

UC Berkeley

IURD Reprint Series

Title

The Urban Police Mission

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3r42z8vp>

Author

Misner, Gordon E.

Publication Date

1967-07-01

Peer reviewed

GORDON E. MISNER



The Urban Police Mission

Center for Planning & Development Research: Institute of Urban & Regional Development
University of California, Berkeley

Reprint No. 27

This work was supported in part by National Aeronautics and Space Administration Grant No. NGR-05-003-125 (Technology and Urban Management) to the Space Sciences Laboratory and the Center for Planning and Development Research, University of California, Berkeley.

The Center for Planning and Development Research is a unit within the Institute of Urban and Regional Development. It is devoted to the study of a wide range of activities in environmental design and urban and regional development. Researchers in the Center are engaged in investigating the processes of urban and regional growth, the consequences of alternative patterns of growth, and the scientific bases for development policy and planning.

Toward these ends, current research is directed to improving theories and methods of planning, to building models capable of simulating urban growth processes, and to formulating improved criteria for urban and regional development policies. Fields of interest to the Center include the development of new and established communities, housing and renewal programming, the effects of technological development on cities and urban life, metropolitan planning, the economics of city-building in the United States and in developing nations, and the social planning and human development issues that accompany urbanization.

The Center contains the Architectural Design Laboratory, which is devoted to research in building technology, the behavioral bases for design, and design processes.

The Urban Police Mission

Gordon E. Misner*

ABSTRACT: The most apparent need for more effective policing in this society, in spite of the advanced training, equipment, and administration of police, is occasioned by the changing character of the police mission. This mission is examined through the use of both historical and textual materials. Particular attention is directed to the influence that new techniques of analysis may have on both goal definition and the measurement of police effectiveness.

Never before in our history have we been policed by a better trained, equipped, and administered police apparatus.¹ Paradoxically, *never* before have we had greater need as a society for more *effective* policing. In an earlier paper,² the author speculated about some of the possible explanations for this paradox and dilemma. In that paper, it was suggested that the current police condition in the nation was characterized at least by the following factors:

1. the metropolitan distribution of the population;
2. the changing character of the urban centers;
3. the changing character of the urban police mission;
4. the development of enfeebling polarities of thought and action;
5. the development of fluid and changing community power centers;
and
6. the growth of police bureaucratization.³

In the present paper, it is the author's intention to continue this speculation and to focus primarily upon an analysis of the changing character of the urban police mission. A portion of the task will involve an examination of some historical materials as they relate to an unfolding of some of our present concepts about the police mission. A second portion of the task will involve some speculation about the relationship which new

*Mr. Misner received his A.B. degree from San Francisco State College in 1951 and his M.A. degree from the University of California in 1952. He is currently visiting Associate Professor of Criminology at the School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley; and Visiting Associate Research Criminologist at the Center for Planning and Development Research, University of California, Berkeley.

¹The author is painfully aware that there are some police forces which fall short of any *reasonable* standard of efficiency, honesty, concept of service, etc. He is saying only that even the poorest of these forces are generally better than they were ten, twenty, or thirty years ago. In addition, there are many forces which conform to very high standards of excellence in several technical senses.

²"The Police and the Community: Confrontation or Partnership?" *Tower*, (San Jose State College Faculty Magazine) Spring, 1966, pp. 19-24.

³*Ibid*, p. 20.

techniques of analysis may have for goal definition and the measurement of police effectiveness.

The Changing Character of the Urban Police Mission:

Historically, it has been the mission of the city to provide the setting for the conduct of mercantile, social, and intellectual activities for sizeable aggregations of human beings. The city still retains that mission, but in today's setting, other dimensions of that mission have been imposed upon the political and social leadership of each urban area. The terms and conditions of the urban and metropolitan setting have vastly complicated the ability of such leadership to provide mass societies with an efficient, healthful, and *secure* physical environment in which to accomplish the social, economic, and intellectual purposes of urban living. From the date of the nation's founding, two of the paramount national missions have been "to establish Justice" and "to insure domestic tranquility." The ability to accomplish these—and other aspects—of the contemporary *urban mission* is an important—perhaps, the crucial—measure of the greatness of the present social and political setting.

