

Winter 1938

Scale to Measure Effectiveness of Police Functioning

Spencer D. Parratt

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Spencer D. Parratt, Scale to Measure Effectiveness of Police Functioning, 28 *Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology* 739 (1937-1938)

This *Criminology* is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

A SCALE TO MEASURE EFFECTIVENESS OF POLICE FUNCTIONING

SPENCER D. PARRATT†

Any measurement of the effectiveness of governmental functioning involves critical consideration of the standard against which measurement takes place. It is quite impossible to measure, except in terms of something akin to a yardstick. The determination of the criterion permitting the formulation of more or less of something of significance about government functioning is made particularly difficult in a democracy because the public administrator is presumed to be the servant of the citizenry and the standard of success, under such conditions, must ever be compliance with an effective sector of citizen opinions. In an authoritarian governmental system it might be compatible with established values for the authoritarian head of the state to announce a standard as commensurate with his will and desire. If this were done the possibility of measurement would be simplified. There is an ever present urge to slip into the easy road of projecting some authoritarian end as an ideal and then seek to measure the relative attainment of this end. The most common error of this nature is to assume that "efficiency" is a valid tenet of value and that measurement can take place against this as frame of reference.

There are then, two basic problems to be faced in any attempt to measure effectiveness of policing in a democracy. First, it is necessary to determine what the standard of approvals and disapprovals of police practices and behaviors is at a particular time. Second, it is necessary to devise some methodology permitting determination of the difference between what actually exists and what is desired or approved by an effective sector of citizen opinion.

Any attempt to determine the standard of citizen opinion in police administration runs into a particular difficulty that the law, as represented by statutes and judicial interpretation, is not an adequate guide to effective citizen approvals. It is notorious that police protect or ignore prostitution, gambling and at times, liquor enterprises, when the standard of the law prohibits them. It is also no professional secret that police chiefs cannot safely ignore the

† Associate Professor of Political Science, Syracuse University.

public toleration of these practices and many a chief has found his professional status jeopardized by too great an insistence upon indiscriminate law enforcement. It is also a recognized condition in many American jurisdictions that police toleration of speed limits is above the legal speed maximum. And what chief of police has not been forced to shift his men from enforcement of one type of law to another under pressure of political or press stimulation? Simply stated, the law designed to control police is not an adequate standard of guidance and successful policing involves knowing how to place emphasis upon enforcement of particular statutes or ordinances at critical times and how to act contrary to them when this will meet greater public support. No standard, then, which seeks to measure police effectiveness as more or less enforcement of statutes, will present a picture of police effectiveness in terms of public approvals and disapprovals. This may be unfortunate and probably is at the root of the general dissatisfaction with American policing. The presence of illegal discretion certainly complicates the problem of measuring police functioning. It involves the determination of what the public approves, independent of what the legislatures say the public approves, and challenges the efficacy of legislation as a standard for measurement of enforcement processes.

The particular difficulties inherent in contemporary policing suggest that it might be methodologically significant to attempt to penetrate into the range and modes of citizen approvals and disapprovals quite independently from legislative prescriptions. What do the citizenry think about police behaviors? An experimental attempt was made to ask such a question of a number of citizens selected at random on a city street. By the time forty-five citizens had been questioned it became apparent that the method was too simple. Citizens thought differently about city police, county sheriffs, state police and the "G" men. But when the results were tabulated for likeness and difference as to the types of activities or characteristics evidenced from the responses certain patterns began to appear. Thus, responses could be classified as to matters of departmental discipline, characteristics of personnel, treatment of the public, press relations, dealings with minorities including strikers and milk truck drivers, success in investigation and apprehension of suspects, dealings with suspects and witnesses, toleration or protection of vice, equipment and facilities, and extent of influence, or freedom of influence from, politics, etc. As a matter of record it was discovered that the most common response, in terms

of the above classification appeared in relation to influence on policing by politics or politicians.

