202902

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF POLICE POLICIES AND PRACTICES REGARDING THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION PROCESS: TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AFTER RAND

Frank Horvath

Robert T. Meesig

with the assistance of

Yung Hyeock Lee

November, 2001

School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
512 Baker Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF POLICE POLICIES AND PRACTICES REGARDING THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION PROCESS: TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AFTER RAND

Frank Horvath

Robert T. Meesig

with the assistance of

Yung Hyeock Lee

November, 2001

School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
512 Baker Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

FINAL REPORT

Approved By: M Battle

Date: 4/3/03

Supported under Award # 1998IJCX0057 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Although criminal investigation is a fundamental mission of the police, there has been surprisingly little scientific inquiry in this area. Much of the available knowledge comes from the Rand Report on the criminal investigation process, a large-scale, multi-jurisdictional study conducted almost three decades ago, and a small number of other studies in individual police agencies. The purpose of this study was to collect and describe more current and comprehensive information about police practices, policies, goals and perspectives regarding the investigation process.

This study is the first-ever nationally representative description of the police criminal investigation process in the U.S. In this study a questionnaire was mailed to a sample of the approximately 18,000 police agencies in the U.S. The agencies sampled consisted of all general-purpose state and local police agencies employing 100 or more full-time sworn personnel (large agencies), and a representative sample of general-purpose agencies that employed fewer than 100 sworn officers (small agencies). In all, 3,123 agencies were included in the sample. As a result of an initial mailing and two follow-up mailings to non-respondents, a total of 1,746 usable responses were obtained; a response rate of 56%. This included responses from 71% of the large agencies and 50% of the small agencies. In total, the respondents employed more than one-half (over 350,000) of the sworn police officers in the U.S.; 16% (over 50,000) of these were investigators.

The questionnaire used in the survey consisted of 87 base questions. These were categorized into six areas of interest about police investigation, determined from a review of the literature and discussions with an advisory group of experienced police investigators. The six areas were (1) organizational matters; (2) the role of patrol officers; (3) the role of investigators; (4) investigation management; (5) investigative support services; and (6) investigative effectiveness.

In this summary, descriptive highlights are provided regarding the results of our survey in each of the six interest areas. We then comment on some of the features of the investigative process that appear to have changed in the past three decades and some that seem unchanged. Finally, we conclude with a number of general observations on the criminal investigation process that deserve special mention.

Overview of Survey Results

Our results are based upon the responses of 1,746 general-purpose state, county and municipal police agencies in the U. S. It is understood that these agencies differ not only by type but also by size, availability of resources, population served, location, and so forth. Any or all of these characteristics, as well as many others, may be related (perhaps, as some literature suggests, strongly so) to how agencies perform their investigative function and how effective they are in doing so. Detailed explorations of these differences as they relate to the numerous issues in the six interest areas are necessary and useful; however, these analyses were beyond the scope of this study.

Except in those instances where specific mention is made of differences in results based on agency characteristics, the overview to follow ignores these differences and focuses on highlighting the state of the art, if you will, of the general police investigation process in the U. S.

(1) Organizational Matters

Eighty-four percent of the respondent agencies reported employment of investigators; on average, investigators accounted for 16% of agency personnel. About one-half (56%) of the agencies employed female investigators but very few employed part-time or non-sworn investigators. Centralization, that is, assignment to agency headquarters (83% of agencies), was the predominant form of jurisdictional assignment of investigators. In most agencies (67%), investigators are generalists (that is, they investigate all cases) rather than specialists (investigate only certain cases). About two-thirds (63%) of agencies with investigators assign them to separate organizational units. The three most common types of units are in the persons, property and narcotics crime categories. Most agencies (82%) meet regularly with other agencies on investigative matters and about two-thirds (63%) of them are involved in task forces, usually arranged on a multi-jurisdictional basis. Task forces target primarily drug-related activities, although other types of crime problems are of substantial interest.

(2) Patrol Officers

Patrol officers typically carry out limited administrative tasks related to investigations but in more than half of the agencies they also interview victims of and witnesses to crimes. However, interviewing and interrogation of criminal suspects, evidence collection and processing, coordination with prosecutors, and some proactive techniques are not usually performed by patrol officers. In short, patrol officers generally do not carry out a wide range of investigative tasks.

There appears to be growing recognition that the patrol officer's role is key to the investigative process, as 72% of the agencies reported efforts to enhance that role within the past five years. Nevertheless, most agencies do not require of uniformed officers classroom instruction on investigative matters beyond that presented in the basic academy training. Additionally, most agencies do not have specific budgets for such training, and most do not specifically evaluate uniformed officers' investigative performance.

(3) Investigators

Overall, investigators' activities have not been significantly altered by recent changes in either policing or in police organizational developments. The criteria most commonly used to select investigators are those reported to be among the most valid predictors of the future performance. However, the selection processes typically used, personal and oral board interviews, are among those reported to be least valid. A little over one-third of the respondents (39%) provide some form of formal training for newly appointed investigators, typically less than two weeks in duration. A small majority

(59%) of the agencies requires investigators to undergo refresher or advanced classroom training. This training is usually provided annually and the types of courses provided are similar whether at the initial stage of appointment or in advanced training.

While most agencies (84%) with investigators rely on funding from their own budgets to support investigative training needs, only 42% have a specific budget for such support. Two factors, personnel shortage and lack of funding, are seen as significant issues hindering investigative training and, even though training is available from multiple sources, about a third (32%) of police agencies report inadequate access to the training desired.

In about half of the agencies, investigators are represented by collective bargaining units; these units most frequently cover salary and promotion. Investigators typically are assigned to either one or two organizational ranks, and upon selection they are automatically entitled to at least one benefit, such as special allowances or a higher pay scale.

Performance evaluation of both investigators and investigative units rests on the same nine criteria. The top three of these, for individual investigators, are, in order, investigative success, report writing and case clearances. When considering unit evaluations, caseload statistics replace report writing in the top three.

(4) Investigation Management

Agencies use similar methods to select both investigators and investigative supervisors. Most agencies follow policies and procedures that allow supervisors to influence directly the investigation process and investigators' activities. Supervisors monitor the status of investigations through regular personal contact, reviews of activity logs and reviews of investigation reports. Additionally, they take decisions regarding what cases to investigate and to whom cases are assigned. Case solvability factors are used to screen cases in about half of the agencies, and typically those factors are applied to all types of cases. In most agencies, investigation reports are prepared and filed on computers, but case management activities are performed manually.

Although most agencies do not assign specific persons to a prosecutor's office, they report having regular meetings and ongoing relationships with their prosecutors and do not identify any significant problems in that relationship. Among the investigations-related problems they identify as significant, the most important relate to the heavy workload of uniformed officers, investigators and investigative supervisors.

Although most agencies do not have innovative investigative programs underway, among the 15% that do, many cite programs focused on investigation management. Moreover, only a small group of the agencies plan major changes in their investigative function in the near future. These changes are in personnel matters (e.g., personnel increases, apparently to address the heavy investigative workload problem) and investigation management. Agencies report that they keep victims apprised of

investigative progress; this is especially true with respect to notification of the police disposition of an investigation.

There is broad agreement that a variety of investigative functions are misrepresented in the popular media. The two items on which there is the greatest agreement are the use of excessive force and interrogation.

(5) Investigative Support

About a third of the agencies that employ civilians assign them to various investigative support tasks. Most agencies do not employ evidence technicians; however, among those that do, it is typical that such persons are sworn officers who are required to have specialized training.

Most agencies with investigators use state/federal police crime laboratories but about one-half indicate problems with access to laboratories and about three-fourths indicate problems with the timeliness of service. Although one-third of the agencies had cases in which DNA played a critical role, only 9% report a backlog of cases awaiting such analysis. However, the backlog involves 21,897 cases and analysis costs are estimated at about $10.9 million. Both a lack of funding and a lack of qualified personnel appear to be almost equally important factors accounting for the backlog.

Most (74%) agencies receive their AFIS services from state level agencies. Only about one-half of the agencies with investigators indicate that a number of different types of crime records and investigative support files are available to investigators on computers. Investigators are much more likely than patrol officers to have daily access to various types of modern personal communication devices (pagers, cell phones, e-mail, etc.) for investigative purposes. About one-half of the respondents plan to upgrade and/or enhance their investigative technology resources within the next year.

(6) Investigative Effectiveness

Most agencies consider goals related directly to investigation issues, protecting the public, and recovery/return of property to be slightly more important than those related to keeping victims and the community informed.

Twenty-two percent of the respondents experienced a decline in clearance rates for serious crimes in the past ten years. The lack of time, prosecutor reluctance to take action, too many crimes, and lack of witness cooperation, were the top four factors said to account for that decline. Across all agencies, increases in personnel, technology, and training were the three factors that were seen as necessary to enhance clearance rates. These same issues were those which agencies identified as most in need of additional funding to improve investigative effectiveness overall.

Most agencies do not identify any (of the specified) legal issues as important problems. The top two issues, searches and use of informants, were selected by only 7% of the agencies.

The two research areas identified as those that most directly influence agency policy and/or practice in investigations are computerized databases and forensic science applications. Additionally, the two top priorities for future research identified by agencies were technological improvements in investigative techniques and investigator training. These responses are consistent with those given as the primary factors influencing clearance rates and investigative effectiveness.

Developments in the Past Thirty Years

This study reveals that in many fundamental respects, the police criminal investigation process has remained relatively unaffected by the significant changes that have occurred in policing, the crime problem and technology in the past thirty years. Nevertheless, there are some promising developments, though not widespread, that warrant attention. In addition, there seems to be keen interest in this area on the part of many police administrators. Perhaps, they await more solid information than what has been available in order to make decisions about their investigative efforts based on knowledge of the most useful developments in other jurisdictions. Moreover, it must be recognized that a sweeping descriptive account, such as that presented in this report, is not particularly sensitive to the changes that may be underway in isolated, individual agencies. Although these changes were noted where appropriate, it was not possible to explore them and their potential effects on the investigation process.

What Has Changed

Developments that have occurred in policing over the past three decades include changes in the nature, amount and costs of crime; organizational, administrative and personnel changes in policing; new research on crime and policing; and increasing resource availability for police agencies. In this section we discuss the apparent influence of some of these changes in policing in relation to what seems to have changed in the police investigation process.

The increased recruitment and hiring of females as police officers seems to have influenced the proportion of female investigators. That is, although there are no firm statistics on this issue, our results suggest that the proportion of females involved in police investigative activities has probably increased since the 1970s. In addition, the proportion of agencies with specific investigative units seems a bit higher than was the case in previous years, and the types of investigative units are certainly more diversified and specialized today. Although it is difficult to discern overall whether relations between agencies have changed, either for better or worse, it is clear that the involvement of agencies in various kinds of multi-jurisdictional task forces is now relatively common.

