

# PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IN THE HUNGARIAN POLICE - THE LEGACY OF THE PAST AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Vince Vári<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

In my study<sup>2</sup> I intend to present the endeavour to improve efficiency and introduce the current model for its measurement. I attempt to analyse the disadvantageous effect of linking performance measurement to statistics-based efficiency measurement on the organizational culture and work ethic of the police, thus influencing the subjective feeling of safety of the society. There is no question that the objective indices of criminal statistics are too complicated to completely exclude the possibility of their manipulation if they are connected to performance evaluation. The efficiency indicator is especially important in moving away from quantity towards quality. The subjective feeling of safety as an efficiency factor must be acknowledged and included in the system. That is, gaining the confidence of the people and the community should be as essential as producing a more successful police performance index from a lower budget.

*Keywords:* measurement, statistics, police, performance, Hungary

*DOI:* <https://doi.org/10.18690/978-961-286-174-2.10>

## INTRODUCTION

In this paper, I will give a historical overview of the organizational performance of the Hungarian police. I want to show you the most important stages of development. Pointing to the fact that the police's organizational effectiveness can be measured with purely statistical and quantitative data, it can lead to extremely dangerous and manipulative processes. It can have many negative consequences, such as the erosion of organizational culture, the self-employed bureaucratic mode of operation, and the fall of citizens' trust in the police. In my article, I also offer solutions and suggestions that would, instead of or in addition to statistical-based indicators, measure the efficiency of the police performance primarily from the social side.

Hungarian statisticians quickly recognised the potential lying in criminal statistics: without the information and patterns hidden in the data of criminal statistics the state is unable to do anything against crime (Domokos, 2013: 64). The efficiency quotient was based on criminal statistics and it has become the most important indicator showcasing the quality of the system. The reciprocal of efficiency exposes the ratio of inner variables to one another, especially in the simplified relation of investment and profit. Moreover, it shows the integrity of implicit and explicit factors by inserting the whole system into an external environment. When police measurement, we examine the operation of a complex system; in case of incorrect fundamental assumptions, the results, if applied to the system, can cause its structural and functional disorder. An outcome-oriented approach can cause the weakening of the formal and informal facets of the organization. As a consequence, in

---

1 Vince Vári, Faculty of Law Enforcement, National University of Public Service, Hungary.  
Contact: [vari.vince@uni-nke.hu](mailto:vari.vince@uni-nke.hu)

2 The work was created in commission of the National University of Public Service, Hungary under the priority project KÖFOP-2.1.2-VEKOP-15-2016-00001 titled „Public Service Development Establishing Good Governance” in Ludovika Workshop.”

contradiction to its original intention, measuring efficiency can lead to the demotivation and demoralization of the police organization, and instead of strengthening its structure and functionality, the opposite outcome occurs. In this way, measuring efficiency can lead to the refusal or questioning of performance indicators and indices. Not recognizing the real nature of effects is an “ostrich-like policy”, which attempts to evade or dodge objective statistical indicators. It does not take into consideration that organizational efficiency is a complex system based on several factors, the efficiency of which is almost impossible to be expressed in simple figures. As a result, delivering the expected figures becomes the sole measure of performance of the organization and the system itself. Delivering these figures at all costs practically becomes more important than fulfilling the fundamental governmental and social function of the organization. Therefore, it is essential to lay down certain principles which might ensure the theoretical basis for the enforcement of these ‘objective’ figures. They can be objected not only because they are old-fashioned or represent a different kind of mentality, but because they represent a factual and serious obstacle for development.

### SEEKING THE WAYS AND MEANS OF THE POLICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IN THE 1980s

The Hungarian Great Encyclopaedia (Magyar Nagylexikon, 1999: 275) defines efficiency as follows: *“1. the ratio of output and input. Depending on the type of input, different efficiency indicators can be created, e.g. efficiency of material consumption, the capital (inverse of capital intensity, i.e. the quotient of capital and production), and productivity (inverse of labour intensity). Complex indicators can also be produced, which include all the (factors) inputs, in case of fixed or convertible inputs, or in case of those inputs which can be expressed in mutual units of measure. 2. evaluation deriving from the comparison of production processes which can be described with diverse, not commensurable outputs. One procedure is more efficient than another, if, for the same output (combination), it uses less of at least one of the inputs, while from the other inputs it does not use more; respectively, with the same input combination it results in more output in case of at least one of the outputs, while the others remains unchanged (vectorial comparison). In this respect procedures are efficient if more efficient procedures do not exist”.*

Some police researchers approached the question of efficiency in the 1980s based on the above given definition. They were aware of the existence of latent crime, and although they accepted that total crime included latent crime, they could not count with it when measuring efficiency. The police authorities also set the theoretically possible maximum as the benchmark, and not total crime which includes latent crime.

