Opponents of EI assessment instruments in the hiring process criticize this process in two ways. These opponents are opposed to the change of traditional processes that have been used for many years and refuse to accept it into the police culture by criticizing the validity and integrity of the assessment (Sanders, 2003).

Another way the opposition counters this is by criticizing the cost of the instrument, by using the faulty reasoning that the cost is too high to implement this assessment instrument into the current hiring process (McKee, 2016).

Research has shown that EI assessment instruments have been scientifically researched, vetted and successfully used in the private industry with positive results to assess job performance (Day & Carroll, 2008). Although it is possible to fake in some of these EI assessment instruments, there are strategies and recommendations to reduce or affect faking responses. One prevalent strategy was to use ability based EI tests versus personality based tests (Day & Carroll, 2008). The idea of using EI assessment instruments in the hiring process is important, but most importantly it is intended to be used along with the existing tests, instruments, and hiring processes – not to replace any of the existing processes.

Finally, if an organization truly cannot see the value in investing in an EI assessment instrument or simply cannot afford to do this, solutions for this have been offered by researchers of the topic. This can be done by honing the interview process to create and ask questions with the purpose of identifying candidates with high EI based on experience, instead of asking questions that focus on abilities or competency, and equally as important having those interviews conducted and evaluated by evaluators that are trained or possess higher levels of EI themselves (Tarallo, 2015).

Law enforcement organizations need to take a leadership role and implement EI assessment instruments into the hiring process. This testing should become part of every hiring process and it should also become a tradition into the future. Law enforcement organizations should not lower their standards or change what is currently

working for them but include this type of testing to capture the area of the process that is missing a measurement and traditionally have not done a good job assessing – people skills. This type of organizational fortitude will increase officer and agency performance and professionalism, increase public trust, increase transparency, and increase collaboration with the community. EI is a necessity, not an option.

REFERENCES

- Adetula, G. A. (2016). Emotional, social, and cognitive intelligence as predictors of job performance among law enforcement agency personnel. *Journal of Applied Security Research, 11*(2), 149–165.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610.2016.1137175>
- Al Ali, O. E., Garner, I., & Magadley, W. (2012). An exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance in police organizations. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 27*(1), 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-011-9088-9>
- Barath, I. (2016, August - October). Emotional intelligence components. *Women Police, 16*–18.
- Bielaszka-DuVernay, C. (2008, November). Hiring for emotional intelligence. *Harvard Management Update, 13*(11), 3–5.
- Brennan, J. J. (2016, July). The use of assessment tools in hiring. *Security, 53*(7), 30.
- Building an emotionally intelligent agency. (2018, October). *Police Chief, 85*(10), 22.
- Conrad, J. (2008, September). What's your EQ? *Security, 45*(9), 108.
- Day, A. L., & Carroll, S. H. (2008). Faking emotional intelligence (EI): Comparing response distortion on ability and trait-based EI measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*(6), 761–784.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2004). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

- Kumarasamy, M. M., Pangil, F., & Mohd Isa, M. F. (2016, September). The effect of emotional intelligence on police officers' work–life balance. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 18(3), 184–194.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: educational implications*. Retrieved from http://ei.yale.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/pub219_Mayer_Salovey_1997.pdf
- McKee, A. (2016, February 5). How to hire for emotional intelligence. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*.
- Nunez, E. R. (2015). Recruiting for emotional-social intelligence (ESI): Enhancing leadership, performance, community trust, and saving lives. *Journal of California Law Enforcement*, 49(3), 6–13. Retrieved from <https://cpoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-Journal-Vol-49-No-3.pdf>
- Sanders, B. A. (2003). Maybe there's no such thing as a "good cop". *Policing*, 26(2), 313–328.
- Tarallo, M. (2015, September). Harnessing the power of emotion. *Security Management*, 59(9), 66–71. Retrieved from <https://sm.asisonline.org/Pages/Harnessing-the-Power-of-Emotions.aspx>