Most agencies have attempted to enhance the investigative role of patrol officers. On the other hand, the role of investigators in performing less-traditional tasks, such as those that might accompany community policing efforts (in which many patrol officers have become involved), appears to have changed only slightly, if at all. The overall level of training provided to investigators may have increased somewhat but in most agencies and for most investigators, the training still appears to be quite inadequate, inconsistent and incomplete. We obtained more specific data about who provides training, and what types of training are made available to investigators, than has been collected previously. Nevertheless, this topic is in need of much greater attention. There apparently are large gaps in the training of investigators, a point made clear in our data and which, though recognized by police agencies themselves, is one that they are unwilling or unable to support financially.

Investigation management, the role of investigator supervisors, and how investigators and cases are managed were not well-documented topics in previous research. For that reason, useful comparisons are not possible. Regarding other related issues, our findings show that agencies do not consider police-prosecutor relations to be problematic. This is encouraging since it is that relationship which is at the core of the processing of criminal cases. In addition it is worth noting that, perhaps because of changing legal requirements to do so, most agencies now notify victims of crime about developments in their case. Finally, most agencies indicate few problems in their investigative efforts and some have implemented innovations in those efforts; many of these, however, deal with internal investigation management rather than what might be seen as dramatic departures from traditional practices.

Our data regarding investigative support personnel (civilians and evidence technicians) and those pertaining to DNA analysis are not directly comparable to any data previously reported. Yet, it is clear that the changes occurring in these and related areas are altering some aspects of the police investigative effort. More attention to these topics is in order.

In a related area we noted slight increases (from what has been observed previously) in the computerization of criminal records and considerable increases in the computerization of investigative support files; neither of these, though, seems to have developed as fully as necessary. Similarly, access to AFIS data bases and to personal communication devices, both of which have potential for improving police investigative efforts, appear to have taken hold; their effects on enhancing the success of investigative activities remain to be fully documented, even though there is some evidence of their promise.

Personnel, technology and training are identified by agencies as the primary factors affecting crime clearance rates; they are also the major factors, which are seen to be in greatest need of additional funding and research. Legal issues, on the other hand, appear to be of lesser concern. This is a considerable change from the controversy about due process concerns that arose in the late 1960s and 1970s, about the time that the Rand Report was published.

What Has Not Changed

Although the police and policing have changed considerably since the 1970s, the proportion of investigators in agencies has remained constant at about 16% of agency sworn personnel resources, and the reasons why agencies organize investigative efforts as they do remain focused on internal rather than external factors. Additionally, in spite of the recognized and well-documented role they play in investigations, patrol officers in most agencies remain quite limited in their performance of investigative tasks. Moreover, they are provided little or no training in such matters beyond what they receive in their basic academy instruction and this is judged to be inadequate and incomplete.

Similarly, the training that investigators receive appears to be considerably less than what is called for. Most do not receive any pre-appointment formal, classroom training. It is typical for police agencies to rely on "on-the-job" training (i.e., a probationary period) and some exposure to post-appointment seminars for their investigators. Whether these are adequate is a question which, it would appear from our data, agencies themselves would answer negatively.

In spite of the changes that community policing has brought about, the majority of police departments do not involve investigators in tasks related to "community policing" efforts. The primary methods for selecting and evaluating investigators remain relatively unchanged, and much of the investigation management process is still manually driven rather than computerized. Access to and timeliness of services supported by crime laboratories continue as long-standing problems for many agencies, and the development of new forensic techniques and technologies, without concomitant increases in personnel and funding, may exacerbate these problems.

Personnel strength, technology and training also continue to be identified as major problems affecting the investigation process, even though significant improvement is reported to have occurred in some of these areas. It is important to emphasize, moreover, that despite the many advances in technology and the forensic sciences that have occurred in recent years, clearance rates, whether at the individual agency or the state and national levels, remain relatively stable. For certain violent crimes, moreover, those rates are declining in some locations, even in the face of more and better technological improvements and personnel enhancements. What accounts for consistency and variation in clearance rates is poorly understood. This is no doubt due to the fact that those rates, whether at the investigator or the investigative unit levels, have not been the focus of researchers in policing – in spite of the dramatic change in the amount, and perhaps the quality, of research in policing since the Rand Report.

Concluding Observations

Two issues, the role of the public as the primary provider of crime information to the police, and the role of the patrol officer in solving crimes, remain unchallenged as the

critical elements underpinning the police criminal investigation process. The nation-wide popularization of community policing focuses attention on these two points. This is seen, first, through community-building efforts by which the police attempt to enhance the trust and rapport between themselves and community members. It would be assumed that such developments would strengthen the flow of useful crime-related information between the police and the public; there would be an anticipated benefit in crime resolution. Second, the patrol officer's role, considered in the light of the "Broken Windows" perspective as advanced by Wilson and Kelling (1982), calls attention to ameliorating crime-conducive environments and shows the need for better relations between all resources of the police in order to focus on both criminal and non-criminal concerns. Community policing and "Broken Windows" advocate a better relationship between the public and the police, which is the foundation upon which the police investigation process itself rests.

Yet, the police investigative function seems, in the main, to be isolated from these two major trends in policing. Those who give investigators direction appear to be preoccupied with internal organizational and management issues and with hope for new technology to solve investigative problems. There is – or so it would seem – less focus on improving relationships with the primary source of crime-related information (the public), or on cultivating better working relationships between investigators and patrol officers, who by default already serve as organizational intermediaries between the police and the public, than on concerns of perhaps lesser overall significance.

For a variety of reasons, some of which may be beyond their control, investigators use case screening and rudimentary case solvability factors (among other things) to weed out hard-to-solve or less serious cases that may never be investigated. They do this in order to pursue more solvable and serious cases, or to deal with the prosecution of solved cases. However, by not dealing directly with the public and patrol officers as important elements in the investigation process, the use of such case management techniques can make investigations even more daunting. They may accentuate – or at least not ameliorate – the unwillingness of the public to cooperate in an investigation and this in turn could restrict the degree to which the collection and use of information, including the discovery and processing of physical evidence, plays a role in solving crime.

The application of technology in policing has made great strides during the last quarter-century, and the prospects that computerized databases, investigative support files, AFIS, DNA analysis, and other technological advances hold for investigators at times seem very promising. Yet, all these developments, taken together, do not appear to have had any measurable impact on agency-level crime clearances. It is ironic that these advances have not been accompanied by a corresponding improvement in investigative effectiveness, except, perhaps in the most visible but relatively infrequent situations. Thus, while technology is playing an increasingly influential role in the criminal investigation process, it for the most part remains supportive of and reliant upon the relationship between the public and the police in solving crime.

The best available data indicate that, while most crimes are not solved by the police, the great majority of the crimes that are solved are cleared by on-scene arrests, the initial identification of suspects, and other routine actions of patrol officers, rather than by the follow-up activities of investigators. It does not follow from this, however, that the investigative responsibilities of the police ought to be de-emphasized. Rather the data suggest the opposite. For example, police investigations suffer from low clearance rates and the police do not collect physical evidence in most cases. If training is presumed to be able to improve performance, then the amount and quality of investigative and evidence-related training that most agencies currently provide to their personnel may need to be increased in order to enhance investigative outcomes. Additionally, if patrol officers and investigators remain untrained, or at least under-trained, on investigative and evidence-related matters, as seems to be the case, then it is also likely that they will struggle with the use of more complex computerized crime information management systems and the effective application of other sophisticated technology during the conduct of their routine investigations. In other words, the training question, a long-standing issue in policing, is destined to become an even more important one with regard to investigative matters in the future. These are problems that are in need of correction and, judging from our data, appear to suffer in the competition for the limited resources within most police agencies.

It is understood that were investigators (and investigations) to become more proficient and to show a corresponding increased productivity in arrests, this could even further overwhelm crime laboratories and other justice system resources. This "systems effect" in the justice system, of course, is well known, though not often the focus of attention. Decisions and actions at one point can often lead to subsequent behaviors that may result in counterintuitive and even counterproductive outcomes (e.g., isolation from sources of crime information, problems in the acquisition and use of technology, and so forth). Police agencies cannot, and most likely do not, ignore such consequences. However, further useful commentary on this issue is not found in our data.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study was to provide a more current and comprehensive description of the investigation process. This has revealed a picture of the process that, while still not entirely in focus, is a bit clearer than that seen before. In many fundamental respects, the investigation process, though showing some advances, seems to have been relatively uninfluenced by significant changes in policing, the crime problem and technological advances made in the past thirty years. In the main, it is our view that progress in police criminal investigative efforts remains largely isolated from broader police efforts to respond more effectively, more efficiently and more resolutely to the crime problem in general. Nevertheless, there are some promising, though isolated, developments, and there is a keen interest in this area on the part of many police administrators. Hopefully, those advances and that interest will spur continued research on the investigative dimension of the police mission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank the following persons for their assistance and support during the conduct of this study:

Criminal Investigations Advisory Group

- Bruce Benson, Ph.D., Chief, Michigan State University Police and Public Safety Department, MI
- J. Draganchuk, Detective Sergeant, Lansing Township Police Department, MI
- Earl James, Ph.D., First Lieutenant (retired), Michigan State Police, MI
- Dennis Payne, Ph.D., Professor, Michigan State University, MI; Lieutenant Colonel (retired), Michigan State Police, MI
- Dennis Shaw, Detective (retired), Lansing Police Department, MI
- David Sinclair, Assistant Chief (retired), Lansing Police Department, MI

Survey Questionnaire Development

- Peter Ackerly, Detective, Ingham County Sheriff's Office, MI
- Robert Dutcher, Captain, Meridian Township Police Department, MI
- Ken Hall, Captain, Michigan State University Police and Public Safety Department, MI
- Steven Schrumpf, Officer, Meridian Township Police Department, MI
- Anne Stahl, Officer, Meridian Township Police Department, MI
- Russell Wolff, Lieutenant, Meridian Township Police Department, MI

Technical Support

- Bonnie Bucqueroux, Project Consultant, East Lansing, MI
- Jan M. Chaiken, Ph.D., Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC
- Stephen Edwards, Ph.D., Senior Social Science Analyst, Crime Control and Prevention Research Division, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC
- Carolyn Gates, Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of Census, Washington, DC
- Drew Howard, Project Consultant, East Lansing, MI
- Robert Kaminski, Social Science Analyst, Crime Control and Prevention Research Division, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC
- Brian A. Reaves, Ph.D., Chief, Statistical Unit, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC
- Jeremy Travis, Director, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC

Administrative Support

- John Anderson, Criminal Justice Master's Degree Student, Michigan State University, MI

- Guo-cheng Chen, Visiting Scholar, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, MI
- Sung-su Chung, Criminal Justice Master's Degree Student, Michigan State University, MI
- Michael Jones, Criminal Justice Student, Michigan State University, MI
- Christopher Nelson, Criminal Justice Student, Michigan State University, MI
- Diamonte Ponce, Visiting Criminal Justice Student, Michigan State University, MI
- Xiaohong Zhang, Visiting Scholar, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, MI

We also wish to thank the employees of the 1,746 police agencies around the country who took the time and made the extra effort to complete our lengthy questionnaire and provided such excellent responses to our national survey.