The second step taken to seek a pattern of citizen opinions and attitudes toward policing was to standardize a series of questions in terms of the classification evidenced in the free responses. It was decided that seven modal questions would result in extensive and comparable data. Thus a process of random sampling of citizens was undertaken again. This time responses were recorded to the seven questions. Each of the seven was asked relative to (1) city police, (2) county sheriff and deputies, (3) the state police. Because of the limited jurisdiction of the "G" men it was decided to eliminate them at this stage of the study, although the voluntary observations made by interviewed citizens evidenced an unquestioned opinion that these officers were useful for favorable comparisons, particularly with city police. By contrast, an almost equal number of voluntary comparisons were made between state troopers and "G" men, intended to evidence approval of troopers because of similarity to the officers of the Bureau of Investigation. No questionnaire, or paper, was evident while these interviews were made. Responses were recorded from memory immediately after each interview. Ninety-seven persons were interviewed in this stage. The only question asked, after roughly seeking evident distribution of age and sex, was "Are you qualified to vote in the next election?" No person answering negatively was included in the study. A large sheet of paper, divided into twenty-one compartments for recording any observations or responses was used for each interview. The seven questions asked were: What is your opinion, or what do you think about, the _____ police (city, county sheriff, state police) as to (1) characteristics of the men composing the force, (2) their dealings with minorities, (3) their dealings with suspected criminals and witnesses, (4) their efficiency or success in preventing or suppressing crime, (5) their success in suppression, or degree of toleration, of vice, (6) their influence or freedom from politics, (7) their methods of dealing with the public and with the press.

The third step in the attempt to explore into the possibilities of measuring police effectiveness was to analyze the responses of the ninety-seven citizens for recurrences and modal opinions. This was done—involving a considerable degree of subjectivity as to determination of similarity and difference in meanings—for each of the sets of responses to city police, sheriff and deputies and state

troopers. Then the entire number of responses was analyzed for the development of a common pattern. Contrary to expectations, the number of responses permitted considerable simplification into a workable number of statements covering all but the unique responses. Whenever a response appeared to have recurred three or more times a modal statement was undertaken, in language as near to the typical response as seemed practicable.

From this analysis developed 473 statements. Some of these were overlapping, to some extent, with others. Some appeared ambiguous and some described practices which would not fit all three of the police systems to which responses had been accumulated. But they were compiled and a form made to permit elimination through concurrent judgments. Twenty-one graduate students of political science and public administration were then asked to check the list for ambiguous statements and unnecessary duplications. After this was done all statements objected to by three or more graduate students were limited. A list of 342 remained. These were distributed among the subjects in about the same proportion as the numbers of original responses on each subject, with the exception of influence of policing by politics. Here the modal statements were retained, although the numbers of persons evidencing responses of an unfavorable type in terms of this element was greater than the proportion of retained statements. It should be noted that the characteristically unfavorable response was to the city police and was something of a contrast statement with that appearing relative to state troopers. Moreover, the responses were stereotyped and did not include a great variety of different types of situations.

The fourth step involved the ordering of the 342 statements, selected by the processes indicated above, into a form to permit relative evaluation of each statement as an aid or hindrance to police effectiveness. A form to permit testing of relative aid or hindrance in terms of eleven equally appearing intervals was used, with a hypothetical neutral position at the middle point (5.5 on the scale). The method utilized was the standard Thurstone psychophysical scale, utilizing the same methodologies previously discussed in this Journal.¹ The testing of the scale was done by fifty selected raters.

¹ See: Beyle, H. C., and Parratt, S. D., "Measuring the Severity of the Third Degree," 24 *J. Criminal Law and Crim.* 485-503 (1933). Also, Beyle, H. C., and Parratt, S. D., "Approval and Disapproval of Third Degree Practices," 27 *J. Criminal Law and Crim.* 526-551 (1937). For an exposition of the theory underlying the construction of a scale see Parratt, S. D., "A Critique of the Bellman Police Service Rating Scale," 27 *J. Criminal Law and Crim.* 895-905 (1936).

Admittedly this number is less than desirable if complete stability is sought. Moreover, for reasons of limited opportunity, these raters were taken in the upstate New York cultural area. A wider sampling would be desirable to determine the existence of more extensive cultural understandings. But the selection was made to give a severe wrenching to the meanings of the statements. Included were ten practicing lawyers, five public administrators not involved with police work, five judges, all of whom had had opportunity to observe critically police practices, ten professional men and women who had quite ordinary contacts with police, eight professors or graduate students of political science and public administration, ten prisoners in a county jail, the chief of police of Syracuse, a sheriff and an ex-sheriff, and an assistant warden and a jailkeeper in a state penitentiary. While this group is not representative of upstate population, it includes interest groups which might be expected to disagree if disagreement is to be found in the cultural area. Although the groups, in themselves, are not large enough to permit comparisons, it is nevertheless true, that agreement of this group on the meaning of a particular practice or characteristic as an aid or hindrance to police effectiveness seems to be of significance.

