

Conceptual Framework: Measuring Police Performance and Efficiency. The Types of “Quality” Indicators in Foreign Researches¹

VÁRI Vince²

The “orthodoxy” of efficiency is essentially nothing else than the practical and rational usage of resources and expences/costs in order to produce the desired product or service. Its axiom is that all production branches, processes and services need to be rationalized, for which inputs/expenditures can be minimalized and profits can be maximalized. Whether the police, as a safety supplier, in their own social context/environment (in case of service users) and in order to increase satisfaction and trust (I mean profit), exploit all the opportunities (i.e. make optimal use of the conditions, that is rationalize) that socially and politically determine their organizational structure and operation. In order to interpret the frames of an efficient police, it is important to identify the targets of law enforcing, because efficiency can only be evaluated in the dimension of achieving those targets. It cannot be anything else than complying with the law, ensuring the rule of law and the protection of human rights as constitutionally identified targets. Therefore, traditional market instruments are not suitable for measuring the quality and efficiency of the police. In order to talk about efficiency measurement, it is necessary to develop the indicators that, in line with the social aims of the police, are suitable to show the defence capabilities of law enforcement. Therefore, at the forefront of our research the social purposes are significant, not the organizational ones. Organizational purposes can be considered as the indicators of inner effectiveness, as a quality index. Producing performance values specified by the organization itself within the burocratic framework, however, may easily conflict with the effectiveness interpretations of other fields of justice, but mainly those expressed by the society.³ Therefore, developing the indicators that indicate the quality of its social functioning and effects is crucial, not its organizational one. “Until the police measure their own performance by their own standards, they will not be able to get an objective picture about the fulfillment of their own social role.”⁴ In that regard, by qualitative indicators we mean the results and effectiveness of the fulfillment of social purposes.

¹ The work was created in commission of the National University of Public Service under the priority project PACSDOP-2.1.2-CCHOP-15-2016-00001 entitled “Public Service Development Establishing Good Governance” in the István Egyed Postdoctoral Program.

² VÁRI Vince, PhD, Police Major, Assistant Lecturer, NUPS Faculty of Law Enforcement, Institute of Criminal Sciences, Department of Criminal Procedure Law.

orcid.org/0000-0001-6416-1645. vari.vince@uni-nke.hu

³ Vári (2015)

⁴ Tihanyi (2013) 8.

Quality as the Decisive Attribute of Efficiency

*Efficiency to the output performance of the police may be approached from an organizational and functional side. By organizational performance we mean the figures that can be numerically and statistically articulated and functionally measured in the outside world. We mean the effects in an open system, i.e. all the indicators that show the quality of the performance the police demonstrated towards their environment in a certain period of time.*⁵

From the side of system theory, the characteristic features of an “open system” permeate the system of the police and the community as well, however, in an economic interpretation, the notion of efficiency operates with contradictory semantic units. In this context, *efficiency and effectiveness are not equivalent semantically*. According to Vass Kálmán, only those activities may be effective that are successful/efficient, but a certain result may be achieved in several ways. On the other hand, successful operation cannot always be regarded as effective operation, as for the spending.⁶

Efficiency, also in case of the police means more and something else than simply being successful/efficient, either in case of law enforcement or economy. The difference between the two notions is essentially caused by the particular normative based dependence within the judicial system, and is given by the complicated relationship between the constituents with the same and different objectives, but it also is elusive. Let us have a look on the contradictions of legitimacy and efficiency. According to Skolnick, the main problem of democratic social law enforcement may be that there is a contradiction between the police’s endeavours to be efficient and the requirements of legitimacy.⁷

On the other hand, the environment – the inhabitants – that integrates police, as indicators measurable at the scene of the result, may not be covered by the traditional output results of the organization. In the environment, efficiency in the community may hardly be influenced by the output results of the organization, and show little interaction with social utility. *It is easier in case of an enterprise as its profitability can be measured in an exact way, so the compulsion of development guarantees gain/grow only together with increasing efficiency. However, in the absence of exact numbers, the efficiency of public administration cannot be measured by quantitative indicators, and if it is attempted, it will have consequences that hide low efficiency and discredits statistics.*⁸ In international literature, distinction between result indicators (output) and simple output indicators (outcome) is a fundamental point. When measuring “output”, inner performance strongly correlates with the desired police performance results. Achieving them completely, comes under the direct control of the police. These are, for example, the number of arrests, taking ups and procedures in case of crimes or antisocial behaviour in connection with prostitution. A certain police force exactly controls the former’s num-

⁵ Gajduschek (2009)

⁶ Vass (1985)

⁷ Skolnick (1975) 3.