PREFACE

This project was supported by Grant #98-IJ-CX-0057, awarded in September 1998, by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Controlling crime is a core police mission. Although the past three decades have witnessed a greatly expanding, more intensive, scientific scrutiny of the police crime control mission, the overwhelming bulk of this attention has focused on the police role in maintaining public order and providing service to the community. The investigation of crime and the apprehension of offenders by the police are also critical elements in the police mandate; yet, there has been surprisingly little scientific inquiry in this area. The investigation of criminal offenses and the subsequent apprehension of offenders – bringing before the bar of justice those who violate the criminal law – seem to be relatively under-represented topics in the policing literature (Horvath, Lee & Meesig, 2001, unpublished raw data). This is all the more surprising in view of the fact that the police are relatively ineffective in detecting and resolving crime. Attempts to improve this aspect of police performance have not been widespread in practice; nor have they been the focus of the many policing reform efforts made in the past two decades or so.

National crime data since the 1970s show that most serious crimes are not reported to the police; moreover, only about 20% of the Index crimes that are reported are solved.[1] In other words, the great majority of all serious (i.e., Index) crimes committed in our society are not resolved, or cleared, by the police.[2] Little is known about the police investigation process that accounts for these results, and much of what is known about who solves crimes and how they solve them is based on research that is both limited and outdated.

Why is it important to learn more about the police criminal investigation process? We offer two major reasons. First, the police relationship with the public is an interdependent one, particularly when criminal investigation is considered. The success of the investigation process is, to a substantial degree, a reflection of how well the police and the public work together to deal with crime and, from another point of view, co-produce crime statistics. Second, police investigative efforts and the evidence they yield, in the main, are the portal to what is commonly called the criminal justice system — the police, prosecutor, courts and corrections agencies.

The Police and the Public

The manner in which the police interrelate with the public in conducting criminal investigations directly affects how they investigate crime and whether or not they are successful in doing so. The research literature indicates that most of the serious crimes the police deal with are the ones that are reported to them by the public, rather than those that they detect themselves (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 1988; Skogan & Antunes, 1979). Additionally, the most important and prolific source of information about crime is people, and the predominant activity of police investigators is to collect crime information by talking to people (Horvath & Meesig, 1996; Horvath & Meesig, 1998). Thus, the public is essentially a co-producer of crime information with the police. It follows that the relationship between the police and the communities they serve can critically affect both the quantity and quality of crime information that is exchanged (Eck, 1983; Horvath, Bucqueroux & Meesig, 1997;

Skogan & Antunes, 1979). This relationship not only directly influences investigative outcomes, but it also affects community trust in the police and the general effectiveness of the police in performing their crime-fighting function.

With regard to the effect on investigative outcomes, the professional competency and integrity of individual police investigators in dealing with crime victims, witnesses, suspects and informants can weaken the public's perception of the ability of the police to do their job properly (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1968). A well-known example of this was seen in the trial of O.J. Simpson, where the credibility of the detectives regarding their handling of evidence was severely challenged. This factor is one generally considered to have been very influential in the jury's decision (Lange & Vanatter, 1997).

In their attempts to obtain crime information, the police often employ investigative tactics that are or may seem to be intrusive, coercive and secretive; all sometimes destructive of community trust. The media and the legal literature are rife with examples of such problems in police conduct; legally questionable searches, interrogations, undercover operations, stings, and electronic surveillance, to name a few, are commonly known concerns. Although the police often resort to such methods because the information they need to resolve crime may not otherwise be obtainable, their efforts are frequently seen by the public, and certainly by defined segments of the public such as the young and minorities, as potential threats to well-being (Brandl & Horvath, 1991). Heightened concerns or suspicions that may develop as a result of such police methods, even though they may be legally authorized, can affect the general level of community trust and may sometimes, and in some cases often do, discourage people from cooperating with the police.

The ultimate effectiveness of the police in resolving crime can shape perceptions of public safety and the general legitimacy with which the police are seen as protectors of the community (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Negative public sentiment regarding police effectiveness can generate strong political pressures on the police and, in turn, can diminish the availability of critical resources. Additionally, other police organizational initiatives designed to improve community relations, such as the development of community policing programs, can also be disrupted by questionable or overly aggressive investigative activities.

Investigation: Gateway to the Criminal Justice System

The criminal justice system in the U.S. traditionally includes the police, prosecutors, courts, and corrections components. It is the investigation process of the police, whether it is a brief on-scene arrest or a time-consuming, complex series of activities, and the evidence that it develops, that serves essentially as the gateway to this system, as most criminal matters that other justice system components deal with are initiated by the police. The information collection efforts and decisions made during the initial complaint investigation by police patrol officers and detectives are key determinants of whether or not any other elements of the system ever become involved.

While the police may detect many minor crimes, they uncover by themselves only around 5% of the serious (Index) crimes they deal with (BJS, 1988). At least one-half of the serious crimes committed in our society are never reported to the police (Zawitz, et al., 1993). Thus, the public filters out from police attention, and, of course, from the attention of the remaining components of the justice system, a large proportion of criminal activity. The public is, in this way, the largest filter in the justice system funneling effect.

The second largest filter of crimes is the internal processing in police agencies themselves. While the public filters out at least one-half of the serious crimes, police agencies screen out another 80% of the remainder due to their failure to identify suspects, to produce sufficient information to process cases, or because of personnel constraints and other internal police agency problems (Cole, 1995). These screened out cases receive little or no further attention by the police; they typically are eliminated from consideration by other components of the criminal justice system as well. In other words, for every 1,000 serious crimes committed, about 90% are filtered out of the criminal justice system by either the public or the police, and only about 100, or one out of ten, result in an arrest and pass through the police portal to the other components of the justice system.

The police investigation process directly influences the workload of the nation's many crime laboratories, including, of course, those that operate under the auspices of police agencies as well as those that exist independent of the police. Although the police are responsible for collecting physical evidence in the cases they investigate, research shows that such evidence is collected in fewer than 10% of them, often in only the most serious (e.g., homicide, rape) cases (Greenwood, Chaiken, Petersilia, 1977; Horvath & Meesig, 1996; Horvath, Orns & Siegel, 1998; Voelker & Horvath, 1997). Moreover, only a small portion of the collected evidence actually undergoes forensic[3] analysis. In many cases suspects are not identifiable and scientific analysis usually is incapable of identifying an offender who is otherwise unknown. Thus, the police decide what and how much evidence is collected and what and how much is sent to laboratories for analysis. The effectiveness of the police in identifying suspects determines to a large extent whether or not the collected evidence is scientifically analyzed and reveals information of value to the investigation.

The quality and thoroughness of police investigations also affect how prosecutors dispose of them. About two-thirds of the people arrested by the police are adults. Upon completion of the police investigation, these cases are referred to the prosecutor for adjudication; however, only about 55% of the arrested adults are actually prosecuted. The remainder (45%) is rejected mostly because of insufficient evidence for prosecution (50%) or witness problems (20%) (BJS, 1988; Forst, 1995). While some of the factors that prosecutors consider in making their decision to prosecute are beyond the control of the police, it is the police investigation that provides the bulk of the information needed for prosecution. In this sense, the police directly influence the amount and quality of evidence available for prosecution, and their investigative efforts can bear directly on the identification of witnesses and their willingness to cooperate.

The police investigation process also influences the workload and activities of the nation's federal and state court systems. Many of the legal issues that are raised and

adjudicated in courts are generated by the police investigation process. Issues involving police searches, seizure of property, detention, arrest, interviews, interrogations, the use of force, and the handling of evidence, are critical areas of legal debate that have long histories in the judicial decision-making process. Aspects of each of these issues are integral to the investigation process, and investigative activities both shape and are shaped by legal arguments and outcomes in these areas. Even the court sentencing process is directly impacted by the presence of physical evidence in police investigations. Empirical research has shown that the presence of forensic evidence in a case increases both the likelihood and length of incarceration (Peterson, Mihajlovic & Gilliland, 1984; Peterson, Ryan, Houlden & Mihajlovic, 1987).

It can be seen that there is a "systems" effect as a consequence of police investigative activities, as each component in the system is affected by and dependent on actions of the other components. The public and the police initially filter out from "system" attention the great majority of criminal incidents, but the nature and extent of the filtering depend heavily on the effectiveness of the police in the collection of information from the public and other sources during the investigation process. Police performance in the use of information to resolve crime influences public satisfaction and support, which, in turn, affects the productivity of the police investigation process. The quantity and quality of the police productivity effort in those cases that make it through the police gateway impact prosecution and court workloads, which, of course, drive corrections system populations.

It is not difficult to imagine the added pressures that even the slightest increase in the crime reporting or clearance rates would place on the various system components. Yet, many efforts are under way to do just that. For example, the increasing amounts of funding available for forensic science research and equipment acquisition, and the technological advances being made in the forensic sciences such as DNA analysis and automated fingerprint identification systems, are, apparently, enhancing the probability that physical, scientifically analyzable evidence will increase the rate of police clearances. Yet, it remains to be seen what effect such a result might have on the resources and workloads of prosecutors, courts and corrections systems.

There remain large gaps in our knowledge about the effectiveness of many efforts to improve various parts of the criminal justice system and how they influence and interrelate with other system components (Nagin, 1998). However, because all of the system components operate under resource constraints, improvements in the productivity of a single element, such as an increase in police case clearance rates through the enhanced use of physical evidence, would likely increase the workload of other system elements. Increasing workloads without also increasing resources to handle the additional work often force organizations into taking actions to constrain their workloads, such as prosecutors rejecting more cases for prosecution. It can be seen that such actions by prosecutors could easily offset the effect of increased crime clearances (Cavanaugh, Boyum & Nambiar, 1993). The inability of one component to take advantage of improvements in another could have negative repercussions on new reform programs and could also decrease the confidence of the public in the value of investing more resources in a system that yields counterproductive results.

Need for and Purpose of the Study

Although police investigations play a critical role in the core police mission, and in the response of the justice system to the crime problem, the overall investigative performance of the police appears to be at least questionable and, in fact, in the eyes of some police administrators, a process in need of major reform (Law Enforcement News, 2000). Police investigative tactics and methods seem frequently to be of dubious utility. In addition, in spite of the apparent improvements in "scientific" means of criminal investigation, clearance rates have not improved correspondingly. In fact, in some large jurisdictions, clearance rates for some serious crimes have declined even in the face of seemingly significant enhancements to produce the opposite (Wellford & Cronin, 1999).