After the 342 statements had been rated for relative aid or hindrance to police effectiveness, and the ambiguity index of each statement computed, an attempt was made to select a representative distribution of statements for a tested scale. Such an instrument, in the theory of this approach, might provide a means of registering citizen approval or disapproval values of police functioning, in terms of the elements of characteristic and practice discoverable in citizen opinion and understanding. Obviously, such a scale will not measure how the approved practices or characteristics are brought into existence, or into citizen consciousness. Such a scale, if a valid instrument for registering the "high lights" of citizen appreciation and evaluation of policing, may prove a more objective method of guidance for police administrators than the rule of thumb techniques of the politician. This will be true whether an administrator be active head of a department or above the chiefship in the hierarchy of responsible power.

The selection of statements for the scale has involved the balancing of a number of elements. All statements having an ambiguity index of more than 3.9 scale intervals were eliminated as lacking descriptive sharpness. Even those above 2.9 were eliminated

when similarity was discoverable in a less ambiguous statement. The elimination has been conditioned by an attempt to provide contrast statements, insofar as possible, in every classification of practice or characteristic developed in the formulation of the pattern of citizen opinions. Another qualification to the construction of the scale has been the attempt to provide as complete a sequence of statements in terms of the variable utilized as the data would permit. To accomplish this has necessitated the inclusion of certain statements of relatively high ambiguity. Sometimes statements without balancing counterparts have been included, as well as statements having less general descriptive utility than might be otherwise desired. After all of these matters were considered it proved possible to construct a scale of 126 statements, covering the range and modes of citizen response to the seven questions formulated through the processes described earlier in this paper.

The scale, as completed, includes an approximate equality of statements evaluated as contributing to or aiding effectiveness and statements rated as hindrances. Moreover, the distribution of statements over the scale intervals is similar on each side of the hypothetical neutral position. The statements bunch at the extremes. If all of the 342 statements should be utilized as a scale, however, this bunching would be even more pronounced. The significance of this tendency toward dichotomous separation appears to rest in the fact that responses elicited from citizens evidence strong, rather than moderate opinions. Few statements were included in these which resulted in being given neutral ratings. While this quality may require care in interpretation of an application of the instrument, it nevertheless represents the modal responses of citizens relative to the subjects covered. An effort has been made to include the statements in the final scale in as near proportionate distribution to citizen responses as compatible with the methodology.

The finished scale has been developed around characteristic or practice classifications. Probably the presentation of the instrument can best be done with respect to this ordering. The various statements will be presented under the headings (1) Characteristics of Personnel, (2) Selection, Discipline, Training and Equipment, (3) Influence of Politics, (4) Public and Press Relations and Crime Prevention, (5) Treatment of Groups and Minorities, (6) Treatment of Suspects and Witnesses, (7) Apprehensions and Investigations, (8) Vice. Together these segments constitute a scale to measure citizen approvals or disapprovals of police administration.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONNEL

Identifying Number	Statement Phrasing	Index of Effectiveness	Index of Ambiguity
	(A)— <i>Physical Condition</i>		
100	Too fat to perform duties efficiently.....	1.6	2.1
101	Usually in good physical condition.....	8.4	1.6
102	Mostly in poor physical condition.....	1.4	1.6
	(B)— <i>Intelligence</i>		
103	Mostly men of ordinary intelligence.....	7.8	2.8
104	Majority of men of more than ordinary intelligence	8.9	2.3
105	Mostly men of low or inferior intelligence..	1.1	1.7
	(C)— <i>Education</i>		
106	Mostly men having at least elementary school education	8.1	2.5
107	Usually men of little or no education.....	1.5	1.9
108	Usually men of high school education.....	9.0	2.8
	(D)— <i>Mental Traits</i>		
109	Usually conscientious in performing duties.	8.2	2.1
110	Mostly men having less than ordinary ambition	3.4	2.2
111	Usually dependable	8.3	2.2
112	Seldom dependable	2.4	2.4
113	Make quick and intelligent decisions.....	10.2	1.6
	(E)— <i>Appearance</i>		
114	Smoke occasionally when on duty.....	5.0	1.7
115	More concerned with appearance than performance of duties	2.2	2.6
116	Usually dress to appear spic and span.....	7.6	2.3
117	Dress to command public respect.....	9.1	2.0
118	Habitually dress sloppily	2.3	2.3
119	Seldom have military bearing and appearance	3.9	2.1
120	Do not smoke when on duty.....	7.0	2.3
	(F)— <i>Professional Interest</i>		
121	Have slight professional interest in work..	1.9	3.7
122	Have moderate professional interest in work	7.2	2.5
123	Have high professional interest in work....	10.5	1.2