⁸ Finszter (2008) 14.

ber, that is, they direct the suitable time and resource in order to absolve/achieve the given output. On the other hand, the results, contrary to the simple output indicators, contain social advantages, as well in connection with what policemen “extract” with regard to the volume. Output indicators encourage policemen one by one and also as an organization to focus on increasing exclusively certain easily quantified results, while disregarding any other aspects that would have socially deeper effects.⁹

At an organizational level, efficiency may mean the efficiency of the whole organization, or the efficiency of one’s work. In case of an organization, individual performance assessments may also cumulatively give the summary/aggregate, averaged, exact performance indicators of the whole organization’s performance. *Still, the mode of action of efficiency typically has a meaning requesting interpretation from a functional aspect since its ambivalence. The police, as an organization, when fulfilling the performance indicators specified by themselves may be opposed to the real requirements and needs expressed by the community.* It means that the useless activities – according to the society – of the organization or producing “inner” indicators realised during its disfunctional operation, seemingly lead to performance growth. But at a social level, an organisation that conceptionally and strategically does not function properly and according to real social requirements, its performance appearing in its outer environment, paradoxically still generates negative social appraisal.

Efficiency as the Balance of a System and its Environment

In *Roelofse’s* model, police organization appears embedded into society, where the essence of a closed and open system depends on where a police officer is personally situated in its own police organization. If at the borderline of their organisation and society, with the opportunity of crossing it is a positive factor, however, if closed in its own organisation with the burden of poor communication, secrecy and opposition, effort to homogenise the whole organisation will not be an operational construction.¹⁰

According to the functional system theory conception, in my opinion the efficiency of the police as a system may not be interpreted regardless of its social environment. According to *Szikinger*, “outwards” the whole society means the environment of police criminal investigation. Mainly the police give the “input” of the whole criminal justice system.¹¹ *Finszter Géza* also specifies separately the public safety system: he means all the legal rules, state entities, social organizations, enterprises, tasks and functions whose designation is to protect the whole society, the community and individuals against unlawful human behaviour. *The product of public safety system can be inferred from the modern views of public safety, that is nothing else than the mutual product produced by those who took part in the cooperation.*¹² If public safety is the output of the system,

⁹ Davis (2015)

¹⁰ Roelofse (2013)

¹¹ Szikinger (2002) 25.

¹² Finszter (2010) 150.

its quality can be examined from all the aspects of reality in the light of efficiency. *So public safety represents an output result in the form of social perception or general and collective feeling in connection with that.* Judicial statistics and the efficiency of the police become to be interpreted in that respect. Criminal investigation partly overlaps with the public safety system by Finszter and the law enforcement subsystem, but in a stricter sense it is only determined in connection with the police that ensures public security.

The parts of the system:

- Police model, style, organisational culture.
- The structural and organisational parts of the body. Significant part of the research results suggests that using government resources is related to the number of crimes and the ratio of reconnaissance.¹³
- The characteristics of operation as the openness of internal and external communication.
- The ability and willingness of reflection on itself, that is the endeavour to undisguisedly show real efficiency, its meaning and level of quality.

According to *David Easton*, American political scientist, police are situated in the social environment as an “empty square” and there are claims and expectations against them, but of course there are supports, as well, without which the organisation would not be able to fulfill its basic function. A system operating in such circumstances achieves results, produces values or fails, which then has an impact on the organization itself.¹⁴ *Loubet de Bayle* said something similar and highlighted the separate role of the police. According to him, police is the “black box” of the society, in which the crop deriving from all of their harmful mechanisms goes into the box.¹⁵

On the contrary, by efficiency *Rutherford* means cost-efficient criminal proceeding, that is to achieve that criminal justice should work with the highest efficiency with using the available personal and fixed assets.¹⁶ In case of the police, from a cost-efficient point of view, the clearance rates of crimes and the rapidity of dealing with a criminal case are not proportionate to the investments in justice. On the basis of this principle, system and efficiency have become coherent concepts/notions. Partial approach to the efficiency of the police has crawled into the head of Hungarian theoretical researchers as well, and led to theories that helped to compromise with the equivalence of clearance rates with unknown perpetrators and the efficiency of criminal investigation. In this approach, efficiency can also be interpreted as something that expresses the standard and quality of using resources for specific purposes.¹⁷ *Whereas, police may never be really efficient from only a cost-benefit perspective for the simple reason that the requirement of legality conflicts with the authority effectiveness which is a mission that hides in the utilitarian*

¹³ Newburn–Reiner (2012)

¹⁴ Easton (1965) 32.