In case of efficiency is nothing but a ratio which includes the volume of labour input and the achieved result, where the achievement is weighted by the danger to society and refers to recorded crimes, and where the volume of labour input and work load is determined by the complex system of several factors (Somogyi, Vass, & Madács, 1979: 22). The new indicator evaluates the activities of the police authority regulated by the Criminal Procedure Law; other activities are not included. The categorization of certain crimes was based on the average court sentences and Penal Code sanctions, which resulted in a “danger to society indicator”; nevertheless, this efficiency formula did not go further than surveying and indexing the regional characteristics of the criminal situation. Somogyi, Vass and Madách focused their research on the question whether the labour input of the police reflected the judicial system’s (i.e. court decisions) imposed average sentence in relation to certain crimes. When defining efficiency, they did not draw any conclusion besides indexing crimes; still, their results could show how the courts perceive crimes after police, creating a ground for comparison. This way police authorities could allocate work and organizational conditions better. If they

wished to get an objective picture of a given investigation authority's efficiency, they could transfer the indexed crime numbers to the recorded crime data of the given authority and compare the labour input of the organization to that data. However, they did not draft further recommendations as to how the system should be adapted or how labour input data should be obtained. Although establishing crime categories is a valid line of research, it does not provide enough information to define efficiency. They failed to point out, that the "danger to society" index does not reveal how complicated and time-consuming investigations and verifications are. In fact, only by indexing how time-consuming the verification process is (amount and nature of evidence) and how dangerous a certain crime to society is, can the priorities and the scope of authority of the police organization be determined.

I fully agree with István Tauber's contemporary reflection on the above-mentioned research, who, while defining the efficiency of police, strongly doubted that the police performance can be measured. According to his view, the efficiency of the social function of crime prevention can only be defined through negative procedures, and only as a tendency. With this method, latent crime is not considered assuming that it is less prevalent than recorded crime. I believe in Hungary this is the case. At that time there was not an overall latency survey that is why the author supposes it. After the political change of 1989, Korinek László published data concerning Hungarian latent criminality. *"It is not the social perception of committed crimes that matters, but the labour intensity of the investigation and prosecution of various crimes. Of course, the social perception of a committed crime can also be considered, but only as an underlying characteristic feature."* (Tauber, 1980: 62). In his efficiency theory Tauber (1980) created the following groups of factors:

- cases should be categorized on the basis of a point system according to how complex they are, how much data we have and the quality and type of the data, etc. The types of cases can be indexed based on how much time needs to be devoted to them. The crimes might be assigned between 1–10 points;
- the average investigation and verification activity done at a given type of crime. Personnel conditions of the examined police unit. Professional preparedness, practice and qualification is also rated; and
- social perception of certain crimes, according to the type and size of the court sentence.

Tauber focuses on the cooperation of the criminal procedure's subsystems from the point of view of efficiency, as he says: *"Criminal prosecution requires the cooperation and coordination of different bodies, because efficient police can only be imagined if all the bodies taking part in the criminal procedure strive for maximum performance."* (Tauber, 1980: 59). Tauber (1980) uses the commonly accepted efficiency formula to calculate the efficiency of police, while also considering factors which really influence the efficiency of the activity, such as: (a) crime situation, (b) quantity and quality of the caseload, (c) time factors in the investigation, (d) quantity, quality and successfulness of work, and (e) personnel and material conditions of the police.

According to his viewpoint, the efficiency formula cannot be automatically applied to the field of police performance, since defining and measuring "effective output and established output" is a complicated task, and the "social need" element of police efficiency raises interpretation problems. His efficiency approach is much more chiselled than the former theory, which was flawed from the start. Still, in his assessment of efficiency he neglects the role of the feeling of subjective safety and the significance of public opinion on the police. However, these aspects are indispensable to determine the efficiency of a modern

police force, integrated into a society. László Korinek's (1998) monograph 'Fear of Crime' was essential to promote this idea, but unfortunately, he only published it well after the change of regime in 1995.