There is enough instructional value in the above statements to warn a police administrator where his weak and strong points are, should these statements be submitted to a significant sample of citizens within his jurisdiction. Probably the experience of the public with contemporary policing accounts for the relatively high rating bestowed upon ordinariness of intelligence, contrasted with

the low rating given to low or inferior intelligence. Elementary education is enough to obtain relative approval. Conscientiousness in performance of duties is high, as is professional interest in work and military bearing. The tendency toward extreme positions, coupled with sharp meanings, is well evidenced in this block of statements.

TABLE II
SELECTION, DISCIPLINE, TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT

Identifying Number	Statement Phrasing	Index of Effec- tiveness	Index of Ambiguity
<i>(A)—Basis of Selection</i>			
124	Members selected for personal merit and ability	10.2	1.3
125	Members usually selected for personal merit and ability	8.4	1.6
126	Members seldom selected for personal merit and ability	2.6	2.6
<i>(B)—Departmental Discipline</i>			
1	Always have military bearing and appearance	9.0	2.8
2	Operate under fairly good discipline.....	7.8	2.5
3	Operate under poor discipline.....	2.7	2.0
4	Operate under rigid military discipline.....	9.5	2.9
5	Very disorderly and undisciplined.....	.8	1.0
<i>(C)—Training</i>			
6	Mostly poorly trained men.....	1.2	1.9
7	Without scientific training in modern police methods	1.8	2.0
8	Use out of date police training methods....	1.8	2.3
9	Use practically no police training methods..	1.4	1.6
10	Use modern police training methods.....	10.0	1.4
11	Specially trained to give advice to boys and girls	10.2	1.4
12	Specially trained to educate public how best to protect property	10.0	1.6
13	Specially trained to recognize situations which may lead to crime.....	10.4	1.3
<i>(D)—Equipment and Facilities</i>			
14	Make use of modern equipment.....	10.3	1.3
15	Do not understand use of modern equipment	2.0	2.7
16	Have experts available having facilities and understanding of scientific methods of handling difficult crimes	10.4	1.3

Again, in the above statements, appears the citizen insistence upon giving extreme values to descriptions of situations outside of his immediate capacity to evaluate because of lack of technical understandings. Thus, few citizens could determine the elements constituting "merit and ability" in the selection of policemen. A department would seem to find citizen support when these are thought to exist. The same generalizations would apply to training and equipment, although the citizen perspective might be better able to pass upon matters of discipline. There is sound advice to a police administrator to be found in application of the above statements in ordering his publicity and dealing with the legislative body responsible for appropriations for institutional functions of his department. The relatively small ambiguities in evaluating the effectiveness represented by the statements in this group seems evidence of well crystallized stereotypes, rather than competency of knowledge of details. Democratic responsibility for administration is at least as much concerned with the opinions of the citizenry about the facts, as with the facts themselves.

TABLE III
INFLUENCE OF POLITICS

<i>Identifying Number</i>	<i>Statement Phrasing</i>	<i>Index of Effectiveness</i>	<i>Index of Ambiguity</i>
17	Active as political party workers.....	1.8	2.2
18	Lose jobs by refusing to obey orders of political bosses9	1.6
19	Membership changes when new political party comes into power.....	.9	1.6
20	Apprehend criminals indiscriminately, without regard for pressure brought by influential forces	9.9	1.5
21	Customarily use influence to help political party in power	2.2	2.6
22	Show favoritism to politicians.....	1.0	1.4

The interference with members of the police department by political forces is rated as a definite hindrance to effective policing. But the customary use of police influence to help a party in power rates well over a scale interval above changing of membership when party shifts in power occur. The extreme citizen attitudes on this subject may be stereotypes. Whatever their basis, they seem to indicate a settled opinion.