While the "mission" of urban society, generally, has been complicated and confused by the rapid development of scientific technology and changes in the patterns of urban living, the effects of these complications and developments have been felt by *each* functional aspect of urban government. Virtually no aspect of local government has been left untouched by these complications and developments. Nor, as the pace of technological and social change quickens, does it seem likely that any aspect of local government will be able to remain immune from the effects or consequences of these changes. This fact is dramatically demonstrated by the new responsibilities which have been imposed upon the police and other criminal justice agencies in our metropolitan areas. The terms and conditions of the urban setting of the late 1960's impose new burdens upon already hard-pressed police agencies. The "police mission" in today's social setting is greatly different than that which engaged police attention even as recently as ten years ago.

Systematic analysis of the police function in the United States probably began with August Vollmer. Actually, some superficial work by city government specialists in this area pre-dated Vollmer; but Chief Vollmer was persistent, curious, and scholarly, and he brought fresh insights into an examination of what the police business was all about. The "list" of police functions which appears traditionally now in all standard treatises on municipal policing has changed little since Vollmer's day.⁴ With little

⁴John D. Holstrom, "Police Administration," in *Encyclopedia of Criminology*, Philosophica Library, New York, 1949; International City Managers Association, *Municipal Police Administration*, 5th Edition, Chicago, 1961; Bruce Smith, *Police Systems in the United States*, 2nd Rev. Ed., Harper, New York, 1960; August Vollmer, *The Criminal*, Foundation Press, Brooklyn, 1949; August Vollmer, *The Police and Modern Society*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1936; and O. W. Wilson, *Police Administration*, 2nd Edition, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963.

variation, the "standard list" of police functions consists of at least the following items:

1. crime prevention
2. crime repression
3. apprehension
4. criminal investigation
5. provision of public service
6. maintenance of peace and security
7. regulation of non-criminal conduct
8. traffic regulation and control
9. provision of emergency services.

It is interesting to note, however, that a list of *functions* is very different from an explanation of a *mission*. In the author's semantic lexicon, at least, one refers to the means, and the other to the ends or hoped-for objectives. Unfortunately all sorts of fields of personal and professional endeavor are currently bedevilled by the problem of confusion of means with ends. It may be assumed that the urban police field has been similarly afflicted.⁵ If, in fact, there has been some confusion of police means and ends, this certainly contributes to the current aura of turbulence which surrounds the public and professional discussion of the contemporary police mission.

Of the items appearing on the list of "functions" above, only two would seem properly to fit the qualifications of describing the social purpose of the police mission: i.e., 1) Provision of public service; and 2) Maintenance of peace and security. All of the other functions would seem logically to be subsumed under these two as means for accomplishing the two primary social objectives.

Even if correct, the above conclusion may very well be at variance with the self-concept of the policeman who is, after all, a person whose activities seem to be central to this whole subject of the police mission. The policeman may very well have a different concept of what his job is all about; if his concept is diversified from that of the society as a whole, tension between the two is almost inevitable.

It is fair to assume that police personnel envision themselves collectively to possess two *distinctive competences*, i.e., occupational skills which are not shared generally by other specialists. These occupational competences are in the fields of criminal investigation and criminal apprehension. All other job skills of the policeman—driving, walking, writing, talking and relating with people, etc.—are shared rather generally with the popu-

⁵Note should be made of the fact "law enforcement" has been excluded from the list of police functions above. This exclusion was conscious, for it appears to the author that "law enforcement" is epistemologically and logically a *process* and a *consequence* involving congeries of public agencies, including regulatory commissions, courts, prosecutors, etc.

Hopefully, some future paper will examine the rather curious use which is made of the term "law enforcement," today.

lation as a whole and certainly with other occupational specialties which impinge upon the work of the policeman. All other aspects of the policeman's job except the areas of his special competence might just as well—might, in fact, be more effectively—turned over to some other occupational specialty. This might be done, *except* for one important fact—i.e., the contemporary urban policeman's job is much broader than the investigation of crime and the apprehension of offenders. In fact, he probably could not effectively accomplish these two functions except for the fact that he is heavily involved and supported in other public duties. Often, it is these "essentially secondary" duties which give to the policeman the public acceptance and cooperation which assists him in accomplishing what he considers to be his "primary" duties.