Yet, little is known about the investigation process that accounts for whatever success or lack of success, that the police have in resolving crime. Much of what is known about how the police "solve" crime is based mostly on research that is relatively limited, often conflicting, and outdated. In addition, many changes have occurred in the nature and extent of the crime problem and, indeed, in policing itself, since much of the investigations-related research was conducted. As the impact of these changes on the investigation process remains unknown, it is difficult to interpret and apply the past research in a modern context. There is a need for more current and comprehensive information about the police investigation process. The purpose of this study was to address this issue.

In this study, we provide the first-ever, nationally representative description of the police investigation process in order to better understand its nature and scope. Because there is so little up-to-date information about this issue, we describe and highlight our major findings in this report and, in many instances, relate them to the empirical findings of prior research. It is important to note, however, that while our study raises a number of interesting hypotheses about how the police approach the investigation process, and indeed about the effect of police agency characteristics on that process, we decided not to explore them in this report. While this may make the data here somewhat less informative of, say, police policy options, it does provide for a more straightforward and perhaps clearer description of the findings. This may be most useful to those police agencies that wish to assess their individual approaches to the investigation process in comparison with what is being done nationally.

Before we turn to our results, however, it is necessary to consider briefly the police role and mission today. In the following paragraphs we present an overview of some of the changes that have taken place in policing and in crime in the past thirty years or so. We follow that with a presentation of what we see to be the essential research questions about the police investigation process. We then discuss important empirical findings as they are related to these questions in order to put our results into perspective.

The Police Mission Today

The police control of crime, a core police mission, is carried out in two major ways: patrol and investigations (Langworthy & Travis, 1999; Moore, Trojanowicz & Kelling, 1988). Police patrol activity and those officers who perform it are seen as the bulwark of police

operations. But patrol officers play a critical role in the investigation of crime, a point of emphasis in some, but certainly not the bulk, of the literature on policing. It is clear, however, that the manner in which patrol officers' investigative duties are shared with investigators is important. The selection, training, management, supervision and evaluation of patrol officers can, judging from available data, directly affect investigative outcomes. The technological and forensic resources available to agencies, and thus to patrol officers, and agency goals, policies and procedures can all bear upon both the efficiency and effectiveness of the investigation process.

Investigators typically comprise only about 17% of police personnel. Most investigations, particularly during the initial response and preliminary investigation stages, are conducted by patrol officers (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). Thus, the organization of police agencies with regard to whether they are centralized or decentralized and the types of units into which they are formed may affect how they respond to and deal with crime. As crimes often cross-jurisdictional borders, the relationships agencies have with each other influence the nature and extent of their responses.

During the past three decades there have been numerous and dramatic changes in crime and policing. For examples:

- The nature of the crime problem that police must deal with in our society has changed significantly with the explosion onto the national scene of illegal drugs, international organized crime, transnational terrorism, corporate crime and computer crime, to mention a few.

- The amount and rate of crime has also changed greatly. The Crime Index is a commonly used measure of crime rates in the U.S. That index, a part of the FBI's Uniform Crime Report (UCR) program, shows changes in the volume and rate of eight "serious" crimes (murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson). The Crime Index has increased by almost one-third from 3,961 crimes per 100,000 inhabitants in 1972, to 5,087 crimes per 100,000 inhabitants in 1997 (Maguire & Pastore, 2000). In many jurisdictions police resources have not kept pace with that change.

- The cost of crime has also never been higher. The amount of monies involved in the worldwide drug trade is now estimated to be $400-500 billion a year, equivalent to the worldwide oil trade, and the direct and indirect costs of serious (i.e., Crime Index) crimes in the U.S. alone have been estimated at $450 billion a year (Miller, Cohen & Wiersema, 1996).

Policing in American society has also undergone significant organizational, administrative and personnel changes (Manning, 1992; Redlinger, 1994). The amount of annual monies currently being spent on policing (over $40 billion a year) and on the overall criminal justice system (over $93 billion a year) is at an all-time high (Maguire & Pastore, 2000). An extensive body of research has been developed on crime and policing and, in

conjunction with this, important reform efforts have been undertaken with regard to community policing, the police role in our society, computerization of information processing systems, technology and the education and training levels of police officers in general.

Major Issues of Interest and Relevant Prior Research

In spite of the many changes in crime and in policing that have occurred in the past three decades, little is known about how these changes have influenced the police investigation process, if at all. Based on a review of the major empirical research literature on the police investigation process, six major issue areas were identified that represent the primary areas of interest about the investigation process. These six areas are used as a framework for developing and presenting a description of our findings. More important, however, they provided the basis for the construction of the data collection instrument we used in the study.

Within each of the six major issue areas a number of general questions were apparent. In this section of the report, we highlight the six areas and their related general questions and we provide an overview of the prior empirical findings.

(1) Organization

- What are the general demographic characteristics of agencies that employ investigators?
- Are investigators most commonly organized in a centralized (assigned geographically to headquarters) or decentralized (assigned to field units) manner?
- Are investigators generalists (assigned all case types for investigation) or specialists (assigned only certain case types)?
- What types of investigation units are investigators assigned to?
- Why are investigators organized the way they are?
- What investigative relationships exist between agencies?

(2) Patrol Officers

- What is the extent of the investigative duties of patrol officers?
- How are patrol officers trained and evaluated regarding investigations?

(3) Investigators

- What do investigators do?

- How are investigators selected?
- How are investigators trained?
- What personnel issues affect investigators?

(4) Investigation Management

- How are investigators supervised?
- How are case investigations managed?
- What is the extent of the relationship between police and prosecutors?
- What other issues affect investigations?

(5) Investigative Support

- What types of investigative support personnel do agencies employ?
- How do crime laboratory services affect investigations?
- What investigative support files and equipment are available?

(6) Investigative Effectiveness

- What are the goals of investigations?
- How do agencies view investigative effectiveness?
- What types of investigation-related research are agencies interested in?

Prior Research on the Police Investigation Process

Prior to the 1960s, virtually no research had been conducted on the police criminal investigation process. It has only been since the influx of federal funds and initiatives spawned by the 1965 President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice that some aspects of the process have been examined (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1968). However, as we have noted, the amount of research on investigations, considered relative to other aspects of police work, is slim indeed.

Much of what we know about the police criminal investigation process comes from a national-level assessment of detective activities, commonly referred to as the Rand Report (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977), and also a number of ethnographic and other field

studies conducted during the 1970s and early 1980s (Bloch & Bell, 1976; Eck, 1979; Eck, 1983; Ericson, 1981; Gay, Day & Woodward, 1979; Greenberg & Wasserman, 1979; Regan, Nalley & White, 1979; Sanders, 1977; Sherman, Milton & Kelly, 1973; Wilson, 1978). In this section we consider the major findings on investigation organized according to the six primary issue areas identified earlier: Organization, Patrol Officers, Investigators, Investigation Management, Investigative Support and Investigative Effectiveness.

The Rand Report

There is little doubt that the research reported by the Rand Corporation in the 1970s is widely considered the seminal study on police criminal investigations. While the most common citation for that research is Greenwood, Chaiken and Petersilia (1977), the research results were also published in several other formats (Chaiken, 1975; Chaiken, Greenwood & Petersilia, 1976; Chaiken, Greenwood & Petersilia, 1977; Greenwood, Chaiken, Petersilia & Prusoff, 1975; Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). In the present study, the term Rand Report (or Rand research) refers to the Greenwood, Chaiken and Petersilia (1977) publication unless otherwise indicated.

Although the research on which the Rand Report was based was conducted more than two decades ago, it remained the first and only national-scale assessment of the police investigation process in the U.S. until the present study was carried out. The major objectives of the Rand research were:

- To describe, on a national scale, current investigative organization and practices.
- To assess the contributions that police investigation makes to the achievement of criminal justice goals.
- To ascertain the effectiveness of new technology and systems being adopted to enhance investigative performance.
- To reveal how investigative effectiveness is related to differences in organizational form, staffing, procedures, etc. (p. 2).

As part of the Rand research, a mailed survey of a non-random sample of police agencies was conducted. Questionnaires were sent to 300 of the largest county and municipal police agencies (agencies with more than 150 full-time sworn and civilian employees, or whose jurisdictions had populations of more than 100,000). A total of 153 agencies responded (153/300=51% response rate). The survey was complemented with onsite interviews and observations of investigative operations in 29 respondent agencies. A computer-readable file of the 1972 UCR files was obtained from the FBI, and a limited telephone survey of 36 out of 72 robbery and burglary victims identified in one police jurisdiction was also conducted (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). The findings of the Rand Report are summarized below in the six major issue areas noted previously.

(1) Organization.

On average, investigators comprised about 17% of the sworn officers in agencies. About two-thirds of the agencies were centrally organized and their investigators were assigned to headquarters. Even in agencies that had separate commands for geographic subdivisions, about two-thirds of the investigators were centrally assigned in headquarters rather than in the field. Investigators worked in totally generalist (assigned all case types for investigation) or specialist (assigned only certain case types) roles in only a few agencies. Most commonly they were assigned to some type of investigative unit that conducted specialized investigations of groups of crime types (i.e., crimes against persons, sex-related crimes, burglary/auto theft). Almost one-half of the agencies reported that during the two years prior to the survey they had undergone a significant reorganization toward either the centralization or decentralization of investigators, or toward assigning investigators as either generalists or specialists. Most agency changes in one direction seemed to be counterbalanced by other agency changes in another direction, indicating no common agreement among them regarding organizational preference. Additionally, agency organizational alignments and practices were found not to be associated with the amount of crime or arrests or clearance rates (Chaiken, 1975). However, some investigative strike forces reported increases in arrest rates, particularly if they stayed focused and were not diverted elsewhere (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). Three agency characteristics – size, geographic location and crime workload – that were not related to the organization of the investigation function were strongly correlated with agency arrest and clearance rates, and each was found to have an influence that was independent of the other two. The larger agencies tended to average more clearances per arrest than the smaller ones. Agencies in regions of the country that reported the highest arrest rates (Northeastern and West regions) also reported the lowest clearance rates. Conversely, agencies in regions that reported the lowest arrest rates (South Central and North Central regions) also reported the highest clearance rates. And in general, agencies with high crime workloads tended to have lower arrest rates and higher clearance rates (Chaiken, 1975).

(2) Patrol officers.