If the three tables of practices or characteristics considered so far should be treated as a unit, a tentative scale relating to the institutional or staff aspects of policing would appear. The following five tables will present various aspects of official-citizen as contrasted with interofficial relationships. If these statements were considered as a unit a scale of these aspects of policing would be available. However, stabilization of meanings and scale positions has been done against a single variable and the statements must be considered to have relative meanings only in relation to the extremes evidenced among themselves. Separation of the institutional from the official-subject statements would provide relative extremes in both groups.

The very high ratings given tactfulness and courtesy in dealing with the public reflects experience with traffic enforcement to a considerable extent. There may be a peculiar localism to this extraordinary rating, due to the persistence of Syracuse police to act contrariwise as evidenced in citizen responses. The favorable statements came from contrast experiences with state troopers in most instances. The consistently high ratings given crime prevention activities seem to be instructive for police guidance and should, if a sample of significant opinion in a city indicates, provide an opportunity for progressive policing to improve status in citizen opinions. The press relations statements appeared from comments comparing and contrasting the state troopers and "G" men on one hand with county sheriffs and city police on the other. The practices of the more centralized officials would seem clearly associated with effective policing in the opinion of the raters. Considering the difference in practice utilized by different police agencies, the ambiguities seem to be low enough to provide clear guidance to meet standards of citizen approvals.

The statements are indicative of a variety of police practices, and probably the outstanding characteristic of the ratings is that even the statements considered most conducive to effectiveness rate somewhat below the values accorded to courtesy, crime prevention, and professional interest in work and training.

The ambiguities of statements in this classification are higher, as a group, than in other classifications in the scale. The statements in a number of instances, are toward the center of the scale, evidencing neutrality on the part of raters. It appears significant that when a person is dubbed "gangster" the police are accredited with use of harsher methods to be effective. There is noticeable sym-

TABLE IV
PUBLIC AND PRESS RELATIONS AND CRIME PREVENTION

Identifying Number	Statement Phrasing	Index of Effectiveness	Index of Ambiguity
	(A)— <i>Standards of Tact and Courtesy</i>		
37	Lose temper easily when dealing with public	1.6	1.9
38	Habitually tactful in dealing with public...	10.2	1.4
39	Civil in dealing with public.....	9.2	2.3
40	Courteous in regulating traffic.....	9.4	2.1
	(B)— <i>Response to Criticism</i>		
41	Take criticism from members of public grudgingly	3.2	2.4
42	Make effort to obtain suggestions from members of public	8.3	2.6
43.	Resent suggestions being made by members of public	2.1	2.7
	(C)— <i>Efforts to Educate Public: Crime Prevention</i>		
44	Seldom conduct campaigns on dangers of traffic violations	2.9	2.8
45	Make effort to gain confidence of boys and girls	10.1	1.5
46	Make consistent effort to educate public in how best to protect property.....	9.9	1.7
47	Conduct regular campaigns on dangers of traffic violations	9.7	1.7
48	Seldom try to educate public in means of crime prevention	2.1	2.4
49	Watchful to prevent child delinquency.....	10.2	1.4
	(D)— <i>Press Relations</i>		
53	Change strictness of traffic enforcement when newspapers protest laxness.....	3.9	3.5
54	Make serious effort to suppress crime only when newspapers complain	1.5	2.0
55	Keep newspapers posted upon every step taken in trying to solve crimes.....	1.6	3.2
56	Carefully censure information given newspapers when attempting to solve crimes so as not to interfere with solution.....	10.0	1.4
57	Give newspapers brief statements of outcome of investigations of crimes, but not until after solution has been achieved....	9.6	1.9
58	All information to newspapers released by head of department	9.9	1.7
59	Operate independently from newspaper publicity	8.6	2.1