¹⁵ Bayle (1992)

¹⁶ Rutherford (1987)

¹⁷ Sebesi (1992)

*approach, and it causes such an irresolvable paradox that basically hinders reasonable and target-oriented operation.*¹⁸ Undoubtedly, assuring the legal practice of clients' rights makes investigations slower and longer by spoiling the efficiency and speed of criminal investigation. Otherwise, considering obeying fair and legal proceedings, the costs of applying coercive measures and expert evidences are also significant cost increasing factors. Applying the same approach, efficiency may be only observed in system theory, that is the operation of the factors needed to achieve "order" and steady-state. It means nothing else than the quality of the interaction with its external environment (police-society).

The indicators of the quality aspect of interaction can be found in the legal nature of differentiated institutions that show the flexibility and openness of the system, and also in the case selection mechanisms used due to the lack of capacity, and also in the domination of statistical approach. *All these, by endeavouring to maintain the appearance of balance, are able to temporarily gloss over reality that shows disorder.* The system defends itself against the increasing "negative" judgement of the environment by propagating these factors. The formula is simple: if there was a balance between the system, namely the police, and its external environment, namely the society, such question would not arise that subjective sense of security – and objective security situation are not homogeneous notions/concepts, therefore ambivalence in this model is an incidental consequence.¹⁹ *Balance means the efficient operation of the police, and views, interests and approaches that are remote from each other mean the level of disintegration and the lack of efficiency.*

Consequently, efficiency is not a phenomenon in a schematic objective-asset construction, but in the steady-state of the system and its environment. *The basic requirements of achieving the balance are: directness, honesty, attention, interaction, openness, communication, flexibility, humanity and trust.* But if the police as a system communicates and shows the quality of their own environment's integration as if it was free from disturbance and problems, meanwhile citizens – therefore the public – do not feel the same, then it will be the engine of ambivalence. According to *Menyhay*, the balance-model shows in the simplest way how easily people may get into ambivalent situations without being aware of ambivalence. Ambivalence can cause serious damage to complex social processes as well.²⁰ Open systems must naturally be in line with their environment, on the other hand, the performance of closed systems can be measured by themselves, and in that case openness may come at the cost of their social mission. That often means that distancing from the environment creates the arsenal of rituals and initiation ceremonies, and members distinguish themselves from those who are not part of the system. It could involve uniform and other distinguishing marks.²¹ *Like anywhere else in the world, police do not function as a closed system in Hungary, their endeavour to be closed is caused by the mutual distrust against society, and this has an adverse effect on the efficiency of the system.*

¹⁸ Kertész (1977)

¹⁹ Tihanyi (2017)

²⁰ Menyhay (1998) 197.

²¹ Finszter (2006)

The character of the relationship of interdependence between the system and its environment can excellently be seen in the organisation and operation of the system, thus an autoriter, hierarchic organisational model may not deny paternalism, and may not voice either “citizen-friendliness” or the priority of climate of confidence, otherwise it shall easily find itself in the whirl of the contradiction of reality and rhetoric. *Distrust against the management system itself has justified keeping the centralised form by politics, as they see equality, public security and more effective actions against corruption granted/ensured in that way.* According to Korinek, after passing the Police Act, uniformity was broken through by politics several times, as it operates three types of police (police with a general competence, counterterrorist and interior defence).²² Meanwhile, the autoriter management model of the organisation creates high social dependence, and its rational consequence is expecting the “solution” from upwards. Despite this, tension is rather caused by ambiguous communication and unclear responsibility system, which undoubtedly leads to the increase of “deceit”. From that, the distrust of the environment may be dealt with as the natural and inherent dimension/projection of the system. Skolnick considers pressures coming from society on the police, as environmental factors. According to him, due to the pressure on police officers, police value system highlights efficiency and not lawful procedures; however, police propaganda itself creates increased expectations for requirements against the police since it emphasises how much police officers are able to do in order to ensure *tranquillitas publica* –thus in the field of public order and criminal investigation.²³

In this approach the complex, multidimensional efficiency of the police is nothing else than its quality isolated in its external environment, which cannot be indicated by statistics based traditional efficiency measurement indicators that operate in the currently used causal scheme. Consequently, from only a negative side, indicators of complex efficiency can be established by a kind of transmission, such as for example:

- characters of the organisational and operational system (the lack of authoritarianism, well functioning incentive scheme, supporting innovation, existence of cooperative mechanisms, characters of internal and external communication, the principles of management selection, etc.)
- the quality of organisational culture (open or closed)
- public satisfaction, mutual confidential relationship (citizens–organisation, client–police officer)
- the lack of statistical approach with a quantity mission
- the effects and levels of bureaucracy (case selection mechanism, latency)
- processual truth and actual/real legitime procedural rules in legislative exercise
- applying efficiency measurement methods that present social effects as well, and the transparency of their results

²² Korinek (2015) 29.