### MEASURING EFFICIENCY IN THE 1990s

Valér Dános (2002) conceived the evaluation of police work along three lines: measuring effectiveness, performance and efficiency:

- how well the police manages the resources at its disposal: human resource, budgetary funds and material infrastructure;
- performances compared to each other and their tendencies; and
- meeting social expectations, changes in efficiency in relation to crime data (Dános, 2002).

The medium-term research of Dr. univ. István Komáromi on police measurement at the Pest County Police Headquarters in 1996 is also worth mentioning (Komáromi & Teremi, 1996). According to his views the development of a unified measuring system is still in the initial stages, calling for more research. Our current system, which is based on statistical data, is unfair; it does not account for the different working conditions of the authorities; it does not differentiate between the various types of crimes and offences, each crime counts as one. A further problem is that statistics, which is meant to provide objective results, do not correlate with the public's subjective feeling of safety. Different crimes have different effects on the public consciousness. *Komáromi*, being result oriented, prefers the objective approach, since subordinates cannot be blamed for lower efficiency if organizational aims are not in accordance with efficiency indices. Economic efficiency aims to achieve the most with as little effort and as few resources as possible. The outcome is the output itself. The index of efficiency is the quotient of input and output during a given period of time. After defining correctly, the input and the output, they have to be converted to a commensurable unit of measurement. The measure of efficiency is not the same as the achieved result and different results can be compared thanks to efficiency measurement (Komáromi & Teremi, 1996).

Komáromi's analysis and research is a serious advancement in defining efficiency. Nevertheless, his approach remained mainly statistical, and he failed to clarify several conceptual elements. Neither could he solve the efficiency dilemma between objective safety and subjective feeling of safety. The inner evaluation method of the variables in his system is rudimentary, therefore his system could not become a self-regulating coherent efficiency measurement system, since the variables can be changed arbitrarily (Komáromi & Teremi, 1996).

Marvin E. Wolfgang and his colleagues conducted a similar research about how people see the seriousness of crimes and offences compared with each other (Wolfgang, Figlio, Tracy, & Singer, 1985). They came to the conclusion that when cases – and not offences (contrary to the Hungarian research) – were graded according to their seriousness, people based their decision on whether the victims were able to defend themselves, how big the loss or damage was, what type of firm or organization had been wronged, and what the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim was. Almost all the respondents agreed that white collar crimes are more serious than crimes against property (Wolfgang et al., 1985).

## PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IN THE PRACTICE

By the mid-1990s, it became obvious to certain police experts that the evaluation practice established for the crime situation in the 1990s contained several dysfunctional elements. The common performance indicators used for evaluating the professional performance of the police was not suitable to measure the real performance of the given body (Dormán, 2002). In 1997 a completely new evaluation system was presented to the leadership of the National Police Headquarters, and its trial implementation was decided upon. The system was to be introduced in three phases, first applying it to the data of three counties, than to five counties and finally to Pest County. The new evaluation system inevitably brought about positive changes. A lot of information, which was not demonstrated by the former statistical indicators, was revealed transforming the former efficiency indices (Dormán, 2002):

- measurements regarding the density of police officers rearranged the order of ranking between the headquarters;
- police authorities could channel their forces better, after the prevalence of specific crimes became visible in the regional data; and
- the expenses per criminal case ranking significantly rearranged the efficiency ranking.

The aspects of the new evaluation system became the following (Dormán, 2002):

- citizens and local governments became involved in the evaluation system through opinion polls;
- combining traditional criminal statistical data with social statistical indices, e.g. certain type of crime incidences per 100 thousand people;
- Regional statistics are not compared to each other, but to the former period of time, revealing tendencies and changes;
- creating weighted indices with nominal numbers based on the average sentences imposed according to the Penal Code;
- using a clarifying index, which shows how many cases the police dealt with during a given period of time. It also contains cases closed but not solved; and
- the human, material-technical and financial conditions of the given body, such as how much money and how many police officers they have, what their technical-equipment utilization is like, etc.

The whole system was to be introduced by 2003, but in the end, it was not implemented. However, it started a way of thinking which led to the acknowledgement of the role of subjective feeling of safety.

## POLICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT BY A LAW

### THE 'EFFICIENCY' CALCULATION METHOD AS THE BASIS OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

18/2012. (X. 12.) ORFK Directive about the Procedure of Evaluation of County (Capital) Police Headquarters, Police Headquarters and Borderguard Offices Based on an Objective Measurement Performance System (18/2012. (X. 12.) ORFK utasítás a megyei (fővárosi) rendőr-főkapitányságok, a rendőrkapitányságok és a határrendészeti kirendeltségek objektív mérőrendszer alapján történő értékelésének eljárásáról, 2012). Efficiency, which is the aim of the directive, is closely linked to the performance evaluation of the organization.

The evaluation system of the set objectives uses 30 index numbers out of which: 20 are crimes, 2 are offences, 4 are related to public order, 3 are related to traffic regulations, 1

reflects the opinion of local governments. The instruction in the evaluation system weights the indicators between 1 and 4 by importance. The indicators included in each importance (1-4x) category are generated primarily based on statistically recorded quantitative data. Only the local government's opinion is an exception, because it is based on the questionnaire survey.

Below I describe the indicators separately according to the importance weighting:

- *Importance (1x)*: The number of investigations per 1 policeman, successful investigations per 1 policeman, prosecution per 1 policeman. The efficiency indexes of investigating crimes committed in a public space, negligence to help, hit-and-run accidents, vandalism, vigilantism, cases involving private vehicles, arbitrary taking of vehicle, damage of property, plundering, solving offences against property committed by an unknown perpetrator, rate of prosecution. The average time of the infringement procedure and the hours spent in a public space per 1 policeman.
- *Importance (2x)*: Solving a crime committed by an unknown perpetrator, the number of crimes committed in a public place per 100.000 inhabitants, the rate of prosecution, the average time of investigating cases, the number of apprehensions per one police officer, the number of arrests per one police officer.
- *Importance (3x)*: Solving homicide cases committed by an unknown perpetrator, the efficiency indexes of investigating theft, burglary, robbery, and the change in the number of traffic accidents with injuries compared to an earlier period of time.
- *Importance (4x)*: The number of registered crimes, opinion of local governments.

## CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING THE WEIGHTING OF INDEX NUMBERS

The original significance of the different crimes (20 crimes, 2 offences, etc.) significantly changes after weighting, so it seems that the original rate is only a principle. On the other hand, there are common criminal statistical and other index numbers, which have no relation to either branch of service.

The measure is dominated by the former (investigation) and the current reconnaissance index in case of an unknown perpetrator performance indicators of certain crimes, that is, by the output statistics of police. It is a positive development that the condition of the authority appears in the evaluation, however, it makes up for only 18% of the evaluation. The proportion of criminal tendency index numbers is also low in the measure: only 18% of the whole evaluation system. Moreover, it is a significant question whether empty positions and appointments are accounted for in the per capita values, since at these measures a reduced number of staff means higher efficiency. The proportion of the local government's opinion is also low in the measure (below 10%). Although the opinion of the local government is important, it is not equivalent with the public's feeling of safety, which does not appear in the evaluation at all. Furthermore, we do not get a picture on the rate of latent crime either.

Analysing the directive, one can declare that the evaluation is still largely based on statistics, while to a certain degree it also calculates with the workload of the authorities and with the figures of local crime, the change of which – we must add – is not always due to the effective operation or activity of the investigation authority, but to several macro factors mentioned in my study. Unfortunately, efficiency measures do not reflect how effectively the police react to criminal tendencies, but rather focuses on the number and rate of files that the police authority produces. Apart from this, the advantage of the directive is that it deals

with authorities on the same level in a comparative way regarding their conditions; however, rates could have been weighted more, not to mention the necessity of representing the differences of local criminal 'characteristics'.

This model worked only for a few years, but the police did not even disclose the numbers. The Act XLII of 2015 on the Service Status of the Professional Staff of the Law Enforcement Officers (Évi XLII. 2015 törvény a rendvédelmi feladatokat ellátó szervek hivatásos állományának szolgálati jogviszonyáról, 2015) prior to the entry into force of the Act, the necessary and mandatory norms have been established for the re-regulation of the normative bases of the police's efficiency measurement, such as the recommended elements of the performance assessment of professional members of certain armed forces under the Minister of the Interior, the rules of procedure for the application of the recommended elements, 26/2013 (VI.26.) BM Decree on the criteria for the performance evaluation of organizational performance in the framework of the organizational performance evaluation of certain armed forces. (XII.21.) instruction (26/2013. (VI. 26.) BM rendelet a belügyminiszter irányítása alatt álló egyes fegyveres szervek hivatásos állományú tagjai teljesítményértékelésének ajánlott elemeiről, az ajánlott elemek alkalmazásához kapcsolódó eljárási szabályokról, a minősítés rendjéről és a szervezeti teljesítményértékelésről., 2013). We do not have significant experience yet with the operation of the new system, so it has not been included in this analysis.