Uniformed patrol officers play a key role in the investigation process. This is because the most important determinant of whether a case is solved is the information, specifically information identifying a perpetrator, that is provided by the victim and others on-scene to the patrol officer who initially responds to an incident (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). As many as 80% of the cases cleared by police are the product of on-scene arrests, initial identification of suspects and other routine actions of the responding patrol officers. Generally, if a perpetrator is not identified at the time the crime is reported, the case will remain unsolved. Thus, the activities of the responding patrol officer directly affect investigative outcomes (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). About 58% of the agencies assigned patrol officers to limited investigative duties in responding to crimes (secure crime scene, notify investigators, pick-up arrests, prepare incident reports), and in the remaining 42%, patrol officers were assigned more extensive investigative duties. Most agencies provided at least some investigation training to patrol officers (Chaiken, 1975).

(3) Investigators.

Investigators spent most of their time on administrative matters, working on cases that had a low chance of being solved, and on post-arrest activities. Almost all solved cases were solved due to the routine processing of reported information rather than by any special investigation activities or techniques of investigators (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). Fewer than half of the agencies provided investigation training to newly assigned investigators. In evaluating investigator performance, the most important criteria used were success in a major investigation, supervisory review and case clearance rates (Chaiken, 1975).

(4) Investigation management.

About one-half of the agencies assigned cases to investigators according to their crime specialty. More than half reported the use of activity logs to monitor investigative activities (Chaiken, 1975). More than fifty percent of the reported serious crimes received only superficial attention by investigators. Additionally, in the one jurisdiction where a crime victim survey was conducted, the victims were found to have a strong interest in being notified by the police regarding the progress of the police investigation and the disposition of their cases (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). Agency relationships with prosecutor offices varied widely. About three-fourths of the agencies reported that their prosecutor's office had their own investigators and conducted investigations independently of the police (Chaiken, 1975).

(5) Investigative support.

Over 80% of the agencies had the capability to dispatch evidence technicians to crime scenes; however, physical evidence was collected in only a small proportion (about 10%) of most cases. Despite this low evidence collection rate, most agencies collected more physical evidence than could be processed, due in part to limited crime laboratory support capabilities. About one-half of the agencies reported that their crime and arrest reports and crime statistics were computerized to some extent, and about one-fourth reported that court records in their jurisdiction were also computerized. However, most other investigative support files (known offenders, modus operandi, sex offenders, intelligence, etc.) were not computerized (Chaiken, 1975; Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977).

(6) Investigative effectiveness.

Most agencies did not document investigative efforts sufficiently or thoroughly enough for the purposes of prosecution. This may adversely affect conviction rates, the prosecutor's plea-bargaining position, and case dismissal rates (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). Thus, while only about one in ten serious crimes committed in our society are solved, or cleared, by the police, only about one-half of the cleared cases with adult suspects are accepted for prosecution.

The general conclusion of the Rand Report was that traditional approaches to criminal investigation by police agencies do not significantly affect the rate at which cases are solved

(Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). While nine investigative reforms to improve agency clearance rates were proposed, the study cautioned that they would have only a marginal effect, as investigators had a relatively minor impact on agency arrest and clearance rates. Case resolution rates were much more heavily influenced by patrol officer activities and the cooperation between citizens and the police. The investigative activities of detectives had little or no relationship to crime clearances (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977; Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975).

Rand report limitations.

While the Rand Report provided some of the most comprehensive information available about the police investigation process, the study itself was limited in a number of respects. In addition to being strongly criticized with regard to methodological concerns and erroneous and unjustified conclusions, the Rand Report was also attacked for generalizing its findings too broadly based on the limited sources of information used in the study (Gates & Knowles, 1976). The mailed survey sampling frame included only the 300 largest general purpose county and municipal agencies in the U.S. and did not include state agencies or more than 15,000 smaller general purpose agencies. Of the 153 agencies that responded to the survey, on-site visits were conducted at 29 agencies for more detailed study (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). However, a number of the Rand Report findings were based on data and samples collected during on-site visits to seven or fewer agencies, and some were based on information from just one agency (Gates & Knowles, 1976).

Thus, the Rand Report was not a nationally representative sample of police agencies and, in some areas, its findings were based on research conducted in only a handful of large agencies. In response to these criticisms, the Rand Report authors commented as follows (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1976):

> The principal substantive finding of our research was that, although the solution or clearance of reported crimes is the primary focus of police investigators, most clearances are arrived at through the application of administrative procedures, with solutions for a very small percentage, concentrated in a few specific crime types, being generated through the use of what has been traditionally thought of as investigative efforts. Much of this traditional investigative effort is applied to crimes which empirical evidence shows will never be solved. As a result of this finding, along with others on fingerprint processing, the use of information systems, strike forces, victim satisfaction, and post-arrest investigation thoroughness, which are based on more limited data samples, we suggested a number of reforms which we believe might result in more effective investigation activity. We cautioned against adopting any of these reforms without careful evaluation of their possible impacts. (p. 62)

Even though the report's authors acknowledged the limitations of their data and cautioned against over generalizing their findings, the Rand Report provided some of the most comprehensive information available regarding aspects of the police investigation process, and the report authors themselves argued that at least some of their findings were supported by other research (i.e., Bloch & Bell, 1976; Greenberg, Yu & Lang, 1973). As a result, the Rand

Report has assumed national significance in shaping the perspectives of researchers and practitioners regarding the police investigation process.

Prior Research in Local Jurisdictions

As noted above, many of the reported conclusions of the Rand Report were controversial (i.e., Gates & Knowles, 1976). In addition, a number of its findings and recommended reforms were subsequently either contradicted or challenged in other studies, and some were never tested. For example, several studies of team policing experiments reported that, contrary to the Rand Report findings, variations in organizational structures and practices in teams were found to have a positive effect on clearance rates (Gay, Day & Woodward, 1977; Sherman, Milton & Kelly, 1973).

In support of the Rand Report findings regarding the effect of agency size on clearance rates, Cordner (1989) pointed out that aggregate UCR clearance rates in agencies decreased as agency sizes increased, and that a number of qualitative studies indicated that communications, citizen expectations and local knowledge were factors that contributed to solving more cases in smaller agencies. Yet, in apparent contradiction to these findings, when Cordner (1989) examined clearance rates in 84 county and municipal agencies of varying size in the state of Maryland, he found that neither agency size nor crime workload affected investigative effectiveness. Instead, he found that region (the Baltimore/Washington metropolitan area vs. the rest of Maryland) and crime mix (proportions of property vs. persons crimes) were more strongly correlated with effectiveness.

Other research has challenged the Rand Report's description of the relative unimportance of the detective function. Several studies have reported that detectives play critical roles in routine case resolutions and post-arrest activities, and that many of their duties require highly specialized skills (Eck, 1983; Horvath & Meesig, 1998; Sanders, 1977; Willman & Snortum, 1984). Additionally, while the Rand research indicated that agency investigation management initiatives were relatively ineffective in solving cases, other studies have reported that formalized investigator selection techniques, case screening practices, case assignment and case supervision did improve the performance of investigative personnel (Cohen & Chaiken, 1989; Eck, 1979; Gaines, Lewis & Swanagin, 1983; Greenberg, Elliott, Kraft & Proctor, 1977; Greenberg, Yu & Lang, 1973; Greenberg & Wasserman, 1979).

Finally, several of the investigative reforms proposed by the Rand Report, such as the placement of detective post-arrest activities under prosecutorial control, the development of programs to encourage citizen support in solving crimes, and the use of strike forces, remained relatively unexplored.

Limitations.

Most of the police investigation studies that were conducted subsequent to the Rand Report were also quite limited in scope. The great majority of the police agencies that participated in those studies were large agencies similar to those in the Rand research. However, as Cordner (1989) pointed out, national UCR data and qualitative studies indicate

that smaller agencies tend to have higher clearance rates than larger ones, and that agency size may be a factor affecting investigative effectiveness, even though his own study did not show that.

Most of the studies were also conducted in agencies that served relatively heavily populated areas. Cordner's (1989) results did reflect a variance in effectiveness based on metropolitan vs. non-metropolitan areas; however, the specific criteria for distinguishing between the two types of areas were not clearly defined. Additionally, many studies included only one or two case types, (i.e., burglary, robbery) in their research, and almost all of them were conducted within the same time period as the Rand Report.

CHAPTER 2 – METHODOLOGY

As discussed in the previous section, the Rand Report is the only research that has addressed police criminal investigation processes from a nation-wide perspective. However, its scope was limited and its findings were not based on a representative sample of agencies, points that dominated much of the criticism it received in the policing literature (Gates & Knowles, 1976). In addition, of course, the data on which the Rand Report was based are now over two decades old. In that time, policing and the crime problem have changed dramatically. These, as well as other societal changes, indicated the need for a systematic, up-to date, and comprehensive description of the police investigation process. The present study was designed to do this by including in its data collection effort a nationally representative sample of all state, county and municipal agencies in the U.S. Additionally, efforts were made to link the results with other national data resources in order to allow for comparisons of agency investigative resources and processes within the context of broader policing functions.

The Survey

The survey in the present study was designed to complement the Law Enforcement Management and Statistics (LEMAS) survey program. The LEMAS program is sponsored by the BJS and consists of periodic (1987, 1990, 1993, 1997, 1999) surveys of a nationally representative sample of police agencies to collect information on police personnel, expenditures, pay, operations, vehicles, weapons and armor, computerization, programs, policies and drug enforcement (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999a). However, the LEMAS surveys do not focus on investigations-related issues. Communication with BJS officials disclosed that it was unlikely that the LEMAS survey would be expanded beyond its present scope, primarily because of limitations on the survey instrument length (B.J. Reaves, personal communication, November 21, 1996).

Study Population

BJS periodically (1986, 1992, 1996) sponsors a census of law enforcement agencies in the U.S. The census includes all state and local agencies that are publicly funded and employ at least one full-time or part-time sworn officer with general arrest powers. The most recent census, published in the Directory Survey of Law Enforcement Agencies, 1996, identified 18,778 general purpose (general arrest powers) and special purpose (special jurisdictional or enforcement responsibilities) law enforcement agencies (U.S. Department of Justice, 1998). These agencies represented the population for the 1997 LEMAS survey (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999a).

The sampling frame for the 1997 LEMAS survey included all state and local agencies in the 1996 census employing 100 or more full-time sworn personnel, and a nationally representative sample of agencies that employed fewer than 100 sworn officers. A total of 3,591 agencies were included in the LEMAS sampling frame (3,123 general purpose agencies and 468 special purpose agencies).

The 1997 LEMAS sample was used as the sampling frame in the present study, In July 1999, the mailing list for the 1997 LEMAS survey was obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, which had collected and processed the LEMAS survey data for the BJS. The special purpose agencies were eliminated from the mailing list and the remaining 3,123 general-purpose agencies comprised the sampling frame for our survey.