The public and the policeman often incorrectly assume that the policeman's principal task is to control crime and investigate and apprehend criminals. Actually, data from any police department will prove the incorrectness of this view. For example, data about the "field activities" of patrol personnel in one large city reveals that 70.9% of the "called-for services" involve *miscellaneous* public services, ranging anywhere from a nuisance call to assisting a resident who has been inadvertently locked out of her house. In addition, another 9.9% of the field officers' time was taken up dealing with traffic matters. In the case of this city, therefore, a sample of one year's activity reveals that more than 80% of the field officer's *on-call* time was spent in *non-criminal* matters. The rest of the calls—less than 20%—related to criminal matters and these were almost equally split between Part I and Part II of offenses.⁶ Actually, even these figures appear to be skewed in direction of involvement in "criminal investigation and apprehension." In many large urban police departments, non-criminal calls will approximate 85% of the officers' on-call time.

The implication of this data becomes even more apparent when it is emphasized that the data relates exclusively to the time the officer was actually occupied by an assigned or on-view field activity. The data does not relate to the so-called "dead time," when the officer was *available* for assignment. If we can assume that it is desirable to distribute and deploy police manpower in such a manner that patrol personnel have 50% of their time available for assignment, then the data outlined above would reveal that only 10% of the officers' total tour of duty was involved in matters which were strictly criminal in character. Viewed from a different angle, this data suggests that the patrol personnel of at least one large urban area spend 90% of their time engaged in activities which are "non-criminal" in character. In the author's opinion, data from any other large city will reveal *similar* patterns.

⁶The precise data for all four categories of activities were as follows: 70.9%, Miscellaneous Public Services; 9.9%, Traffic Accidents & Control; 8.7%, Part II Cases; 10.5%, Part I Cases.

It should be emphasized that there is no deliberate or unconscious intent here to minimize the importance of police patrol; nor is there an intent to depreciate the social worth of deploying police patrol manpower in the field in such a manner as to make it reasonably available for assignment to some emergency duty. The intent is quite the contrary. Patrol personnel *should* be deployed so as to be available for this type of emergency duty—either criminal or non-criminal in nature. This is a social cost which society has volitionally—sometimes grudgingly—been willing to bear, precisely because there is no other social agency which is skilled *and* available on an around-the-clock basis to protect, to guard, and to serve.

Unfortunately, neither the police field nor academe has developed any systematic method for determining *in advance* the level of police service which is needed in a particular area. There are an abundance of "myths" and "rules of thumb," but certainly there is yet to be developed a systematic method of relating police need to physical and social setting. The best existing method is *post-dictive* rather than predictive. The most systematic and comprehensive method is that developed by O. W. Wilson, based upon early beat surveys in Berkeley, and upon Wilson's work in Wichita, Chicago, and elsewhere.⁷ A detailed analysis and discussion of Wilson's method of patrol distribution and deployment is beyond the scope of the present paper. What should be mentioned, however, is that under his method, a patrolman's time on his tour of duty may be divided into three categories of activities: 1) Called-for Services; 2) Inspectional Services; and 3) Routine (Preventive) Patrol.⁸ It is this division of "patrol time" which is the logical starting point for a discussion of "levels of police service."

To the best of the author's knowledge no definitive analysis has been made to differentiate "desirable" levels of *rural* and *urban* police service.⁹ Implicit in much of the early literature dealing with county and city government has been the suggestion that "urban" represented somehow a higher level of public service than "rural." If improved service was not, in fact, a consequence of either incorporation or annexation, an area could just as well have remained unincorporated and saved additional taxes. Historically, therefore, it would appear that a "rural" level of police service would mean generally that only "on-call" services were available. If something happened at the Schmidt's, for example, the sheriff and his deputy

⁷O. W. Wilson, *Distribution of the Patrol Force*, Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1941, and *Police Administration*, *op cit*.