TABLE V
INVESTIGATION AND APPREHENSION: STANDARDS OF ENFORCEMENT

<i>Identifying Number</i>	<i>Statement Phrasing</i>	<i>Index of Effectiveness</i>	<i>Index of Ambiguity</i>
50	Change traffic enforcement spasmodically..	1.7	2.1
51	Accept bribes for fixing parking violations..	.7	1.3
52	Make practice of fixing traffic tickets for friends of members of department.....	1.8	2.3
76	Occasionally arrest innocent persons.....	4.2	3.0
77	Inconsistent in making effort to apprehend petty criminals	2.9	1.9
78	Usually tolerate petty criminals, without making serious effort to apprehend them.	1.6	2.4
79	Usually follow up all telephone calls reporting suspected crimes	8.0	2.3
80	Try to enforce laws which public opinion most supports	8.5	2.4
81	Rarely get their man in difficult cases....	1.3	1.5
82	Never slow and superficial in investigating suspected crimes	9.9	1.7
83	Do not understand use of scientific methods in investigating suspected crimes.....	1.5	2.0
84	Seldom use up-to-date scientific methods in apprehending criminals	2.1	2.6
85	Keep close contact with underworld by means of ex-convicts acting as stool pigeons	7.2	3.0
86	More likely to arrest the agents than the principals or head men in organized criminal activities	2.3	2.3
87	Seldom able to return stolen property to owner	1.9	2.0
88	Careful not to arrest innocent persons....	9.3	3.0
89	Usually apprehend criminals in difficult cases	9.7	1.6

pathy for the ex-convict coupled with approval of a practice of using him as a stool pigeon (Statement 85, Table V). Police effectiveness is considered to warrant harshness in something like rough proportion to the discredit in which the class of suspect happens to fall. This conclusion is peculiar in light of our stereotyped support of natural rights although consistent with the ratings in the following table involving similar problems.

TABLE VI
TREATMENT OF GROUPS AND MINORITIES

<i>Identifying Number</i>	<i>Statement Phrasing</i>	<i>Index of Effectiveness</i>	<i>Index of Ambiguity</i>
23	Usually fair in dealing with employers. . . .	8.5	2.3
24	Usually fair in dealing with strikers.	8.8	2.8
25	Usually fair in dealing with farmers.	8.6	2.5
26	Force merchants and business men to buy tickets to entertainments as means of retaining good will	1.7	2.1
31	Use harsher methods with ex-convicts than with other persons	4.6	3.2
98	Unfriendly to ex-convicts	2.9	2.7
99	Make honest and consistent effort to help ex-convicts to go straight.	10.3	1.4
27	Use harsher methods with Negroes than with other persons	4.0	2.9
28	Interfere with radical meetings only when public order is threatened.	8.9	2.2
29	Feared by boys and girls.	2.3	2.8
30	Liked by boys and girls.	9.4	2.4
32	Use harsher methods with aliens than with citizens	4.6	3.4
33	Use harsher methods with radicals (communists for example) than with citizens.	5.4	3.9
34	Use harsher methods with "gangsters" than with other persons	8.0	2.9
35	Use harsher methods with those suspected of murder than of other crimes.	6.4	3.4
36	Break up radical meetings with clubs and tear gas whenever such meetings are known	2.8	3.6

No other classification of statements presents the confusion evidenced in this one. For example, statement 74 receives a high rating (9.1) as consideration that constitutional rights should always be respected. Statement 62, by contrast, should be rated at an opposite extreme. But this is not the case. This disregarding of constitutional rights in the interest of efficiency is considerably nearer the neutral point than the extreme of ineffectiveness or hindrance to effectiveness. The ambiguities tend to be relatively high. The lack of clear intolerance of the use of force and violence is compatible with the findings of the studies relating toward attitudes toward third degree practices reported earlier in this Journal.

The statements accumulated from citizen responses on vice tended to be negative and specific in form. Some attempts were made at generalization, but these were eliminated in the rating process as evidencing high ambiguity. It will be observed that the practices most conducive to effective policing are outside of the clear legal duty of police in some instances. Police, in central New York at least, are not empowered to keep prostitutes in segregated areas by state law. Nor are they authorized to have prostitutes medically examined, except after conviction for crime or through voluntary cooperation with other agencies, either public or private.