Development of Data Collection Instrument

During January 1998 through January 1999, a large number of draft versions of our data collection instrument were developed. This development process was based on a systematic reading of the extant literature, the authors' experiences in the field, and a number of other processes. Initially, the Rand survey questionnaire was used as a guide to develop our draft instrument. Many of the questions in the draft instrument were formulated as similarly as possible with both the Rand questionnaire and another that was used in a survey of Canadian police agencies (Chaiken, 1975; Chappell, Gordon & Moore, 1982). This was done, of course, in order to accommodate comparisons between the different studies. Unfortunately, in many cases extensive modifications and changes had to be made to update and expand the information in each of the major issue areas of interest. Question items were also developed to address new issues regarding investigative training, funding, supervision, crime laboratory support, DNA analysis, and goals. Because we had access to the LEMAS survey results, it was possible to limit the inclusion of demographic and other questions that duplicated information in those results.

During February through May 1999, our draft instrument was pre-tested by investigators at four county and municipal agencies in the mid-Michigan area. Additionally, it was reviewed and discussed with an informal advisory group of five active and retired senior level police officials and investigators who had extensive command, management and investigative experiences in four mid-Michigan state, county and municipal agencies. Based on the responses and recommendations received, changes were made as appropriate to add some items, delete others and, in general, to improve the clarity of the questions and to facilitate response accuracy and completion times.

A letter of transmittal for the questionnaire was prepared describing the nature and purpose of the study. The letter stated that the recipients were selected to participate in the survey because of their earlier participation in the 1997 LEMAS survey, and because of the potential research advantages of integrating detailed information regarding investigative resources with the broader management and administrative data obtained from the LEMAS survey regarding their agencies.

The finalized instrument was a 24-page booklet which included the letter of transmittal on the first page and 87 questions, organized around our six major issue areas, on the remaining 23 pages. The instrument was submitted to the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects at Michigan State University in May 1999; final approval was granted in September 1999.

In July 1999, we submitted a request to the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) for a second letter of transmittal to be included in our mailing in order to encourage agency responses. In September 1999, a letter soliciting agency participation and signed by Jeremy Travis, the Director of NIJ, was received for inclusion as a separate letter in the survey.

The Survey Process

The survey booklet and the NIJ letter were enclosed in an envelope together with a stamped, pre-addressed return envelope. These were mailed to the chief law enforcement administrator of the 3,123 agencies identified in the sampling frame. The first mailing took place in October 1999. Follow-up mailings of the questionnaires were made to non-respondents in December 1999 and February 2000. The follow-up mailings included additional letters of transmittal urging them to respond. Copies of the survey booklet and transmittal letters are attached in Appendix A.

During November 1999 through August 2000, the completed questionnaires were received from agencies and the questionnaire data were entered into a computer-readable database. (We note here that returned questionnaires were received well after the date we set for data entry, cleaning and analysis. In some cases, however, larger agencies, apparently finding it necessary for a lengthy internal processing of our request, returned useful data after initial preparation of our database. In order not to lose such data we opted to enter them. To our knowledge, no usable data returned to us were excluded from our database.) During this period a number of agencies made telephonic and e-mail inquiries regarding the questionnaire and the survey process; timely responses were provided as necessary. In a few instances, personal telephone calls were made to respondents in order to clarify answers that were either confusing or made in error.

Other Data Sources

An attempt was made to obtain the raw data that were collected and used in the Rand research; however, it was determined that they were no longer available (P.W. Greenwood, personal communication, December 9, 1997). Therefore, only the published results of the Rand research were used in order to make comparisons with the present study findings regarding changes and trends in the investigation process over the past 25 years.

An attempt was made to obtain 1999 UCR data regarding known offenses and clearances by arrest for the agencies in the present study's sampling frame; however, agency-level data were not available at the time of preparation of this report. The most currently available agency-level information of this type was located in a report entitled Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: [United States] Part 95: Offenses Known and Clearances by Arrest, 1997. This report had been compiled by the FBI and contained data for seven Index crimes (arson was not included). It is archived at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999b).

Data Handling

There were two major groupings of respondents that were dealt with in this research. The first of these is all agencies that provided usable responses. This category is referred to as "all agencies"; there were 1,746 such respondents. The sub-set of respondents that indicated that they employed "investigators," as defined in our data collection instrument, is referred to as "agencies with investigators"; there were 1,460 such agencies among the respondents. We have indicated in Chapter 3 – Results, when appropriate, which of these two categories of respondents our findings pertain to.

The purpose of this study was to provide the first-ever overview of the state of the police criminal investigation process in the U.S. Accordingly, our sample included all large police agencies and a nationally representative sample of all small agencies. In this report the findings, in the main, are shown in aggregate form and do not distinguish between different groups of agencies based on size, type, geographic location, etc. One example of a departure from this rule is shown in Table 4 in the next chapter; data are tabled separately by agency size and type along with aggregate data. In that table it will be seen that the mean number of investigators employed by all agencies is 36. However, when agency type is considered, the mean number of investigators varies from 19 in sheriff agencies to 168 in state agencies. Similarly, when agency size is considered, the number of investigators ranges from one to more than 5,000. Clearly, disaggregating the data into what may be more meaningful groupings for some purposes presents a different picture than the overall data. Additional statistical analysis beyond what was called for in this project will be necessary in order to develop more specific decision-making guidance for police administrators in the six major interest areas explored in this report.

In any research project of this nature and scope, how missing and incomplete data are handled must be confronted. For purposes of this report, we did not impute values or make any adjustments to the data in order to accommodate instances of missing information. (This is in contrast to what is done in the LEMAS survey where imputed values are used. See: U.S. Department of Justice, 1999a). This simplified presentation of the findings but made it likely that in some instances reported values are somewhat different from those that would have been obtained had the missing cases been dealt with differently. For example, many of the items in our data collection instrument were contingency questions, to be answered depending upon either a Yes or a No to an initial question. In most cases, those stating Yes to the initial item were expected to respond to follow-up questions. In some agencies that either did not answer or who answered No to the initial item provided responses to the contingency items. We did not adjust for these discrepancies, preferring instead to analyze only those cases in which an appropriate (usually a Yes) response was provided to the initial item. That is, contingency items were analyzed only when the response to the initial item was answered appropriately. This procedure generally resulted in a somewhat reduced calculated value for some items.

In those instances in which we dealt with either the total number of respondents (N=1,746) or the sub-set of respondents identified as "agencies with investigators" (n=1,460), we were interested in (in both cases) the proportion that provided affirmative responses to an item. Thus, the percentages shown in Chapter 3 - Results, unless otherwise noted, were

calculated on base values of either 1,746 if the item pertained to all respondents, or 1,460 if it pertained to only agencies with investigators. For example, if 1,500 of all respondents answered Yes to an item and 200 answered No and the remaining 46 did not provide an answer, we report that "86%" (1,500/1,746) and not 88% (1,500/1,700) answered Yes. In other words, the statistical results are reported, again unless otherwise noted, without displaying the missing cases. This simplified the presentation of the findings. But, because some may prefer a different approach, we tabled the total number of usable and missing responses for questions and included them in Appendix B.

In some instances, respondents were given several closed-ended choices to an item, along with a provision for writing in an Other - Specify answer. When the number of respondents that provided a write-in response exceeded by more than 10% the total number that responded to an item, additional information revealed by the write-in responses is presented so as to describe the general nature and content of the comments. Otherwise, we opted not to detail the written comments yielded by the Other - Specify choice.

Percentages reported are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

CHAPTER 3 – RESULTS

The survey results are presented in this chapter. Because the primary purpose of this study was to provide a nationally representative description of the police criminal investigation process, the data are presented in that context. For purposes of clarity and simplicity, agency type and agency size were used as organizing variables in tabling some of the data. However, no attempt was made in this report to explore hypotheses regarding the effect of those or other variables on the investigation process. We recognize that this limits the usefulness of the data for some purposes. On the other hand, a description of the investigation process has not been reported previously; we hope we have made the need to do so explicit in earlier portions of this report.

This chapter is divided into seven sections. The first section presents information regarding the general characteristics of the agencies that were included in the sample and the agencies that provided responses. The remaining six sections contain data regarding each of the six major issue areas and the general questions within each that our survey addressed.

Agencies in the Survey Sample

In Table 1 the number and percent of questionnaires that were distributed to and returned by agencies in our sample are summarized. The information is presented by agency type and agency size to illustrate the relative proportions of agencies in these categories that were included in our sample and that responded to the survey. Agency type data were obtained from the mailing list for the 1997 LEMAS survey that had been provided by the U.S. Census Bureau (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999a). Agency size data were obtained from the Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies, 1996, which reported the number of full-time sworn officers in each agency in the sample (U.S. Department of Justice, 1998). In the present study, agencies that employed 100 or more full-time, sworn officers were Large and those that employed fewer than 100 were Small.

Table 1

Number and Percent of Questionnaires Distributed and Returned
by Agency Type and Agency Size

Questionnaires	Agency Type: State Agencies		Sheriffs' Agencies		County Police		Municipal Police		Total Agencies	
	n	%[1]	N	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Number Distributed										
To Large agencies	49		292		34		481		856	27
To Small agencies	--		702		11		1,554		2,267	73
Total	49	2	994	32	45	1	2,035	65	3,123	100
Usable Returns										
From Large agencies	44		179		27		355		605	35
From Small agencies	--		308		8		825		1,141	65
Total	44	3	487	28	35	2	1,180	68	1,746	100

[1] Percentages rounded to nearest whole percent.

Questionnaires were mailed to 3,123 agencies. A total of 1,787 were returned. (This is an overall response rate of 57%.) Forty-one responses were unusable.[4] As a result, 1,746 usable questionnaires were received (a 56% response rate). The 1,746 agencies that submitted these questionnaires are referred to as "all agencies" throughout the rest of this report.

Of the usable questionnaires, 1,696 (97%) were from agencies that had also responded to the 1997 LEMAS survey. This made it possible to compare the LEMAS data with the data in this survey. We indicate where this was done.

As can be seen in Table 1, when classified by type, 65% of the agencies in the sample were municipal police agencies, 32% were sheriffs' agencies, 2% were state agencies and 1% were county police departments. However, 68% of the usable returns were from municipal police agencies, 28% were from sheriffs' agencies, 3% were from state agencies, and 2% were from county agencies.

Large agencies comprised 27% of the sample, and 73% were small agencies. Among the usable returns, 35% were large agencies and 65% were small. All state and most county police agencies were large, and the majority of sheriffs' and municipal police agencies were small.

Of the 856 large agencies in the sample, 605, or 71%, provided responses. Of the remaining 2,267 small agencies in the sample, 1,141 (50%) responded.

Size of Respondent Agencies

In Table 2, various statistics related to the size of the agencies that provided usable responses are set forth.

Table 2

Size Statistics of Agencies that Provided Usable Responses

	Full-time Sworn Officers		
Statistics	Large Agencies (N=605)	Small Agencies (N=1,141)	Total Agencies (N=1,746)
Total Number of Officers	320,406	34,579	354,985
Range	100 – 36,813	0 – 99	0 – 36,813
Mean	530[1]	30	203
Median	192	22	48

[1] Rounded to the nearest whole number.