⁸Basically, "Inspectional Services" covers that amount of time spent on commercial security checks, vacation house checks, inspection of licensed premises, and similar duties. "Routine Patrol" covers that time the patrolman is not involved in either of the first two categories of activities.

⁹The present author is willing to concede that such a matter *should* have been the subject of a study. Seemingly diligent search of the literature has failed, however, to reveal any such study.

would have to ride over or drive over from the county seat at Walmsnest. Theoretically, if the Schmidts and their neighbors didn't like this arrangement, they could either incorporate their own town or annex to Peabody which was just a half mile down the road.

Even casual examination of the spate of incorporations and annexations which took place following the close of World War II would seem to confirm the fact that an "improved" or "higher" level of service was desired by the residents of the affected areas. Expressed public concern about the two "public safety" aspects of local government—i.e., police and fire services—was central to many of election battles waged over either incorporation or annexation. Theoretically, then, residents within incorporated limits should receive a higher or improved level of police service than residents of unincorporated areas. This, therefore, would mean an increased amount of "Preventive Patrol."

In fact, however, residents of some *unincorporated* urban fringe areas in California are receiving a "higher" level of police patrol service than their counterparts in some of the state's larger cities. Analysis of patrol data for a sheriff's department in one metropolitan area, for example, reveals that patrol personnel have 60% of their tour of duty for "preventive" patrol, i.e., time free of assigned activities.¹⁰ On the other hand, the data for a large city within the same metropolitan area reveals that patrol personnel in that department have less than 30% of their time for preventive patrol. In the urban areas of California—i.e., in both unincorporated urban fringe and the incorporated area—lack of agreement upon the meaning of various "levels" of police service has resulted in some incongruent patterns of police service.

The point of this discussion concerning the allocation of time for patrol in rural and urban areas is to indicate how little has really been done to systematize this administrative chore, or to specify what is meant when we speak of *levels of police service*. We have taken for granted, for example, that there somehow exists a distinction between rural and urban levels of service, but we haven't made these distinctions explicit. Furthermore, if we haven't made this relatively simple distinction, then we certainly have not done an effective job of making the more complicated linkage of police service to physical and social setting.

We operate on the assumption that somehow police effort bears a relationship to criminality and crime control. We are *sure* that conspicuous patrol serves some sort of preventive function, and yet we are never quite certain how this function becomes operative, nor are we really certain about what types of events conspicuous patrol actually prevents. We

¹⁰From this point on, the term "Preventive Patrol"—as a category of patrol activity—is considered to be a combination of time available for both Inspectional Services and Routine Patrol.

assume, without assurance, that physical and social environment has some relationship to the need for police services.

In each edition of the *Uniform Crime Reports*, the F.B.I. inserts a disclaimer to caution the public against making invalid comparisons of crime data from different jurisdictions.

*Caution should be exercised in comparing crime data for individual cities because the differences in the figures may be due to a variety of factors.*¹¹

The following is a list of some of the factors which affect the amount and type of crime in the community but it should be noted that these are not all-inclusive:

Population of the city and metropolitan area adjacent thereto.

The composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex and race.

The economic status and activities of the population.

Relative stability of population.

Climate.

Educational, recreational, and religious facilities.

The number of police employees per unit of population.

The standards governing appointments to the police force.

The policies of the prosecuting officials and the courts.

The attitude of the public toward law enforcement problems.

The degree of efficiency of the local law enforcement agency.¹²

Similar vagueness, generality, and lack of precision have been found in other efforts to relate levels of police service to the physical and social environment.¹³

The one thing which all these efforts have in common—other than vagueness, generality, and lack of precision—is the assumption that police resources are crucial to the crime control problem; consequently, crime control *per se* becomes the central problem of the police. This assumption, in turn, appears to be based on the belief that *crime* is a single phenomenon; that a single approach is adequate as social protection, at least as far as the immediate crisis is concerned.