²³ Skolnick (2009) 109.

Indicators (Predictors) Determining Trust in the Police in International Researches

Measuring the performance of the police has become an increasingly important research field in several countries. However, there is no scientific agreement concerning the applied forms and methods of efficiency measurement. It is also debated which indicators should be used from the different ones in order to promote better performance. On the other hand, there is a full agreement that efficiency measurement is potentially an excellent policy and professional instrument, and may have an effect on the work and judgement of the police. International literature published since the 1970s can be arranged by several methodological aspects, mainly depending on whether scientists gave priority to quantitative or qualitative, objective or subjective factors. Nevertheless, the question of efficiency measurement is of a really sensitive nature, as in case of a bad concept or law enforcement philosophy, police authorities easily make the mistake of emphasising administrative indicators that were simply and routinely collected, meanwhile they are incomplete and have less contextual values. Therefore, the most important starting question of researches is determining performance indicators properly. Its shadow phenomenon or negative side-effect is distorting statistics in order to achieve the targeted performance objectives and requirements. Considering the selection of indicators, international research results have highlighted an interesting paradox: the more beneficial an indicator is, the less it is available, in addition, it can only be produced expensively. Simple indicators that can cheaply be “extracted” from the routinely collected administrative data – crime rates, effectiveness of criminal investigations, clearance rates, response times, and other similar things – are typically the least informative ones regarding real performance, and have a higher risk of negative side-effects. More informative indicators such as satisfaction with the police, fair procedures (treatment by the police), the latency of certain crime categories, are the hardest and much more expensive to grasp, and they often require dedicated surveys.

In her study, Hinds (2009) analyses the effect of police officers–civilians encounter on people, she distinguishes former and later contacts, and also whether they are initiated by citizens or police officers and which one has a greater role in forming satisfaction, i.e. trust. In accordance with the former researches of Rosenbaum et al. (2005), he points out that the negative experience of police contacts initiated by civilians have resulted in more significant negative change in attitude at the police, whereas, negative experience coming from contacts initiated by the police did not change the attitude towards the police so much. These results indicate that if people’s expectations on police encounters initiated by themselves are not fulfilled, the effect is more negative as, in that case, people’s expectations are higher. During encounters initiated by the police, people’s expectations are lower, therefore their attitude towards the police is less influenced by negative encounters. It is in accordance with the theory of terminating expectations, according to which people’s expectations form the apperception in connection with the certification/classification of police services. Hinds concludes

that the police is able to improve citizens' satisfaction on their own, thereby to improve positively people's opinion on the legitimacy of the police by accepting practices and procedures that the majority considers to be fair. Changing practices and procedures that lead to dissatisfaction with the police during the encounters (measures), is clearly a productive strategy. It can be stated that the police cannot significantly improve their performance in connection with crime control, quasi their quantitative indicators, but in the long-term they can also do so if they use every opportunity when they come into contact with citizens.

As an alternative solution, in international literature several models have already been recommended to measure the efficiency of the police. DEA methodology may be regarded as almost an independent category, and on that basis, the performance of the police may be based on "objective" input and output measures. The "most efficient" comparison of such was done by Drake and Simper: they compared forty-three police forces from a crime-geography point of view using the DEA analysis, which made it possible to examine the effects of environmental factors from the aspect of the effectiveness and efficiency of measures. They have found that environmental factors significantly influence the relative performance rank of police forces. In case of the North-Welsh police, the relative performance rank changed in a way that counting such factors as, e.g. the average of the population, one-parent families and population density brought the North-Welsh police to the 1st position from the 30th position.²⁴

According to Moore and Braga (2004), by increasing the number of arrests and apprehensions, crime reduction for the benefit of the community cannot be reached. In their opinion, there are several other things that can influence crime reduction by having a greater influence on society. In their study, Charbonneau and Riccucci (2008) outline the importance of the factors of social equity when measuring the performance of the police. They suggest social equity indicators, including the assessment of fair treatment, that is similar to the so called "fairness of the procedure". In connection with trust in the police, a research has confirmed that the community's trust in the police primarily depends on demographic, attitudinal and environmental factors.

The authors Jang, Joo and Zhao (2010) note that several predictors show the situation of trust. One of them is the legitimacy of the values of homicides/murders and democracy, and their social institutionalisation. In those countries where homicide rates are higher, people have less trust in the police. Analysing the institutions of democracy, they have found that public trust is directly connected to them. They have also found significant predictors on the basis of individual variables, such as age and educational qualification. They have discovered a positive correlation between the conservative values system, personal satisfaction and trust in the police. In accordance with the attitudinal and social context indicators, lower trust in the police may usually be expected in deviant subcultures. Cao and his colleagues (2012) used multilevel data of 50 nations

²⁴ Drake-Simper (2005)

to examine the role of economic inequality, but they did not find them significant when explaining trust in the police. In another national research, they looked for correlation with trust on the basis of the level of differentiated democracy.²⁵ Generally, in democratic countries police think that they maintain social order by strictly and fairly implementing laws, and democratic governance means involving citizens in social decision making, thereby creating trust in the government.