TABLE VII

TREATMENT OF SUSPECTS AND WITNESSES

<i>Identifying Number</i>	<i>Statement Phrasing</i>	<i>Index of Effec- tiveness</i>	<i>Index of Ambiguity</i>
60	Always careful to explain a suspect's legal rights so that he understands them before asking questions to gain information.....	6.6	3.9
61	Deliberately mislead suspected criminals as to their legal and constitutional rights to gain information or force confessions.....	1.1	2.1
62	Disregard constitutional rights in the interest of efficiency	3.0	3.7
63	Seldom treat suspected criminals civilly...	3.7	2.7
64	Occasionally promise leniency to suspected criminals to force confessions.....	4.6	3.4
65	Use whatever degree of force found convenient	6.2	3.9
66	Usually respect constitutional rights of suspected criminals	7.4	2.6
67	Never treat suspected criminals brutally...	6.9	3.8
68	Treat suspects civilly	8.4	2.5
69	Sometimes use third degree on witnesses to gain information	1.3	2.0
70	Careful to use no more force than necessary	7.9	2.6
71	Occasionally beat suspects to death trying to force confessions6	1.3
72	Ask suspects leading questions to gain information	8.6	2.6
73	Habitually treat suspected criminals civilly	7.2	2.9
74	Always respect constitutional rights of suspected criminals	9.1	3.5
75	Often conscienceless and brutal in performing duties8	1.5

TABLE VIII

VICE

<i>Identifying Number</i>	<i>Statement Phrasing</i>	<i>Index of Effectiveness</i>	<i>Index of Ambiguity</i>
90	Make effort to keep prostitutes in segregated areas	8.7	3.1
91	Make practice of protecting bootleggers when they have influence.....	1.4	1.7
92	Confiscate and destroy illegal slot machines	8.9	2.4
93	Make practice of protecting prostitution when operators pay bribes.....	.9	1.6
94	Make effort to have prostitutes medically examined	8.9	3.2
95	Arrest prostitutes only when reformers rouse public opinion	2.0	2.4
96	Ignore the operation of illegal lotteries.....	2.3	2.3
97	Make effort to suppress betting on horse racing only when reformers protest.....	2.7	3.2

The rating of these as being conditional to police effectiveness indicates that citizens may not fully approve of the range of duties delegated to police. The same observation applies to the failure of the raters to consider that suppression of lotteries, even when stated to be illegal, as a practice closely associated with effective policing. The tentative suggestions possible seem to warrant more penetrating analysis into such matters. The great variety of citizen responses is not reflected in the small selection of statements, nor is the ambiguity of ratings of discarded statements shown by the selection above. However, the eight statements are modal of citizen responses insofar as possible.

The application of the scale here presented involves no great difficulty. A study is being undertaken to compare comparable samples of citizen opinion in three upstate New York municipalities. In this study the entire number of statements is being presented in the numerical listing used as identifying numbers in the tables I to VIII. Nothing will appear in the application form to indicate separation of statements into classifications, although the association of statements will permit comparisons by the person filling the form. Very simple directions are used.²

² Form for Recording Opinions as to Presence or Absence of Characteristics of the Police Department of

Most police officers have a sincere desire to meet the approval of the citizens

This scale is presented with the hope that others interested in its utility or direction will find opportunity to make use of it, or improve its usefulness. Some suggestions might be made. It would be possible to use leading questions to force citizen responses and thus obtain a wider variety of statements or practice or characteristics of police functioning. Through this method it might be possible to construct a separate scale, with no gaps, and of statements having general descriptive utility of each of the classifications presented in the various tables. It might prove desirable to create a much longer scale to permit more adequate insight into

served by them. But they have no carefully designed instrument to determine which of their activities and practices meet with approval; which meet with disapproval. A police department will meet standards of public approval when it acts as the public desires it to act. They need to know a great deal more about what the public wants in order that policing may conform to these wants. This form is an experiment to find out what citizens think about police department activities and characteristics. It is carefully constructed of a variety of different statements, each of which describes some characteristic or practice. Each of these statements has been given a value in describing a situation contributing or detracting to police effectiveness. When a number of intelligent citizens record their opinions about a police department which serves them, and these opinions are made into a pattern of agreements and disagreements, it will be possible to describe and evaluate a given police department much more accurately than with methods now in use. As a result it is hoped that a new opportunity to increase the effectiveness of police department work can be brought about.

We are seeking your cooperation to discover just what you think about the police department in your city. Below is a list of statements describing situations which may, or may not, exist in your city. On the left of each statement is a square. On the right of each statement is another square and under each statement is a third square. When a statement describes a situation which you think exists in your city, place a check in the square on the left of the statement. When the situation described is absent, in your opinion, place a check in the square on the right of the statement. When you are undecided, place a check in the square in the middle of the line, below the statement. We need to know certain facts about those helping us. But we do not need identifications. We should appreciate knowing: (a) occupation or profession, (b) length of residence in the city in years Thank you.