Without arguing the relationship which "crime" has to the centrality of the urban police mission, one can still argue effectively that we have been generally remiss in our degree of specificity. Historically, crime has become an occupational specialty of the policeman and this development has taken place without any particular guidance from the total community, or even from its political or social leadership. Early in the twentieth century—as an aspect of the more general municipal reform movement—it was

¹¹U.S., F.B.I., *Uniform Crime Reports*, 1959, p. 85. The statement quoted is similar or identical to statements appearing in each edition of the *U.C.R.*

¹²*Ibid.*

¹³See, for examples, staff studies made to assess the cost of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department providing police service to various incorporated areas.

made clear to the policeman that he would be judged primarily and essentially in relationship to his "efficiency" in controlling the "crime problem."¹⁴ Today, much police locker room banter is still characterized by the declaration, "Well, let's go out and fight crime!"

Despite the fact that the "Standard List" of police functions outlined above attests to the fact that urban policemen are involved in a diverse range of activities, their "effectiveness"¹⁵ is still judged primarily in terms of their distinctive competence in criminal investigation and apprehension. For example, in the 1954 edition of *Municipal Police Administration*, the author outlines the "police activities" which characterize the police mission. They are, as follows:

1. prevention of criminality,
2. repression of crime,
3. apprehension of offenders,
4. recovery of property, and
5. regulation of non-criminal conduct.¹⁶

Subsequently, he reveals the methods he advocates using in making his administrative evaluation.

A comprehensive measurement program must evaluate police activities in all of these directions: (i.e., those activities outlined immediately above)

- crime rate
- cases cleared by arrest
- recovery of stolen property
- conviction of persons arrested.¹⁷

A later edition of *Municipal Police Administration* does not improve upon this formula for measuring police "effectiveness."

Measurement of the performance of "sub-specialties" within the police service follows the same general formula. For example, there are three measures of detective "effectiveness."

- % of cases cleared by arrests
- % of stolen property recovered
- % of persons convicted.¹⁸

Assessment of the "effectiveness" of traffic officers involves the use of a number of different formulas, each of which utilizes the officers' objective performance of issuing citations or summonses. The principal measure of

¹⁴The relationship of the "muckrakers," the Progressives, and the general municipal reform movement is still an essentially untold story in modern American history.

¹⁵A survey of police administration literature will reveal that "effectiveness" is the term which is used almost exclusively in discussions concerning quality control or measurement of performance. Actually, of course, "efficiency" is more appropriate in terms of the context of the discussion. For a differentiation of the two terms, see the discussion below.

¹⁶International City Managers Association, *Municipal Police Administration*, Chicago, 1954, p. 1.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 441.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 311.

traffic division and officer effectiveness, for example, is the "enforcement index" which is determined by dividing the number of citations (summons, in which a penalty is assessed by the number of injury or fatal traffic accidents.

Interestingly, the police traffic field has given rise to one measurement of *genuine* effectiveness which has been overlooked; nevertheless, this measure has intriguing implications for the police function, generally. This is the "compliance index," which is a figure derived by dividing the number of voluntary "compliances" by the number of observations. The intent of this measurement device is to assess the degree of public compliance with some newly installed regulatory device such as a "yield" or "stop" sign. The 1954 edition of *Municipal Police Administration* advocates the use of the compliance index as *one* of many measures of traffic effectiveness.

7. *Periodic law observance checks*, by officers in civilian clothes in different key or problem locations throughout the city to correlate the recorded enforcement information with actual compliance by drivers.¹⁹

The possibility of transferring this measurement device to the urban police function, generally, poses some interesting possibilities.

Unfortunately, a survey of the literature reveals little change in evaluation methods in the last forty years.²⁰ The common denominator in virtually all non-traffic police evaluation methods is the Uniform Crime Reporting System. In fact, the U.C.R. system was developed in response to a need to evaluate police performance.²¹ Although billed as the beginning of a national system of "criminal statistics," it has fallen far short of this objective.²² The Report in 1929 was directed at the accomplishment of two separate purposes: the establishment of a national system of criminal statistics and the development of improved means of evaluating the criminal justice system. In fact, however, the Report gave rise to the perpetuation of two imperfect systems, and soon became merged into a single system unsatisfactory for either purpose.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 357.

