

NEW WAYS IN THE MEASUREMENT OF THE POLICE PERFORMANCE IN HUNGARY: RESULTS OF THE GOOD STATE AND GOOD POLICE PROJECT

Vince Vári¹

National University of Public Sector, Budapest, Hungary

Abstract: Law enforcement is a unique, clearly delineated area of state involvement. Enhancing security is an important aim of state involvement, which affects diverse areas. Research thereon relates the interdisciplinary concept of security to conflicts and socio-economic crises. As a consequence, setting up a framework of policies for the topic demands a plurality of methods. Police performance measures should be multidimensional to capture the complexity in modern policing. Policing experts have proposed several considerations in developing performance indicators. The Good State and Governance report published in 2015 names security and trust as defining spheres of influence. In my paper, I present the characteristics the sorts of indicators, showing the role of the quality indicators, the specificities of the Hungarian police performance measurement nowadays and the results of the “Good State - Good Police” special project.

Keywords: performance, measurement, indicator, Hungary, trust, legitimacy.

INTRODUCTION

It has been acknowledged that public security is a measurable social phenomenon; the objective state of private security is shown by criminal statistics; and public opinion concerning public security informs us about subjective security. Public security is a product of cooperation, which is a sum of the official services provided by the state and the individual and collective accomplishments of self-defence (Finszter, 2009: 8). On the other hand, it is undeniable that the chief element determining the level of public security is the police. This statement is especially true in light of the fact that Hungarian society expects the police to ensure public security and holds them accountable for it (Barabás, Irk, Kovács, 2008). In the earlier sections of our study, we have pointed out that security is a complex concept with several components. According to a study by Mátyás Szabolcs és Sallai János published in 2015, complex security has 6 components, with economy, environment, defence and public security as their main factors. ”In order to enforce the abstract standards of public welfare, the state has to take up the role of creating and protecting values in the spheres of politics, economy and society.” (Kaiser, 2015: 2).

The author sums up the processes relating to this statement under the headings of financial and economic crisis, effects of climate change, terrorism and illegal immigration. We can describe the aspect of public policy in the same way as we handle the effects of personal and

¹ email: variv@uni-nke.hu

social (public) risks (their prevention and consequences). However, in today's complex world, it is difficult to treat the decrease of emergencies individually.

Accordingly, we can define the requirements of the content of "good law enforcement" and specify the indicators that are capable – through the relevant measures – of enhancing the citizens' sense of security, along the principles of the concept of good state (Kaiser, 2015).

According to our hypothesis, this quality can be in essence identified with the change that law enforcement work achieves in the level of public security characteristic of society. At the forefront of our research is the social quality of law enforcement work, which has a complex definition with respect to public policy too. This complex task is also important because in the past 25 years, the socio-economic background that characterises the natural environment of complex law enforcement work has changed significantly.

It should definitely be mentioned that there are several offences, where the effects of changing the statistical method and raising the misdemeanour threshold to 50 thousand forints did not and could not be felt.

THE RESULTS OF THE RECENT PERIOD – A FEW CHARACTERISTIC TRENDS IN CRIMINAL STATISTICS

In criminal statistics – which is held to be a manifestation of the state of public security, there have been significant changes recently. In the case of certain offences (such as the fraudulent use of documents and non-cash paying instruments), the significant rise has not affected the subjective sense of security of the majority of citizens. No trends of constant rise or decrease could be determined concerning the individual crime types and the operational criminal situation has not deteriorated. We can state that since 2012 the decrease in the numbers of crimes has been practically constant. Considering the figures of the past 4 years, the number of registered crimes has decreased by nearly 200 thousand. What can be behind this constant decrease, which can now be considered statistically relevant? It is often brought up as the reason for the decrease that the misdemeanour threshold has been raised, which has naturally reduced the number of known offences significantly. This was obviously a great item in the single year when this act of decriminalisation was performed. However, it cannot account for the further significant decrease of the following years. Since 2013, there has been a major decrease in the number of known offences (2013: 358.806, 2014: 309.394), which can be partly attributed to the modification of the statistical method mentioned above, and, according to several experts, the results of a stricter criminal policy, furthermore, a new interpretation of presence in public areas can also be felt behind the decrease. Besides quantitative change, we should also raise the topic of qualitative change. Besides the decrease in the number of known crimes, several offences that greatly affect the subjective sense of security have also dropped in number. As regards the years between 2011 and 2015, it should definitely be highlighted that the number of robberies (3202→1442) and homicides (327→205) has constantly decreased. These two types of crimes have an especially great influence on the citizens' subjective sense of security. The number of larceny crimes has also decreased significantly, which – because of the great number of incidents- is one of the offences that have the greatest influence on national crime figures (181,982→111,324). It is evident that raising the misdemeanour threshold has also contributed to the significant drop in the number of incidents; however, even if we do not consider that, the number of known thefts has decreased.