## **THE PRECONDITIONS FOR DEMONSTRATING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

At a conceptual level, the separation and independent handling of crime and the affect 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 (Sárosi, 2008).

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 (Harcourt, 2001). However, criminological research consistently verified the close relation and interaction between crime and police (Szabó, 2002: 35).

The two subsystems, affecting and influencing each other, represent crime, therefore evaluating and emphasizing their conditions independently from each other is meaningless, inconsequent and does not assume a strategic aspect at all. 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; and
- 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).

## **CHALLENGES OF THE POLICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

In accordance with the notion of efficiency expounded above, the following aspects should be considered when developing the method of performance evaluation of law enforcement employees:

- the number of operations, including executed investigation actions;
- the number of solved cases (perpetrators and crimes);
- the number of dissolved and suspended cases;
- the number of cases passed on to prosecution;
- weighting the investigation difficulty of cases based on the crime and the concrete case, which would be a "prequalification" from the leader;
- the period of time spent on certain investigation activities in proportion to the working hours in the given period of time;
- the rate of decisions rejected by prosecution, the same in case of supplementary investigations, compared with the number of investigations in process; and
- the number of commander revisions, and the quantity and quality of the discovered deficiencies, etc.

The listed aspects of evaluation are not complete, and they may vary according to the sphere of activity, nevertheless, it can be seen quite well that a performance evaluation system developed in accordance with organizational efficiency, could basically change the functional system of the organization and would steer it towards the direction of efficiency.

Measuring performance is significant for the efficiency of police, because through increasing individual performances the whole system is developing. To achieve this, there has to be a harmony between the long term and short-term objectives of the organization and between the objectives of the branches. Management theory provides a scientific approach as to how this should be carried out, defining the advantages of modern management



principles and methods, and explaining the means to increase performance motivation. A relevant performance survey at the police contains:

- a committed management;
- an active participation of the subordinates;
- consistent endeavour;
- regular appreciation;
- consistency in the rewarding system; and
- adequate and regular trainings to improve the necessary skills.

If the organization wants to operate successfully, it has to establish a culture which appreciates effort by concentrating on results and performance. All this helps to establish the adequate performance-centric culture based on endeavour (Morgan, 1995: 21).

The crime-case solution index cannot be the basis for performance evaluation; its use deliberately misleads society, public opinion and citizens, and at the same time it is a self-deception to overemphasize its importance in the system of performance evaluation (Finszter, 2008). The impracticality of using the crime-case solution index lies in the interaction between cause and effect, since public safety is the aggregate of objective factors and phenomena, which are also significantly influenced by the efficiency and result-oriented approach of the police working. The crime prevalence index, since ignoring the macro structural elements of social relations, is not suitable for comparison. To sum it up, objective police indices are unsuitable for performance evaluation since:

- There is no causal relation between performance and these indices; e.g. the inverse proportionality between crime solution indices and crime prevalence cannot be measured or verified. It means that the improving crime case solution indices do not necessarily reflect the improvement of the crime situation, they simply show that the activity of police has increased. E.g. if crime indices have increased = public safety has deteriorated = the police have worked badly. On the other hand, if the same happens in case of a hidden crime (drunk driving, family abuse, etc.), we can surely state that the efficiency of the police body has increased (Kertész, 2002: 29).
- The crime situation, i.e. the objective safety is the result of complex factors, which depend on the efficiency of the police to a great extent; the role and effect of police performance, that is the procesual and regressive model cannot be measured or separated from the effect of the proactive model. Only the separated measurement of these two could explain the necessity of their use.
- The crime rate data does not consider important factors, such as the composition of the population or the structure of crime.

According to Dános (2002), goal setting reveals the vision and the basic philosophy of the police, which determines the leading motive of the activities of the whole police force, its units and its members. The quantitative indices of the measurement must be in harmony with the most fundamental aims of the police; the close interaction between them must be thoroughly examined.

As far as community goals are concerned, first of all the indices of contentment must be taken into consideration. The indices of case solving, and successful investigations provide only an indirect and deformed picture of how successfully the police work. As if the success of legislation lay in the number of acts passed each year instead of their social effects. Similarly, the police authorities of the state are successful if they produce the least possible data, and they guarantee social peace and public safety. Guaranteeing objective

safety (negative police indices) is only important as far as they increase the subjective feeling of safety and reveal the fight against hidden crime.