As shown, the respondents employed a total of 354,985 full-time sworn officers. This is 53% of the 663,535 full-time sworn officers employed by all general-purpose police agencies in the U.S. (Reaves & Goldberg, 1998). The number of full-time sworn officers employed by the respondents ranged between 0 and 36,813, with a mean of 203. The total number of officers employed by the 605 large agencies was 320,406, and ranged between 100 and 36,813, with a mean of 530. The total number of officers employed by the 1,141 small agencies was 34,579; this ranged between 0 and 99 with a mean of 30.

In sum, questionnaires were distributed to 3,123 state, sheriffs', county and municipal police agencies; 1,746 usable questionnaires were returned (56% response rate). In terms of agency type, municipal police and sheriffs' agencies comprised 97% of the sample and 95% of the returns. In terms of agency size, large agencies comprised 27% of the sample and 35% of the returns. The 1,746 responding agencies employed 53% of all of the full-time sworn officers employed by general-purpose police agencies in the U.S.

(1) Organization

In this first issue area, organizational issues pertaining to the investigation process were of interest. Specifically, general questions regarding demographic characteristics, centralization versus decentralization, generalists versus specialists, types of investigative units, reasons for organization, and relationships with other agencies, were examined. Findings related to each of these issues are presented in a separate sub-section below. In each sub-section, a brief review of the pertinent past research is presented and then our findings are described. This section concludes with a summary of the findings.

Demographic Characteristics

In the Rand Report, the term "investigator" was defined as any sworn officer assigned to a unit having investigative duties. This included personnel assigned to investigations, patrol officers who worked in plainclothes for investigative units, and supervising officers (Chaiken, 1975). At the beginning of the questionnaire used in the present study, a similar description was provided. Investigators were defined as sworn and non-sworn officers who:

- generally wear civilian clothes.
- perform primarily investigative duties.
- have special titles such as "detective," "investigator," "agent," etc.
- may be managers or supervisors who primarily supervise either investigators or investigative activities.

The term investigator did not include sworn and non-sworn officers having investigative support duties, such as crime scene or laboratory technicians, legal staff, crime analysts, and intelligence or information specialists.

In Table 3, the number and percent of respondents that employed investigators are set forth by agency type and agency size.

Table 3

Number and Percent of Agencies Among Respondents that Employ Investigators by Agency Type and Agency Size

	Agency Type									
Employ Investigators	State Agencies (N=44)		Sheriffs' Agencies (N=487)		County Police (N=35)		Municipal Police (N=1,180)		Total Agencies (N=1,746)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
All Agencies	36	82	399	82	34	97	991	84	1,460	84
Large agencies		82[1] (36/44)		96 (171/179)		100 (27/27)		100 (355/355)		97 (589/605)
Small agencies		--		74 (228/308)		88 (7/8)		77 (636/825)		76 (871/1,141)

[1] 82% (36) of the 44 large state agencies that responded to the survey employed investigators.

As shown, a total of 84%, or 1,460, of all agencies employed investigators. These 1,460 agencies are referred to as "agencies with investigators" throughout the rest of this report. Almost all (97%) county police respondents employed investigators, and 82% or more of the other types of agencies did so.

When viewed by agency size, 97% (589) of the 605 large respondents employed investigators, including 100% of large county and municipal police and 96% of large sheriffs' agencies. Only 82% of state agencies did so. A total of 76% (871) of the 1,141 small agency respondents employed investigators. Again, more small county police agencies (88%) employed investigators than other small agencies (municipal = 77%, sheriffs' = 74%). There were no small state police agencies.

To determine the threshold at which agencies begin to employ officers in the specialized position of investigator, the number of full-time sworn officers employed by agencies that had only one investigator was determined. In our data, there were a total of 125 such agencies (86 municipal and 38 sheriffs'). The number of full-time sworn officers in these agencies ranged from 1 to 154, with a mean of 13 officers per agency. Based on this calculation then, police agencies employing 13 or more officers, on average, develop an investigative specialist position.

The Rand Report found that its large agency respondents assigned an average of 17% of their sworn personnel as investigators (Chaiken, 1975). In a more recent study, which reported the results of the 1996 census of 18,769 general- and special-purpose agencies in the U.S. that employed at least one full-time or part-time sworn officer with general arrest powers, it was found that about 15% of the full-time sworn personnel in those agencies were assigned to investigative duties (Reaves & Goldberg, 1998). Statistics related to this issue for the respondents that employed investigators in the present study are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Statistics Regarding Investigators Employed by Agencies That Employ Investigators by Agency Type

Statistics	Agency Type: State Agencies (34/36)[1]	Sheriffs' Agencies (396/399)	County Police (34/34)	Municipal Police (980/991)	Total Agencies (1,444/1,460)
Number of Investigators	5,703	7,495	4,292	34,763	52,253
(Nr of officers)	(39,593)	(54,888)	(21,060)	(205,693)	(321,234)
Percent of Investigators	14.4	13.7	20.4	16.9	16.3
Range	3 – 900	1 – 388	5 – 871	1 – 5,359	1 – 5,359
Mean[3]	168	19	126	35	36
Median	108	8	53	10	10

[1] 34 of the 36 state agency respondents that employed investigators provided data regarding the number of investigators they employed.

As indicated, of the 1,444 respondents (that employed investigators and also provided information regarding the number of investigators they had), the total number of investigators employed was 52,253, or 16.3% of the total number of full-time sworn officers employed (321,234). The type of agency that employed the highest proportion of investigators was county police (20.4%), followed by municipal police (16.9%), state police (14.4%), and sheriffs' agencies (13.7%).

In addition, agencies with investigators provided the following data:

- 1,437 (98%) agencies indicated they employed a total of 45,773 male investigators (range 1 - 4,582, mean = 32).
- 815 (56%) agencies indicated they employed a total of 6,480 female investigators (range 1 - 777, mean = 8).
- 67 (5%) agencies indicated they employed a total of 197 part-time investigators (range 1 - 26, mean = 3).
- 163 (11%) agencies indicated they employed a total of 1,817 non-sworn investigators (range 1 - 150, mean = 11).

In sum, 1,460 (84%) of all agencies employed investigators. A greater proportion of large agencies employed investigators (97%) than small agencies (76%). Inspection of the data showed that agencies assigned officers as investigators when, on average, there were 13 full-time sworn officers employed. On average, investigators comprised about 16% of the number of full-time sworn officers employed by respondents (that had investigators). This is quite similar to the statistic (17%), which the Rand Report indicated. Although the overwhelming majority of investigators in agencies were male, 56% of the agencies also employed female investigators. Very few agencies employed part-time (5%) or non-sworn (11%) investigators.

Centralization vs. Decentralization

In this sub-section, the question addressed was whether investigators were most commonly organized in a centralized or decentralized manner. Several studies have reported that investigators were centrally organized in most agencies. In the survey portion of the Rand Report, it was found that about 65% of the agencies centrally organized investigators; that is, their investigators were assigned to agency headquarters. Even in agencies that had separate commands for geographic subdivisions, about 63% had investigators centrally assigned to headquarters rather than in the field (Chaiken, 1975). Additionally, a 1981 survey of over 150 police agencies serving populations of 50,000 or more reported that over half of the detectives in the 122 responding agencies were in centralized units (Police Executive Research Forum, 1981).

Other studies have described police efforts to decentralize investigators. Various team policing experiments in the 1970s reported assigning investigator responsibilities to patrol officers. Others tested the reassignment of some detectives to decentralized neighborhood teams to work with patrol officers while still maintaining centralized detective units for certain types of cases (Bloch & Bell, 1976; Elliott, 1978; Gay, Day & Woodward, 1977; Public Systems Evaluation, 1977; Schwartz & Clarren, 1977). Most of these experiments reported at least some successes (i.e., the ability of patrol officers to handle increased investigative duties; higher arrest, clearance and/or prosecution rates; improved patrol officer - detective relations; etc.).

In the present study, the agencies with investigators were asked if any investigators were assigned to agency headquarters. A total of 1,211 (83%) agencies indicated they were. This included 522 (90%) of the 581 large agency respondents and 689 (81%) of the 854 small agency respondents.

Agencies with investigators were also asked if any investigators were assigned to field level units, and 399 (27%) indicated they were. This included 240 (42%) of the 577 large agency respondents and 159 (19%) of the 843 small agency respondents. In these 399 agencies, 48% had investigators assigned to district or precinct stations; 20% had them assigned to fixed neighborhood or community substations; and 6% had them assigned to mobile neighborhood or community substations. Thirty-eight percent provided other responses. The combined percentages exceeded 100% because some agencies provided multiple responses, most of which were variations in location of assignment based on some types of cases (drugs, homicide, sex-related, etc.), the seriousness of crimes (felonies versus

misdemeanors), and types of investigative units (internal affairs, specialized units, task forces, etc.).

In sum, the percentage of agencies with investigators assigned to headquarters appears to have increased from 65% of the large agencies in the Rand Report to 83% of agencies of all sizes in the present study. The percentage of agencies with investigators assigned to the field may have increased slightly among large agencies (Rand Report large agencies = 35%, present study large agencies = 42%), but is only 27% for agencies of all sizes. Apparently, centralization, as opposed to decentralization, has been and remains the predominant form of geographic assignment of investigators. Investigators appear to be even more centrally located today than two decades ago, despite the potentially promising results regarding decentralized teams with investigative responsibilities reported in a number of team policing experiments in the 1970s.

Generalists vs. Specialists

In this sub-section, the question of interest was the extent to which investigators were assigned as generalists or specialists. When Ward (1971) compared clearance rates in 21 police departments across the U.S., he found no significantly different rates between agencies using a generalist approach to investigations and those using a specialist approach. In the survey portion of the Rand Report, investigators were found to be most commonly assigned to an investigative unit specializing in particular groups of crime types (i.e., crimes against persons, burglary/auto theft). In only a few agencies did investigators "operate on a total generalist concept, with no specialized units whatsoever," or in a "totally specialized form of organization" with "all ... investigators in specialized units" (Chaiken, 1975, pp. 18-19).

Based on its findings, the Rand Report recommended that most investigators be assigned as generalists to conduct obvious follow-up leads on routine cases, thus minimizing the emphasis on specialized skills or centralized coordination. It further recommended that generalist investigators be assigned to local operations commanders to support their public service function (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). However, when the generalist investigator concept was field-tested in a number of team policing studies during the 1970s, it was typically found to be difficult to implement. For a variety of reasons, few if any of these experiments continued beyond the 1970s (Eck & Spelman, 1987; Walker, 1993).