Based on the above, we can state, that considering the crime statistics data of the past six years, the number of known crimes has indeed decreased. Practically speaking, the last time

that saw such low crime figures was the period around the change of regime. Besides traditional statistical tendencies, we should also mention that along with a general improvement, a mosaic interpretation of the data is also available. In an international collection of studies on police forces, published in 2013, the author of the chapter on Hungary points out that while the risk of becoming a victim is relatively low, the sense of security is not higher than the EU average (Leyrer, 2013. hiv. Christián, 2014). All in all, the decrease in the number of registered violent crimes in the representative group indicates a measurable improvement of the government's power to prevent and fight crimes. Law enforcement capacities have increased, state expenditures on public order have grown and the human resources of law enforcement have increased. Trust in the legal system has strengthened.²

POSSIBILITIES OF MEASUREMENT AND ASSESSMENT IN THE LIGHT OF TERRITORIAL INFLUENCES

Due to its cooperative nature, the state of public security is influenced by several factors besides the activities of the police. Thus, it is hard to form a clear picture of the quality of the work of the police merely based on public security data.

As Sallai János put it in *Belügyiszemle* (Internal Review) in 2014, police (and law enforcement science) also draw upon the findings of criminal geography. This appears in the aspects of the Good State and Governance Report, which states that the data of macro statistics and organisational performance reviews should be analysed in light of the characteristics of locality.

In his already quoted study, Bíró Gyula highlights the following local aspects out of the defining components of public security (Bíró, 2011):

Criminal/traffic factors: tendencies in the number of crimes occurring in the narrow or broader living environment – in the citizens' proximity – and the "quality" of the crimes in the direct living environment, furthermore, the traffic conditions of the routes most frequently used by the individual.

Factors related to the order of public areas: the condition of public lighting in the immediate living environment of the individual and around their place of work and sanitation conditions in their immediate surroundings.

Factors related to human relationships and human communication:

- the relationship between the individual and police officers;
- police presence in public areas;
- the quality of the police's response ability;
- the quality of police and press communication concerning the various crimes;
- the presence of the auxiliary police in public areas

When examining social influences, an analysis of integrated urban development strategies can become important background material too. Based on the background material needed

² According to a survey by TÁRKI, trust in the Hungarian legal system has increased between 2009 and 2013 (from 4.0 to 4.78). The 2014 survey by KSH (Hungarian Central Statistical Office) used a different methodology and produced a score of 5.1 on a scale ranging to 10, which could become a baseline data of measuring trust in the future (Good State and Governance Report, 2015: 6). TÁRKI's survey on trust in institutions has shown a significant increase of trust in the police between 2009 and 2013. Out of the public institutions examined by TÁRKI, the police achieved the second highest trust index after MTA (and received a higher score than the Parliament, the Central Bank of Hungary and the State Accounting Office). (Good State and Governance Report, 2015: 14).

for its preparation (Dietz, 2011), we can see that the question of public order is an important methodological and (regional) conceptual component. In task forces, the question of public order is treated together with economic activity and employment, the situation of young people, the question of immigrants, the delineation of the targets of urban rehabilitation and citizens' involvement.

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. 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 (Skolnick, 1975: 3).

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* (Finszter, 2008: 14). 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 number, that is, they direct the suitable time and resource in order to absorb/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 individually and also as an organization to focus on increasing exclusively certain easily quantified results, while disregarding any other aspects that would have deeper social effects (Davis, 2012).

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 dysfunctional operation, seemingly lead to performance growth. But at a

social level, an organisation that conceptually 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.

INDICATORS (FACTORS) DETERMINING TRUST IN THE POLICE

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. Perhaps one of the most important quality factors is the trust and the equality. In the United States and in other developed democracies, the progress towards the implementation of fair and efficient law enforcement inevitably implies its slow-down 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. Below I will outline some of the research results that are specifically related to the quality measurement method.

In her study, Hinds (2009) analyses the effect of police officers–civilians encounters on people, he 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. 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. Hinds concludes that the police are able to improve citizens' satisfaction on their own, thereby to improve 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.

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, which 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.

In their comprehensive empirical research, Rogge and Verschelde (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 “benefit of the 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 reported, 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.

As an alternative solution, in international literature several models have already been recommended to measure the efficiency of the police. The 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 (Drake and Simper, 2005).