We must make sure that (either centrally or locally) set aims are reached. This activity can be described as measuring general police efficiency. Where the set aims have been reached, the resources used for reaching the aims have to be evaluated, then decide whether they were excessive or not. Another factor must be considered, namely the 'profitability' of the organization in terms of expenses. This is another kind of efficiency measurement or survey to reveal how much loss there is, how much time and energy have been wasted. The ratio between results and methods must be considered here (Skuli, 1995).

The crime solving index is also paramount in evaluating the performance of the organization, but while it highlights the successfully closed cases, it ignores unsuccessful activities and wasted working hours. Therefore, it is important to assess how much time is spent on a case, i.e. how long it takes to produce a report, furthermore how much time is spent on processing cases either successful or unsuccessful. The reasons for stopping investigations can be further detailed revealing how many working hours and how much energy input the authority needs to achieve its success indices. Trends of certain activities must be analysed and all the legislative or law enforcement anomalies must be uncovered, in this way the work load conditions of successful and unsuccessful procedures become detectable. The robocop system records all the investigation activities; these electronic records can uncover the relations between work load and the number of staff providing an insight into the nature of efficiency. We must pay attention to the fact that only the results of similar police bodies can be compared and evaluated drawing conclusions from them. A clear advantage of the revision is that standard figures can be established, which reveal the time-scale of various working processes and highlight more clearly the relations between administration load and success.

The disadvantages of using outcome data for performance evaluation have been presented in several studies. Its problems mainly appear in its inadequacy to reflect latent crime. It is improperly connected to the quality of work and to the salary system, which creates serious contradictions and dissatisfaction inside the organization (Kádár, 1967).

The more efficient German police system evaluates the changes and tendencies in the crime scene. Police management, both at higher and lower levels, reacts to the dynamically changing face of crime with flexible measures. On local levels it means strengthening the patrol and surveillance service, organizing large-scale public safety actions and raids, and establishing different special investigation teams, for which workforce is taken from other fields (Ziegler, 1995).

## DISCUSSION

On the basis of the above considerations it can be safely stated that basing performance evaluation purely/only on "objective" police statistical data, does not correlate with the original objective of improving the efficiency of police. This paradigm disregards strategic thinking and does not examine crime and crime control with a scientific approach. It also fails to perceive crime as a social phenomenon and the police as an institution which reacting to it. Moreover, it has a negative effect on the motivation/incentive system of the organization by serving ad-hock purposes and thus alienating the society. The police performance cannot be handled separately from crime and society as a hierarchically controlled system.

There is no question that the objective indices of criminal statistics are too complicated to completely exclude the possibility of their manipulation if they are connected to

performance evaluation. The efficiency indicator is especially important in moving away from quantity towards quality. The subjective feeling of safety as an efficiency factor must be acknowledged and included in the system. That is, gaining the confidence of the people and the community should be as essential as producing a more successful police performance index from a lower budget. The efficiency of a community type police integrated into society, measured with the “objective” indices of criminal statistics is an antagonism in itself.