Perhaps the most important study on citizens' trust in the police has been Tankebe's research (2010) so far. It includes the three dimensions of trust in the police: 1. reliability; 2. efficiency; 3. fairness of the procedure. Results show that indirect, non-personal experiences in connection with police corruption and misuse significantly reduced positive replies to questions concerning trust in the police. The reason for the non-significant difference may be that those who replied had no personal experience in connection with police corruption. On the other hand, it is a fact that assessing police reforms increased public trust.

Jang-Lee (2015) examined trust in the police with both individual and national variables on the basis of 83 thousand questionnaires from 57 countries, from the point of view of the government and corruption at the same time. The primary finding of the current study was the harmful effect of corruption on the trust in the police. It suggests that the police may enjoy advantages by increasing the fight against corruption, but ensuring state and government aids and complex background is still of paramount importance. It is especially true if the level of homicide rate and governmental corruption confuse the common effect of the national level of democracy. It is likely, that homicide rate and fear of crimes and corruption significantly influence the level of democracy and trust in the police. In a country with a high homicide rate, citizens have lower trust in the police.²⁶ To sum up, these results imply that the public expect the police to be accountable in connection with crimes, just like the fight against corruption. The study focuses on trust in governments via individual modelling. Not surprisingly, there was a positive correlation between trust in the government and trust in the police. The objective of the approach was to check the unknown correlation between trust in the state and trust in the police. In case of older and female citizens, the police have higher level of trust than in case of younger and male ones. Meanwhile, education had a negative connection with trust in the police, in accordance with the former findings.²⁷ Concerning the two attitude variables on individual level, contrary to the inclination toward crimes, public order had a negative connection with trust in the police, which also confirms the former findings.²⁸ This finding may be accepted in a sense that people with strong deviant inclination do not like the police, and that such an antipathy may lead to lack of trust. Those who evaluated democracy in their countries, mostly had higher trust in the police. The results of this study, namely, that low governmental corruption, trust in the government and people's democratic outlook suggest that the police may

²⁵ Cao-Zhao (2005)

²⁶ Hurst-Frank (2000); Payne-Gainey (2007); Van Dijk (2001); Weitzer-Tuch (2005)

²⁷ Scaglione-Condon (1980); Stack-Cao (1998); Tankebe (2010)

²⁸ Cao et al. (2012); Jang and et al. (2010)

improve their own satisfaction indicators by exploiting people's participating in police work, as the community police model also indicates that, and may be also improved by increasing transparent operations. A research based on preferring certain political parties and on belonging to a certain race has revealed that liberal individual attitude, contrary to the conservative one, supposed a higher trust in the police, similarly, the black judge the police significantly worse than the white.²⁹

In his study, Sung (2006) justifies that non-democratic countries and developed democracies show the highest level of police efficiency, whereas, countries situated on the middle-level of democracy show lower police performance. According to the comprehensive and complex research made with using information from 59 countries, in "interim" societies the inevitably required comprehensive reform of the police often reduces the efficiency of it in crime control, in that initial phase of the democratisation process. This deteriorating trend is often aggravated by weakening traditional social controls and by the effects of the media, which actively contribute to crime stories are better publicised, therefore citizens' fear of crimes increase, and the renomé of the police decrease because of the news on police corruption. The lack of safe environment due to the efficiency of the police became of a critical importance in the mid-phase of democratic development, just when democratic institutions already exist but "the basic and necessary elements of democratic law enforcement" are not ensured yet.

In the United States and in other developed democracies, the progress towards the implementation of fair and efficient law enforcement inevitably implies its slowdown and deadlock if universal suffrage is not accompanied by equal opportunities. Maybe, it is not simply a coincidence, that the winners of police efficiency are the best performing countries of this trend, such as Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Canada and Australia. These countries have the most developed systems of welfare reallocation and also have the lower level of income inequalities. Making the police more efficient and more humanitarian requires greater and more comprehensive reform than reorganising and operationally restructuring the police. It must be added, that citizens' temporary dissatisfaction with governmental functions is neither unusual nor necessarily problematic. However, there is a serious concern if chronic dissatisfaction with the police in more important segments of the population becomes more usual and changes into distrust in its democratic operation. The citizens of countries undergoing democratisation have greater needs for higher performance of their governments and especially police forces. The question is: how can it be ensured and maintained? The researcher justifies that liberal democratisation is perhaps the strongest and most effective factor of forming an effective police all over the world. The vulnerability of young democracies must be recognised and treated from the direction of authoritarian thinking and from such kind of regressive law enforcement philosophies. Unfortunately, if craving for the nostalgia of increasing crime rates and former stability are together present in a developing democ-

²⁹ Seron-Pereira-Kovath (2004)

racy, it can easily get rid of legitime and fair police procedures, which may lead back to non-transparent and unaccountable criminal investigation situations. In this case, the efficiency of the police may be the first victim of the democratic development.