²⁰See, for example, the following: Clarence E. Ridley, *Measuring Municipal Government: Suggested Standards for Measuring the Results of Fire, Health, Police and Public Works Departments*, Municipal Administration Service, New York, 1927; Clarence E. Ridley and Herbert A. Simon, *Measuring Municipal Activities: A Survey of Suggested Criteria for Appraising Administration*, International City Manager's Association, Chicago, 1943; Clarence E. Ridley, *Check List on How Cities Can Cut Costs: Practical Suggestions for Constructive Economy in Local Government*, International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1949; International City Managers' Association, *Municipal Police Administration*, (5th Ed.) Chicago, 1961; and O. W. Wilson, *Police Administration*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963.

²¹International Association of Chiefs of Police, Committee on Uniform Crime Records, *Uniform Crime Reporting: A Complete Manual for Police*, (Rev. Ed.) New York, 1929.

²²For an excellent criticism of the U.C.R. system, see Marvin E. Wolfgang, "Uniform Crime Reports: A Critical Appraisal," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 111:708-37 (1963).

While a detailed discussion of the statistical inadequacies of the U.C.R. is beyond the scope of this paper, suffice it to say that the U.C.R. is a criminal statistic system based upon an inadequate base of criminological theory,²³ that it is prey to all sorts of subtle and sometimes flagrant manipulative practices, and that it attempts to describe "crime" in only the grossest of characteristics.²⁴ Ironically, even though a criminal statistic system has different—yet related—objectives than a system for administrative evaluation, the "statistical inadequacies" given above also limits the utility of the U.C.R. as an evaluative device.

The recent report of the President's Commission was oddly uncritical of the Uniform Crime Reporting System. Despite this fact, its report pointed to another limitation of the U.C.R., *viz.* the problem of "unreported crime." Using a "crime victimization" survey, the Commission sponsored special studies in high and medium "crime rate" precincts in Washington, D. C., Chicago, and Boston. Depending on the area and the type of offense, the Commission data revealed that specific offenses ranged from one half to ten times greater than revealed in police statistics.²⁵

As a consequence of its findings, the *Report* of the Commission made the following observation and suggestion:

The survey technique, as applied to criminal victimization, is still new and beset with a number of methodological problems. However, the Commission has found the information provided by the surveys of considerable value, and believes that the survey technique has a great untapped potential as a method for providing additional information about the nature and extent of our crime problem and the relative effectiveness of different programs to control crime.²⁶

More broadly conceived, the Commission would also seem to be suggesting that the survey technique might have a general application in both program design and evaluation. Certainly, in its own analysis and evaluation the Commission sponsored a number of studies, utilizing a variety of methodologies.

The author directed one of these research efforts, a set of case studies of police-community relations in two metropolitan areas.²⁷ In the course of investigation it became evident that the findings *could* have been obtained by city officials in each area, assuming the use of the same tech-

²³*Ibid.*, p. 724.

²⁴For a discussion of the objectives of criminal statistic system, see Leslie Wilkins, "New Thinking in Criminal Statistics," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Service*, 56:277-84 (1965).

²⁵President's Message to Congress, March 9, 1966, quoted in *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, 1967, pp. 20-22.

²⁶*Ibid.* p. 22.

²⁷Joseph D. Lohman and Gordon E. Misner, *The Police and the Community: the dynamics of their interaction in a changing society*, (2 vols.) University of California School of Criminology, Berkeley, 1967.

niques, the same orientation, and the availability of competent research personnel. There are a variety of reasons, however, for the findings of this study to be considered new "information" by the political and social leadership of the two areas. One need refer, however, to only one explanation, Kenneth Burke's dictum:

A way of seeing is also a way of not seeing—a focus upon object A involves a neglect of object B.²⁸

There is, after all, the perfectly human phenomenon of being so close to an operation or problem that one cannot see alternatives, unanticipated consequences, etc.

At best, however, survey techniques are only a partial solution to the problem of developing systematic models of different levels of police service and devising more adequate measures of police effectiveness. Such techniques should be directed not only at querying the public, but also at an analysis of the physical and social setting in which police functions must take place. Properly utilized, therefore, such techniques can add to a somewhat miniscule data base from which to make decisions.