## REFERENCES

- 18/2012. (X. 12.) ORFK utasítás a megyei (fővárosi) rendőr-főkapitányságok, a rendőrkapitányságok és a határrendészeti kéirendeltségek objektív mérőrendszer alapján történő értékelésének eljárásáról [18/2012. (X. 12.) ORFK (National Police Captain) Directive about the Procedure of Evaluation of County (Capital) Police Headquarters, Police Headquarters and Borderguard Offices Based on an Objective Measurement Performance System]. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.police.hu/a-rendorsegrol/jogszabalyok/orfk-utasitasok?page=8>
- 26/2013. (VI. 26.) BM rendelet a belügyminiszter irányítása alatt álló egyes fegyveres szervezetek hivatásos állományú tagjai teljesítményértékelésének ajánlott elemeiről, az ajánlott elemek alkalmazásához kapcsolódó eljárási szabályokról, a minősítés rendjéről és a szervezeti teljesítményértékelésről [26/2013. (VI. 26.) BM (Minister of the Interior) Decree about the recommended elements of the performance evaluation of professional members of certain armed forces under the direction of the Minister of the Interior, the rules of procedure related to the application of the recommended elements, the classification scheme and the organizational performance assessment]. (2013). Retrieved from <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1300026.bm>
- Boge, H. (1991). Vorwort [Foreword]. In H. D. Schwind (ed.), *Dunkelfeldforschungen Bochum 1986/87* (pp. 1-3). Wiesbaden: BKA Forschungreihe.
- Dános, V. (2002). A teljesítményértékelés [Performance measurement]. *Belügyi Szemle*, 50(4), 20-23.
- Déri, P. (2000). *A bűnözési statisztika és a valóság* [Criminal statistics and reality]. Budapest: BM kiadó.
- Domokos, A. (2013). A kriminológiai gondolat megjelenése a magyar büntetőjogban a XIX. század végén. in *Deres Petronella – Domokos Andrea (szerk.): De iuris peritorium meritis 8. 80 Studiain Honorem Tamás Jakucs* [The emergence of criminological thought in Hungarian criminal law in the end of 19th century]. Budapest: Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Állam- és Jogtudományi Kar.
- Dormán, T. (2002). Új szemléletű értékelési rendszer [New approach evaluation system]. *Belügyi Szemle*, 50(4), 15-20.
- Évi XLII. 2015 törvény a rendvédelmi feladatokat ellátó szervezetek hivatásos állományának szolgálati jogviszonyáról [Act XLII of 2015 about the Service Status of the Professional Staff of the Law Enforcement Officers]. (2015). Retrieved from <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=A1500042.TV>
- Finszter, G. (2008). A rendészeti szervezetek működésének jogi alapjai [The legal bases of the law enforcement agencies] *Mester képzés*. (Master thesis). Budapest, Rendőrtiszti Főiskola.
- Harcourt, B. (2001) *Illusion of order: The False promise of Broken Windows Policing*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Kádár, J. (1967). A bűnügyi statisztika felhasználásáról a rendőri vezetésben [The use of criminal statistics in the police leadership]. Budapest: *Rendőrségi Szemle*.

- Kertész, I. (2002). Statisztikai mozaik [Statistical mosaic]. *Belügyi Szemle*, 50(4), 29–32.
- Komáromi, I., & Teremi, J. (1996). Kezdeti lépések a rendőri eredménymérés útján [First steps through police performance measurement]. *Belügyi szemle*, 44(1), 63-71.
- Korinek, L. (1998). A bűnözés visszatükröződése. Látens bűnözés, bűnözésábrázolás, félelem a bűnözéstől. [Reflection of crime. Violent crime, crime representation, fear of crime] In K. Gönczöl, L. Korinek, & M. Lévai (eds.), *Kriminológiai Ismeretek – Bűnözés – Bűnözéskontroll* [Criminological Knowledge - Crime - Crime Control] (pp. 75-92). Budapest: Egyetemi Könyvtár. Corvina kiadó.
- Magyar Nagylexikon [Hungarian Great Encyclopaedia]. (1999). Budapest: Magyar Nagylexikon kiadó.
- Morgan, P. J. (1995). A rendőri tevékenység mérése, teljesítmény-fejlesztés és a felmérés [Measuring police activity, performance development and survey]. *Új rendészeti tanulmányok*, 1, 19-27.
- Sárosi, P. (2008). „Zéró tolerancia” veszélyes illúziók a rend fenntartásáról [„Zero Tolerance” is a dangerous illusion about maintaining the order]. *Beszélő*, 13(3), 1-6.
- Skuli, D. (1995). A rendőri teljesítmény mérése. [Measuring police performance]. *Új rendészeti tanulmányok*, 1, 138-146.
- Somogyi, J., Vass, L., & Madács, I. (1979). A bűnözés helyzetének és a bűnüldözés hatékonyságának mérése [Measurement of crime and the effectiveness of law enforcement]. *Belügyi Szemle*, 17(2), 21-30.
- Szabó, A. (2002). Kriminológiai gondolkodás az informatikai rendszertervekben. *Belügyi Szemle*. (50)4, 34-35.
- Tauber, I. (1980). A bűnüldözési munka hatékonyságának kérdéséhez [The question of the efficiency of law enforcement work]. *Belügyi Szemle*, (17)2, 59-63.
- Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., Tracy, P. E., & Singer, S. I. (1985). National survey of crime severity. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- Ziegler, J. (1995). A német rendőrség és a föderalizmus [German police and federalism]. *Új rendészeti tanulmányok*, 1, 155-162.