In their comprehensive empirical research, Rogge and Vershelde (2009) measured citizens' satisfaction with using composite indicators and a non-parametric mathematical method with regard to local police forces and regions. More precisely: the authors of the study suggest the user approach of the above mentioned popular Data Envelopment Analysis method together with applying the so called "benefits of doubt" model. The most important benefit of the method is that in citizens' satisfaction it weights the effects of functions and tasks done by the local police by an endogenous method with composite points, which makes it possible to calculate different values and approaches in order to interpret "good local police" more precisely when comparing police forces. The methodology well illustrates the citizens' satisfaction in a broader assessment of local police and regions. The DEA model using non-parametric assessment methodology highlights the weak and strong points of police functions determining citizens' satisfaction, and also performance values on both micro (a local police station) and macro (region) levels. Researchers found that average macro satisfaction points in Belgium are 91.94%. It can be stated, that in Belgium most citizens are usually satisfied with the work of the local police forces. The incredible advantage of the model is that it was able to identify the basic functions of local police stations that are the most important ones according to the citizens' own assessment. Those indicators were identified that basically explain the weakening and strengthening of citizens' satisfaction in connection with practicing police functions. Results showed that rural environment does not strengthen the level of satisfaction on its own in case of the participating local police stations, and regional differences have much greater significance than it was originally supposed. This research was the first to measure citizens' satisfaction with multidimensional scores and to use them in the assessment of the efficiency of local police forces. The research uses the method that considers specific circumstances of local police forces as it weighted them endogenously and assigned individual values to them.

Quality-based Measurement of Police Performance in Practice

Currently, the efficiency measurement method that contains all three segments of effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy is used at the police of the United Kingdom and Wales. The police performance assessment indicators are open to the public as they are available at a transparent internet link by anybody. The earlier stated organisational and functional efficiency appear intertwined in the dominantly qualitative measuring forms of legitimacy pillar. The key area will be supporting police work and increasing performance motivation, and its important element is involving police personnel in decision making processes. *"The worries of subordinates are well heard, meanwhile it*

*becomes transparent and interpretable why the leaders have come to certain decisions, and it inevitably encourages subordinates to do correct and fair work.*³⁰

Organisational justice proved by researches has a broader range in performance assessment than mere internal procedural justice which contains the fairness of distribution, the feeling that how fair resources, workforce, financial and intellectual endowments are distributed and ensured inside the organisation. Procedural justice means informing subordinates on decisions, internal information flow, the rules of career, and fair and humane treatment of subordinates. Among measurable values such as the fairness of the distribution of resources and the procedural justice, the latter has a greater impact on the quality of police work and the policing behavioral culture.³¹ The Oxford research at Durham police was a convincing reason that organisational justice must contain the above mentioned procedural justice of the management and senior management (involvement in decision making, notification, treatment). Also the above mentioned fairness of distribution, has a positive effect on organisational affinity and more social and more cooperative organisational attitude and behaviour, and from then it has repercussions to the subordinates' working culture, as well.³² Another research has also identified a statistically significant correlation between organisational justice and identification of the organisation at the police, that effectively has an impact on performance. The following statements have been made:

- officers who recognised that the organisation was fair to them, identified more likely with the objectives of the organisation
- unfairness showed consistency with developing officers' cynical and authoritative subculture
- officers who felt that they had the support of the community, trusted their organisation more
- officers who trusted their own organisation more, supported applying procedural guarantees, lawful procedures and proportionate force more³³

Unfairness and the lack of organisational justice at the police mean significant organisational risk. Research findings indicate that, if subordinates feel that they are treated unfairly, they will less likely have the motivation to provide citizens quality service. They will become more and more cynical, and less and less committed to the objectives of ethical policing. In making their decisions falling within their competence, the deterioration of their discretion can be noticed. It is realised in avoiding lawful measures, using case selection mechanism, and in the strengthening of procedural passivity resulting in the non-completion of cases. Therefore, ethical, legitimate policing has a close context with organisational culture and with guaranteeing internal procedural justice. It is basi-

³⁰ Fair cop 2 (2015) 11.