Other techniques will be complementary and equally useful in assisting in the development of strategies and the making of the hard decisions which are a part of the contemporary urban police mission. Cost-benefit analysis, system analysis, operations research, and program budgeting are sophisticated tools for both economic *and* political decision making.²⁹ Existing methods of evaluating police performance have been ostensibly stimulated by and responded to economic criteria of efficiency and economy. Irrespective of their being given the label of "measures of effectiveness," these measures—where they have been used—have almost uniformly been expressed in terms of economic cost per work unit. They have been computed without consideration of social and political cost or social and political benefit.

Furthermore, these measures of "effectiveness" have been developed without explicit consideration being given to what Professor Wildavsky calls *exchange costs* and *hostility costs*, or what Neustadt refers to as *reputation costs*.³⁰ These measures are assumed to be neutral tools of administrative analysis and control, when, in fact, they were probably not neutral at the time of their development in the 1920s and 1930s. The fact that they are *still* used as the principal means of measuring police performance in a radically changed social environment is not so much a tribute to their *ageless validity* as it is a testimony to institutional *resistance* to change. In

²⁸*Permanence and Change*, New Republic, New York, 1935 p. 70, quoted in Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, (Rev. Ed.) Free Press, New York, 1965, p. 198.

²⁹Aaron Wildavsky, "The Political Economy of Efficiency: Cost-Benefit Analysis, Systems Analysis, and Program Budgeting," *Public Administration Review*, 26:292-310 (1966).

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 309.

spite of the fact that measures of performance and other control devices may lead inextricably to aberrations and sub-optimization,³¹ measures of police performance have remained basically unchanged since their inception.

One example will suffice as an illustration of the manner in which explicit consideration must be given to so-called "extraneous" factors in the analysis and improvement of the urban police mission. The writer and a colleague, Richard B. Hoffman, have postulated that sub-optimization of the traffic function causes aberrations in the performance of the urban police mission. Consequently, when analyzing whether responsibility for traffic functions should actually be lodged in urban police departments, explicit consideration must be given the consequences which sub-optimization has for the over-all police mission. The costs in terms of hostility and reputation, alone, may be high enough to suggest that some other agency should be assigned this onerous task.³² By limiting evaluation *inputs* solely to the traditional methods of measuring police performance of traffic functions, departmental administrators may actually be overlooking information which is more vital to their presumed organizational goals. This action would be particularly unfortunate in view of the fact that *genuine* improvement of the "flow of traffic" may, in fact, involve changes outside the police system boundary.³³

Additional data and increasing the number of system inputs, therefore, are needed both to create models of different levels of police service and to measure police performance of those levels. Within the constraints of a given set of police resources and conditioned by a set dynamic of legal, social, and political constraints, certain models of performance are realistically obtainable. Choice—both organizational and political—depends, however, upon an adequate level of information about both means and ends.

³¹See, for example: Richard B. Hoffman, *Implementing Information and Computer Technology to the Urban Police Functions Through Systems Analysis: A Preliminary Study*, presented to the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Western Section of the Operations Research Society of America, (June, 1966). Center for Planning and Development Research, University of California, (Working Paper Nbr. 38) Berkeley; Renis Likert, *New Patterns of Management*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961; and R. A. Johnson, F. A. Kast, and J. E. Rosenzweig, *The Theory and Management of Systems*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963.

³²*Onerous* is used here in the sense of being *burdensome*. It may, in fact, be that a well-trained policeman is having his training misused in being assigned to traffic functions. Trained essentially in the field of crime prevention and criminal investigation, the officer may find little opportunity of using these talents in the traffic field. If the officer is using his talents in the criminal field, then some serious policy questions arise.

The author recognizes that there may also be some important benefits which accrue from assigning policemen to traffic duties. In a sense, what he is really saying is that we should be explicit about *both* the costs and the benefits.

³³Hoffman, *op. cit.*, p. 5. I am indebted to Richard B. Hoffman for his criticism and comments on this paper. Responsibility for its content, however, rests solely with me.