CHARACTERISTICS OR PRACTICES OF POLICE DEPARTMENT

Statement Number	Present in Police	Characteristic or Practice Undecided	Absent in Police
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	Always have military bearing and appearance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operate under fairly good discipline	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operate under poor discipline	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operate under rigid military discipline	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very disorderly and undisciplined	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly poorly trained men	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	

citizen opinion.³ It might prove possible for more adequate appraisal of actual police attainments and characteristics with those given high rating as to effectiveness by citizens.

If the premises underlying the foregoing analysis of the conditions involved in measuring police effectiveness are valid, a commentary on the role of the expert police administrator can be made. Manifestly, as evidenced by the nature and scope of responses by citizens to the general questions used in obtaining statements of opinions about police functioning, the citizenry have no understanding about how characteristics or practices it considers essentially related to effective policing can be made operative. Citizens' opinions about police are in terms they can understand. They consider effective policing involves conscientiousness, honesty, freedom from politics, military bearing, modern equipment and the various items indicated in the scale. While they have definite opinions on these matters, they indicate few suggestions as to how these can be accomplished. Thus modern training methods may be rated as very essential to effectiveness, but nothing will appear from an examination of citizen responses as to how this can be put into effect. The same generalizations appear valid for the entire range of technical problems of police administration. But the citizenry can, and will, as long as the effective checks of democracy exist, pass upon whether they think police meet standards approved in terms of their understanding and values. To deny this competency to the citizen is to deny the efficacy of democratic control of policing.

In the past, as well as today to a considerable extent, the standards of public approval and disapproval have been determined through the crude methods of legislation, supplemented by politician evaluation of that legislation and shaping of standards different from it when the interest of politicians so dictates. The peculiar element to be emphasized is that the statutes do not furnish adequate guide to the patterns of public approval and disapproval. Statutes often are statements of ideals, enacted to have educative values rather than to provide criteria for judging police effective-

³ With Professor Herman C. Beyle's cooperation a shorter scale, designed to indicate general approval or disapproval of police functioning in terms of effectiveness has been selected from the longer scale. The short scale can be used as a work device for students or where time and opportunity permits only the short instrument to be utilized. Statements numbered 2, 3, 14, 20, 22, 24, 31, 39, 41, 54, 59, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 76, 80, 84, 87, 114, and 122 will form such a scale. The directions for the longer scale can be applied with no changes. There are no gaps in this short instrument and the ambiguities are low. An attempt has been made to use statements giving broad coverage of police behaviors and characteristics and include only statements having general application.

ness. At the present time the differential between the face value of the statutes and the limits of citizen toleration constitutes the twilight zone of policing and fertile support for an organized underworld. It is in this twilight zone that the politician forces police functioning to accomplish party and politician ends, compromising the interests of public or citizen approvals. This is possible, to a considerable extent, because no machinery exists to discover more accurately and publicize the patterns of public approval and disapprovals. It is well to remember that the system of legislatures as fountain heads of guiding rules of law developed long before modern policing came into existence. Perhaps the crudeness of the machinery is too great to accomplish the needed separation of ideals toward which the legislature projects the future, and approved patterns of practice commensurate with present shortcomings in light of these ideals.

What then is the role of the expert police administrator? There appear to be three main characteristics involved. First, the expert is able to determine, or should be, what the effective sector of citizen opinions actually approves and disapproves at a given time and place. Second, the expert is able to determine, or should be, what technical practices will accomplish the approved standards. Third, the expert is, or should be, concerned with instructing the citizenry as to the functioning of the police to better obtain citizenry approvals.

In doing these three things he will realize that methodologies must be objective and subject to criticism and discussion. There can be no mumbo-jumbo of the politician whenever more explicit devices can be utilized. The basic problems of police administration, from this perspective, is the facilitating of the long term self-interest of the administrator to alignment with the approved standards of citizen opinions. Expertness is the quality of accomplishing these ends through means susceptible of explicit scrutiny and recurrent check. Once these conditions are fully appreciated, the role of the expert as one seeking to impose honesty or efficiency upon a police department, independent of public approvals or disapprovals, will be superseded in the interest of more enlightened democratic control over police discretion. The significance of this study, if any, is not that its substantive conclusions are compelling, but that it points direction to more realistic understanding of the problems involved.