³¹ Greenberg (2011)

³² Bradford-Quinton (2014)

³³ Bradford et al. (2013)

cally called a “feedback loop”, that is, procedural justice enjoys broader public support within the organisation, but they also may appear in a negative aspect having repercussions on organisational performance. Bearing in mind these research findings, there are researches on police legitimacy – as a part of efficiency measurements – at the police of the United Kingdom and Wales annually. For instance, in 2015–2016, 16 police units were involved in the research.

Conclusion

In the light of international researches and practical application, when measuring performance at the police, we must be especially careful about development and reforms. Because of its multidimensional character, the question is complicated, so the significance of quality indicators cannot be ruled out, similarly, traditional quantity indicators cannot be condemned early. When applying certain methodologies and technologies in practice, it seems to be the best solution if the performance is measured by applying different procedures. Its results shall be told to the professional management, as a kind of information helping them to manage, instead of centrally using them as organisational or performance requirements in the form of uniform, “strict” numbers. With this procedure, the advantages of each methodology can be extracted, meanwhile harmful side effects can be minimized. It is especially true in case of several traditional indicators (e.g. reconnaissance rates, investigation effectiveness rates, clearance rates, response time) that, ideally, they function as indirect and practical performance indicators when examining the efficiency of police activities.

REFERENCES

- Bradford, Ben – Quinton, Paul (2014): Self-legitimacy, Police Culture and Support for Democratic Policing in an English Constabulary. *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 54, No. 6. 1023–1046.
- Bradford, Ben – Quinton, Paul – Myhill, Andy – Porter, Gillian (2013): Why do ‘the law’ comply? Procedural justice, group identification and officer motivation in police organizations. *European Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 11, No.1. 110–131.
- Cao, Liqun – Lai, Yung-Lien – Zhao, Ruohui (2012): Shades of blue: Confidence in the police in the world. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 40, No. 1. 40–49.
- Cao, Liqun – Zhao, Jihong Solomon (2005): Confidence in the police in Latin America. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 33, No. 5. 403–412.
- Charbonneau, Etienne – Riccucci, Norma M. (2008): Beyond the usual suspects: An analysis of the performance measurement literature on social equity indicators in policing. *Public Performance and Management Review*, Vol. 31, No. 4. 604–620.
- Davis, Robert C. (2012): Selected International Best Practices in Police Performance Measurement. RAND Corporation. Available: http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR1153.html (Downloaded: 12.02.2018.)
- Drake, Leigh M. – Simper, Richard (2005): The Measurement of Police Force Efficiency: An Assessment of UK Home Office Policy. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, Vol. 23, No. 4. 465–482.
- Easton, David (1965): *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York, John Wiley.