THE PRECONDITIONS FOR DEMONSTRATING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

At a conceptual level, the separation and independent handling of crime and the effect of the police working (and their effects) requires consideration. In fact, the authentic interpretation of the relation between the subjective approach to police and crime and the objective figures of public safety is flawed because it is approached in a causal scheme. Crime is not the consequence of the lack of police performance; in the causal chain neither of them fulfils the role of reason or result. In this way different institutional solutions and interventions which treat delinquency, no matter how strict they are, such as 'zero tolerance', wish to make a change via the tools of police, meanwhile remaining within – the tight one-way causality – its uniformed formula (Tihanyi – Vári, 2015).

We have to realize that improving the quality and the credibility of the police authority together with a growing confidence of the population has a bigger effect than simply fighting crime. It was also verified by researches, which, by analysing the results of opposing police approaches, came to the conclusion that they transformed the criminal situation with very similar effectiveness. However, criminological researches consistently verified the close relation and interaction between crime and police (Szabó, 2002). Handling police outside the scope of crime and using its statistics for research purposes leads to faulty results, which can encourage wrong conclusions. Crime can be handled solely in correlation with police activity and social processes, where several factors must be considered, which can make the real nature of police exact and intelligible. Such factors can be:

- Complex statistics integrated into society

When evaluating the quality of police activities, it is indispensable to know and reveal local social conditions and figures. Local unemployment, social stratification, standard of living and other significant macro factors can definitely create different expectations towards the police as a police authority. At a national, county or local level the root cause of crime is the functional disorder of basic social processes which can be traced back to social disorganization, the weakening of social control, cultural conflicts or other anomalies.

- The opinion of local governments, civil organizations and churches

We must pay considerable attention to specifically local public safety requirements, since police can be qualified as meeting these. If local government law enforcers work hand in hand and in active cooperation with civil public safety self-organizations, they can react more effectively to the local challenges of public safety.

- The basic unit of police is the local body

The foundation of efficiency is the evaluation and measurement of local settlement units revealing its specific crime and police situation. The national survey is not able to show and deal with the social, economic, cultural and other processes of smaller geographical units; which not only creates an opportunity to crime, but also motivates perpetrators (Déri, 2000, 62). Knowing the real quality and size of crime makes it possible to adapt the strategy of crime prevention and investigation; adjusting the organization, structure, division and location of the forces, while considering the tendencies and prediction of crime (Boge, 1991).

THE “GOOD STATE - GOOD POLICE” IS A SPECIAL REPORT OF THE “GOOD STATE – GOOD GOVERNANCE” IN HUNGARY

The 2016 chapter of the Good State-Good Law Enforcement Special Report was discussed by the Scientific Council of the Interior Ministry (hereinafter referred to as “the Council”). In addition to acknowledging the merits and the forward-looking nature of the report, the Council has made several criticisms. These can be summarized as follows: 1. There is a need for theoretical consideration; 2. As a result, the title of the special report will be narrowed down, which will then be referred to as the “Good State - Good Police” instead of “Good State - Good Law Enforcement”; 3. It is necessary to specify the precise demarcation of the police performance assessment system; 4. Further expansion of the international outlook is necessary; 5. It is appropriate to further elaborate the element of territoriality. Accordingly, the 2017 Working Paper of the Good State - Good Police Special Report was developed along the lines set by the Interior Ministry Science Council.

- Purpose of the measurement

The law enforcement is one of the specific, well-defined areas of state involvement. Accordingly, the principles of the “good police” can be defined along the principles of the “Good state – Good Governance” concept and the indicators that can be used to reflect the quality of law enforcement work can be identified. This quality can be identified essentially with the quality that law enforcement works as a change in the state of public security that characterizes society. The social status of law enforcement work is at the forefront of our study of the special report 2017-2018.

The NUP’s Research and Development and Innovation Strategy is well linked to the “Good State” report and the definition of “Good State”. “A good state is one that does not give up its humanity, and good law enforcement is the one that involves effective and lawful functioning, and that helps the functioning of the state by protecting the people. Therefore, we do not place the organizational but the social goals of the police in the focus of our research. Organizational goals can be seen as indicators of internal effectiveness as a quality indicator.

- The evaluator

The police’s organizational benchmarking is defined as an evaluation system that promotes the professional, lawful and professional operation of a law enforcement body, improves the efficiency and effectiveness of its activity, supports decision-making and decision-making in management. The aim of the police organizational performance assessment is thus to operate a (complex) management information system. The basis for performance measurement is that the organization’s strategic objectives can be viewed as a coordinated performance index for the purpose of achieving goals. Therefore, long-term and comprehensive strategic objectives need to be transformed into short-term and concrete goals. Organizational performance evaluation means dismantling organizational goals and monitoring the tasks required to achieve them.