- Finszter Géza (2006): A demokratikus jogállami rendőrség alternatívái a XXI. században. In *Rendőrségi Évkönyv 2005*. Budapest, ORFK.
- Finszter Géza (2008): Viziók a rendőrségről. *Belügyi Szemle*, 1. szám
- Finszter Géza (2010): A rendészeti rendszerszemléletű megközelítése és a stratégiai tervezés. In *Tanulmányok a rendészeti stratégiához. Rendészeti Szemle Különszám*.
- Gajdusчек György (2009): Közigazgatási eredményesség – piaci hatékonyság? Avagy alkalmazható-e a piaci ideál a közigazgatásban? In Lőrincz Lajos (szerk.): *Eredményesség és eredménytelenség a közigazgatásban*. Budapest, MTA Jogtudományi Intézet. 8–87.
- Greenberg, J. (2011): Organizational justice: The dynamics of fairness in the workplace. In Sheldon, Zedeck (ed.): *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization. Washington, D.C., American Psychological Association.
- Hinds, Lyn (2009): Public Satisfaction with Police: The Influence of General Attitudes and Police–Citizen Encounters. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 11, No. 1. 54–66.
- Jang, Hyunseok – Lee, Joongyeup – Gibbs, Jennifer C. (2015): The influence of the national government on confidence in the police: A focus on corruption. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, Vol. 43, No. 4. 553–568.
- Jang, Hyunseok – Joo, Hee-Jong – Zhao, Jihong Solomon (2010): Determinants of public confidence in police: An international perspective. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 38, No. 1. 57–68.
- Kaiser Tamás (szerk.) (2015): *Jó Állam Jelentés*. Budapest, Nemzeti Közszolgálati Egyetem.
- Kertész Imre (1977): A szocialista törvényesség és a bűnüldözés hatékonysága. *Belügyi Szemle*, Vol. 15, No. 1. 49–57.
- Korinek László (2015): Rendszerváltozás a belügyben. *Belügyi Szemle*, Vol. 63, No. 1. 5–33.
- Loubet del Bayle, Jean-Louis (1992): *La police. Approche socio-politique*. Paris, Montchrestien, Clefs Politique.
- Moore, Mark H. – Braga, Anthony A. (2004): Police performance measurement: A normative framework. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, Vol. 23, No. 1. 3–19.
- Menyhay Imre (1998): *Adalékok Káin „esti meséjéhez”*. Gazdaság és szocializáció a jelenkori liberális társadalomban. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Murphy, Kristina – Hinds, Lyn – Fleming, Jenny (2008): Encouraging Public Cooperation and Support for Police. *Policing & Society*, Vol. 18, No. 2. 136–155.
- Newburn, Tim – Reiner, Robert (2012): Policing and the Police. In Maguier, Mike – Morgan, Rod – Reiner, Robert (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. 5th ed. Oxford, University Press. 806–838.
- Payne, Brian K. – Gainey, Randy R. (2007): Attitudes about the Police and Neighborhood Safety in Disadvantaged Neighborhoods: The Influence of Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of a Drug Problem. *Criminal Justice Review*, Vol. 32, No. 2. 142–155.
- Roelofse, Cornelis J. (2013): Community Policing: Homogenous Societies Are Actually Heterogenic – Challenges to Diverse Community Needs. *Internal Security*, Vol. 5, No. 2. 7–21.
- Rogge, Nicky – Verschelde Marijn (2013): A composite index of citizen satisfaction with local police services. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, Vol. 36, No. 2. 238–262.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis P. – Schuck, Amie M. – Costello, Sandra K. – Hawkins, Darnell F. – Ring, Marianne K. (2005): Attitudes Toward the Police: The Effects of Direct and Vicarious Experience. *Police Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 3. 343–365.
- Rutherford, A. (1987): Introductory Report. In *Interactions within the Criminal Justice System. Reports presented to the seventeenth Criminological Research Conference, 1986*. Collected Studies in Criminological Research, Volume XXV, Council of Europe, Publication Section, Strasbourg.
- Scaglion, Richard – Condon, Richard G. (1980): Determinants of attitudes toward city police. *Criminology*, Vol. 17, No. 4. 485–494.
- Sebesi Béla (1992): *A bűnözés és a bűnüldözés közgazdasági összefüggései*. Budapest, BM Könyvkiadó.
- Seron, Carroll – Pereira, Joseph – Kovath, Jean (2004): Judging Police Misconduct: “Street-Level” versus Professional Policing. *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 38, No. 4. 665–710.
- Skolnick, Jerome H. (1975): *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in a Democratic Society*. 2nd ed. New York, Wiley & Sons.

- Stack, Steven J. – Cao, Liqun (1998): Political Conservatism and Confidence in the Police: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, Vol. 21, No. 1. 71–76.
- Sung, Hung-En (2006): Police effectiveness and democracy: shape and direction of the relationship. *Policing*, Vol. 29, No. 2. 347–367.
- Szikinger István (2012): Rendőrség és politika. *Belügyi Szemle*, Vol. 60, No. 3. 16–28.
- Tankebe, Justice (2010): Public Confidence in the Police: Testing the Effects of Public Experiences of Police Corruption in Ghana. *The British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 50, No. 2. 296–319.
- Team Consult Report. Manuscript, Budapest, 1991.
- Tihanyi Miklós (2013): A társadalmi kontroll helye, szerepe a rendőrség működésében. In Tihanyi Miklós (szerk): *A rendőrség társadalmi kontrollja*. Lecture Notes. Budapest, NUPS.
- Tihanyi Miklós (2017): The Tools of the Police for the Improvement of the Citizens' Subjective Sense of Security in Hungary. *Hadtudományi Szemle*, Vol. 10, No. 2. 284–294.
- Vári Vince (2015): A bűnüldözés relatív hatékonysága és a rendőrség. PhD dissertation, Miskolc, Miskolci Tudományegyetem Állam- és Jogtudományi Kar, Deák Ferenc Doktori Iskola.
- Vass Kálmán (1985): A nyomozó szervek büntetőeljárásjogi tevékenységének mennyiségi értékelése. *Belügyi Szemle*, Vol. 23, No. 8. 20–26.
- Weitzer, Robald – Tuch, Steven A. (2005): Determinants of public satisfaction with the police. *Police Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 3. 279–297.

INTERNET SOURCES

<http://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmic/>

Fair cop 2: Organisational justice, behaviour and ethical policing, College of Policing, 2015. Available at: http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/150317_Fair_cop%202_FINAL_REPORT.pdf (Downloaded: 10.03.2018.)