On the other hand, the special report is based on the notion of good state, not the organization of the police, but the development of the indicators of the quality of the social functioning and the effects of the police. In this regard, quality indicators mean the results of the achievement of social goals and the effectiveness of their effectiveness. This approach is most likely to be based on the expectation that the special report should serve as the basis for policy decisions.

- The method of the evaluation

A common feature of all organizational performance appraisals is that the degree of achievement of the organizational objectives is ultimately assessed by the leader who determines the objectives. In the case of the police, this is done linearly upwards. The assessment of the head of the superior police force is partly based on the subjective self-assessment of the head of the subordinate body. To this end, the head of the regional body evaluates the performance of the local body by 20 January of the year following the subject year, taking into account the self-assessment of the local body. The national commander shall evaluate the performance of the territorial body by 31 January of the year following the year of issue, taking into account the self-evaluation of the regional body. The Minister of the Interior evaluates the performance of the body performing the law enforcement duties by 15 February of the year following the reference year, based on the proposal of the national commander.

The Good State Special Report is included in a broader dissemination process, but it is true for both evaluation systems that it will be evaluated by the minister responsible for policy as well. The special report evaluation system goes beyond law enforcement policy.

It is important to note that as long as the police's organizational benchmarking process and its main aspects take on normative provisions, special report indicators will be created as a result of scientific research work. One of the advantages of the latter is that the indicator system can be modified according to changing social needs. The special reports of the coming years are not based on a wide-ranging indicator system, but strive to measure the police functions that are perceived by society. It is important to note that the different local characteristics require different organizational, personnel, technical and staffing conditions for police departments working in different geographic areas to provide at least the same quality of service. To do this, it is very important to develop integrated social impact indicators that help to plan and implement complex sectoral and territorial public policy programs.

On the basis of the complexity of police work and the multiplicity of connections between the sector and other subsystems, it can be said that the social dimension is a segment of the performance evaluation of the police organization (which we consider is a great segment). Theoretically, we can say that this is where the organizational activity weakens / where it strengthens. In the Good Police project package, it is therefore important to propose dimensions and factors related to security enhancement.

- The ratios, units of measure used for the evaluation

The performance appraisal system primarily takes the organizational data into account when constructing relationships. The Special Report of 2016 also worked with relationships that addressed the local social inequality indexes. The characteristics of the quality of police work appear partly in the police performance evaluation system. The indicators that are formulated in this system are partly quantitative and partly qualitative indicators. Quantitative indicators include the number of police measures and crime-specific indicators. They cannot be considered as indicators that express the quality in real terms, because they lack, in whole or in part, the necessary benchmark for this. The proportion of the number of people affected by crime can already be suitable to show an indicator of the quality of life of the community. At the same time, one cannot forget that, in itself, the population is far below the territorial features that have a decisive influence on the complex concept of criminality and the sense of security that can be characterized by social space. We do not want to take a stand for the proportional assessment of police measures as organizational performance indicator, but it is certainly not possible to determine the extent to which the various measures affect the criminological phenomena they wish to influence. The special report is working with relationships that include indices that map local social inequality.

THE MAIN TASKS OF THE SECOND PHASE OF THE SPECIAL REPORT 2017

During the first phase, the following segment has changed the structure of police work, the multiplicity of links between the sector and other subsystems, which will determine the structure of the special reports coordinated by the research group of the Faculty of Humanities in the near future.

1. By emphasizing methodological approaches, the content that was relevant to the performance evaluation system of the police was clearly separate. The authors of the special report basically focus not on the complex efficiency of the police organization, but on the (essentially) social framework of the police, we have been focusing on the factors that may affect the subjective sense of the population / community and that public security can be expressed in objective, state. Progress in this means updating the literature and adapting it to content. Our main goal is to answer the challenges of law enforcement in the 21st century.

2. The key ideas of the special report are based on the relationship between trust and security. Among the two key concepts, the “bridge” is space and community (society). In our present study, we strive to move towards the “new paradigm” indicated in the chapters: combining the content and purpose of the basic and applied science research. Our short and medium-term research idea is that we do some small-scale, low-drilling, walking-level research to evaluate the social framework and law enforcement work. For this, it is necessary to identify, in the framework of the first phase, a list of those that are “vulnerable” and some of which are less pronounced along the analyzed social impact are as a long important social impact are as in criminal geography.

3. The 2017 Good State Report Security and Confidence Dimension / Indicator of the Impact Area in Governance also maps the national / local level to the nationwide data. All of this is well connected to the theme of the special report “Good State - Good Police” in 2017, in which we aim to map out the social framework that is emphasized by the new paradigm and is in line with public security and local affairs.

CONCLUSION

The 2016 Special Report of the Special Report outlined an indicator system along which we thought it possible to measure the social impact of the police in accordance with the objectives of the report. Since then, through the Police Headquarters’ Scientific Council, we have conducted a number of consultations with the nominated executive positions of the police with the involvement of the Police Council’s Scientific Council. As a result, a detailed explanation and a detailed description of the elements (counters and denominators) of the commonly designed indicator system are planned for 2018.

The task, therefore, is to define, expand and detail all of the factors which affect the social impact of the police. In addition, we select from the traditional statistical indicators which are the most suitable for social impact measurements. We combine these with each other, possibly adjusting to the number of police forces or local population. Load up the indicators with actual statistical data. The resulting results are processed, compared, analyzed and deduced. In particular, whether the purpose of police work was properly defined, if not, then what and where to change so that social confidence in the police could grow.

REFERENCES

4. Barabás T., Irk F., Kovács R. (2008): *Félelem, bűnözésésbűnmegelőzésEurópaötnagyvárosában*. Budapest, ORKI.
5. Bíró Gy. (2011): „A közbiztonság és a közlekedésbiztonság egyes kérdései, különösképpen a balesetmegelőzésre”. In: Rendészeti kutatások – a rendvédelemfejlesztés című tudományos konferenciáról szóló tanulmányok. Forrás: <http://pecshor.hu/periodika/XII/birogy.pdf> (Letöltés dátuma: 2018. 03. 10.).
6. BOGE, Heinrich: Vorwort. In: SCHWIND, Hans-Dieter: *Dunkelfeldforschung in Bochum 1986/87*. BKA Forschungreihe, Bd. 21. Wiesbaden, 1989, pp. S. 1–3.
7. Charbonneau, E., - Riccucci, N. M. (2008): „Beyond the usual suspects: An analysis of the performance measurement literature on social equity indicators in policing”. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 31(4), pp. 604–620.
8. Christián L. (2014): *Arendőrségre és a titkosszolgálatokról szóló szabályozás változásai*. MTA Law Working Papers. Forrás: http://jog.tk.mta.hu/uploads/files/mtalwp/2014_43_Christian.pdf (Letöltés dátuma: 2018. 05. 14.).
9. Davis, r. C. (2012): *Selected International Best Practices in Police Performance Measurement*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation.
10. Déry, P.: *A bűnözési statisztika és a valóság*. BM Kiadó, Budapest, 2000.
11. Dietz, F. (2011): *Az integrált városfejlesztési stratégia*. Forrás: www.tankonyvtar.hu/hu/tartalom/tamop412A/.../05_Integralt_varosfejlesztes.pdf (Letöltés dátuma: 2018. 05. 12.).
12. Drake, L. M. – Simper, R. (2005): “The Measurement of Police Force Efficiency: an Assessment of UK Home Office Policy”. *Contemporary Economic Policy* 23(4): pp. 465–482.
13. Finszter, G. (2009): *Közbiztonság és jogállam*. Forrás: online.sze.hu/images/J%C3%81P/2009/3/Finszter.pdf (Letöltés dátuma: 2018. 04. 22.).
14. Finszter, G. (2008): Viziók a rendőrségről. *Belügyi Szemle*, 1. szám
15. Hinds, L. (2009): Public satisfaction with police: The influence of general attitudes and police– citizen encounters. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 11(1), pp- 54-66.
16. Kaiser, Tamás (szerk.) (2015): *Jó Állam Jelentés 2015*. Budapest, Nemzeti Közszerzői Egyetem.
17. Moore, M. H. – Braga, A. A. (2004): Police performance measurement: A normative framework, *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 23:1, pp. 3-19
18. Rogge, N. -Verschelde, M. (2012): „A composite index of citizen satisfaction with local police services”. *Hub Research Papers, Economics & Management*, 2012/13,
19. Skolnick, J. H. (1975). *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in a Democratic Society*. 2nd ed. Wiley & Sons, New York.
20. Vári, V. – TIHANYI Miklós (2015): „Jó állam, jó rendészet”. A rendőrség hatékonyság mérésének koncepciója. *MAGYAR RENDÉSZET* 4. szám. pp. 117-126.