In the present study, the agencies with investigators were asked if their investigators were assigned as generalists (i.e., assigned all cases, including minor ones, but with uniformed officers to do preliminary inquiries). A total of 67% of the 1,211 respondents with investigators assigned to the headquarters and 44% of the 399 respondents with investigators assigned to field level units reported that their investigators were assigned to be generalists.

Agencies were also asked if their investigators were assigned as specialists (i.e., assigned only certain cases, such as major, complex or lengthy investigations). A total of 30% of the 1,211 respondents with investigators assigned to the headquarters and 47% of the 399 respondents assigned to field level units indicated they were.

Additionally, 12% of the agencies indicated their investigators were assigned all cases, including minor cases, but within specific geographic areas. Seven percent indicated they investigated only certain cases (major, complex, lengthy, etc.) but within specific geographic areas. A number of agencies provided additional comments, which essentially described other variations in investigator case assignments based on locations and case types. The combined percentages of agencies with generalist and specialist investigators exceeded 100% because some agencies had both generalist and specialist investigators.

In sum, in the present study, the predominant role of investigators was found to be generalist-oriented rather than specialist-oriented in the majority of agencies at the headquarters level, and relatively evenly divided between generalists and specialists at the field level. It is difficult, and perhaps somewhat misleading, to make direct comparisons between the Rand Report and the present findings, as the Rand Report approached the generalist-specialist issue in terms of assignment to specialized units, and here it was approached from the perspective of the kinds of cases assigned to investigators.

Investigative Units

In this section, the question addressed was what were the types of investigative units to which investigators were assigned. The survey component of the Rand Report defined a specialized investigative unit as one that has responsibility for investigating certain types of crimes, but not all crimes. It showed that at least one-half of the responding agencies had juvenile and vice/narcotics units, and between 30% and 40% had units specializing in organized crime, auto theft, burglary, homicide, checks/forgery/bunco, and internal inspections. About one-fourth of the agencies had crimes against persons or crimes against property units (Chaiken, 1975).

To handle serious crimes, the Rand Report proposed the development of Major Offense Units (MOUs) and closely supervised teams consisting of well-trained and experienced investigators. It also reported that strike forces could be effective if they were used selectively and judiciously. The concept of task forces (a different term than strike forces but presumably similar in concept) was subsequently popularized in the 1980s, and typically consisted of representatives from one or more agencies joining together to address specific types of crime-related problems. There are some reports in the literature addressing the effectiveness of certain types of task forces (i.e., Jefferis, Frank, Smith, Novak & Travis, 1998). However, specific research assessing or evaluating agency experiments with MOUs, serious case teams, or strike forces, as described in the Rand Report, has been very limited.

In the present study the agencies with investigators were first asked if they had investigators assigned to separate organizational units: 917 (63%) indicated they did. These agencies were then asked to list the names of the units, and they provided a wide array of over 700 investigative unit names identified variously by crime type (i.e., homicide), function (i.e., intelligence), victim and/or offender type (i.e., juveniles), specific targets (i.e., task forces; fugitives/warrants; special assignments), and so forth. For our purposes, these unit names were sorted into ten categories. The categories and a brief description of the number and types of units sorted into each category are shown in Table 5.

It is to be noted that in categorizing the units shown in the table, a number of unit names were not clearly descriptive of their function; in these cases they were sorted by interpreting their purpose based on the name and other available data provided by respondents. Thus, the number of units in each category should be regarded as an approximation. In those instances where unit names were too ambiguous, were identified by unrecognizable acronyms, or were not classifiable in one category, they were placed in the Other category.

Table 5

Categories and Numbers of Investigative Units
in Agencies with Investigators

Major Category	Number of Units	Unit Descriptions
1. Persons	857	Mostly crimes related to UCR Index crimes against persons (homicide, rape, robbery, and assault).
2. Property	727	Mostly crimes related to UCR Index crimes against property (burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, arson). Included money-related crimes (fraud, gambling, white collar, etc.).
3. Narcotics	481	Included narcotics, drugs and alcohol-related functions concerning anticrime, forfeiture, gang abatement, high intensity, intelligence, interdiction, internal affairs, K-9, multi-agency units, special operations, street activities, surveillance, tactical units, etc.
4. General	390	Included more than one major category (i.e., Persons and Property), or was broadly encompassing (i.e., General Crimes, Felonies, Major Crimes)
5. Juvenile/ Youth	385	Crimes involving juveniles/youth, including assaults, family violence, gang-related incidents, habitual offenders, missing persons, school incidents, sex-related crimes, etc.
6. Internal Affairs	345	Included functions related to background investigations, integrity issues, professional standards, surveillance, etc.
7. Task Forces	270	Included both intra- and inter-agency units at the municipal, county, state and federal levels targeted against types of crimes, organizations, offenders and other targets.
8. Vice	184	Included internal agency units targeted against types of crimes, organizations, offenders and other targets.
9. Intelligence	76	Included functions related to case management, child abuse, domestic terrorism, gangs, general crimes, organized crime, etc.
10. Other	645	Included functions related to special crime problems (233), geographic location (67), fugitives/warrants/apprehension/arrest (56), acronyms (47), other organizations (46), crime scenes and forensics (45), investigative support (40), organized crime (18), computers (15), and miscellaneous (82).

As indicated in Table 5, the most common major units were the Persons (N=857) and Property (N=727) categories, followed by the Narcotics (N=481) and General (N=390) categories. A total of 645 units were placed in the Other category. These were further sub-divided into ten sub-groupings, as shown in the table.

In sum, while two-thirds (63%) of the agencies with investigators reported they had investigators assigned to separate organizational units, one-third indicated they did not have such units. When unit assignments were made, person and property crimes units were found to be the most common. In the Rand Report, such units were found in only about one-fourth of the agencies. About one-half of the agencies with investigative units in the present study reported having narcotics units, which is similar to what the Rand Report found. In the present study, less than one-half of the agencies (with investigative units) reported having juvenile or youth-related units. These were the most commonly reported units (73% of city agencies and 61% of county agencies) in the Rand Report.

Reasons for Organization

In this sub-section, questions regarding why agencies organize investigators the way they do were explored, as were issues regarding investigation-related changes introduced in the last five years.

The Rand Report found that almost half of the agencies reported significant reorganizations of their investigative units during the two years prior to the study. While some agencies centralized organizationally, others decentralized, and while some agencies tended more toward the specialization of investigators, others moved to generalist investigators (Chaiken, 1975).

Why organized that way.

In the present study, in an effort to learn more about some of the factors that affected their organizational structure, the agencies with investigators were provided a list of seven different reasons for organizing investigators and cases. They were asked to indicate whether or not each one was a reason for the way in which they were organized. The percentage of agencies that responded to each listed reason was as follows:

- To make more efficient use of personnel and resources – 88%.
- To solve/clear more crimes – 82%.
- To develop expertise in investigations – 80%.
- To be more proactive in investigations – 75%.
- To improve familiarity with criminals and crime patterns in the area – 74%.

- To improve communication with or assist uniformed officers – 72%.

- To develop better community relations – 64%.

Five percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

Changes in the past five years.

In an effort to identify recent investigation-related changes, the agencies with investigators were provided a list of seven different types of investigative initiatives. They were asked to indicate whether or not they had introduced any of them in their agency within the past five years.

The most frequently implemented investigative change was the improved management and monitoring of continuing investigations (selected by 65% of the agencies). Crime analysis/intelligence functions (selected by 39%), police-prosecutor liaison programs (selected by 37%), responsibility for problem solving (selected by 36%), and formal case screening (selected by 34%), were each selected by at least one-third of the agencies. Only 17% and 13% of the agencies selected either centralization or decentralization of investigative units, respectively. This differs from the Rand Report findings that showed almost one-half of the agencies had gone through significant reorganizations in their investigative function within just two years prior to that study. Two percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

In sum, in the present study it was found that most agencies organized as they did in an effort to improve investigative efficiency and effectiveness. The investigative changes they had made in the past five years were focused on management enhancement rather than structural reorganization of investigators.

Relations with Other Agencies

In an effort to learn more about inter-agency investigative relationships, respondents indicated how frequently they met with other agencies and participated in task force arrangements. Their responses are described below.

Meetings between agencies.

Agencies were asked if they met regularly with other criminal justice agencies to share information regarding investigative activities, and 1,432 (82%) of all agencies said they did. Almost all (97%) of these agencies said they met regularly with other local police agencies, 82% met with sheriffs' agencies, 81% met with state agencies, and 62% met with federal agencies. Seven percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

Task forces.

Agencies were asked if any of their investigators or uniformed officers had been assigned to an investigations task force during the past 12 months, and 1,095 (63%) of all

agencies answered affirmatively. Forty-three percent of those 1,095 agencies indicated they had been involved in or formed 1,731 task forces that involved only their own agency. The mean number of task forces in which they were involved was 4 and the range was from 1 to 100.

A total of 1,015 (93%) of the 1,095 respondents indicated they had worked in task forces that involved other agencies. The mean number of task forces in which they had been involved was 3.8, and the range was from 1 to 100. When asked what types of other agencies were involved, 85% of these agencies said the local police, 77% said state agencies, 71% said federal agencies, and 69% said sheriffs' departments. Eight percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

When asked what the task force targets were, 90% of the 1,095 agencies involved in either single or multi-agency investigation task forces said they were drug-related, 37% said they were related to organized crime activities, 35% said they were on a specific case investigation (ex: a single murder), and 27% said they were on a specific case type (ex: a series of murders). Twenty percent of the agencies wrote in other responses, which described task forces focused on mixed case types (alcohol-related, auto theft, burglary, homicide, etc.) or other targets (white-collar crimes, violent crimes, etc.).

In sum, most (82%) of the respondents met regularly with other agencies on investigative matters. The Rand Report only looked at investigative strike forces in a few selected large agencies and did not ask about the extent to which all agencies in their sample were involved such arrangements. However, in the present study, about two-thirds (63%) of the agencies had been involved in task forces in the past 12 months, and most (93%) of them involved working with other agencies. The use of investigative task forces, especially those involving more than one agency, appears to have become a relatively common and generally accepted way of dealing with different types of criminal investigation problems. While drug problems were the most frequent target, task forces were also used to address other types of crime issues. The regular meetings with other agencies, combined with involvement in multi-agency task forces, indicate that most agencies routinely participate in external relationships to carry out operational investigative tasks.

Summary

All agencies in the present study employ about one-half of the full-time sworn officers in the U.S. Eighty-four percent of the respondent agencies employ investigators and, in total, the number of investigators exceeded 50,000; this number, on average, is 16% of agency personnel. This is similar to the percentage of investigators in agencies found in the Rand Report (17%), indicating little change since the 1970s. Fifty-six percent of the agencies employ female investigators but very few employ part-time or non-sworn investigators.

Centralization, rather than decentralization, is the predominant form of geographic assignment of investigators. In most agencies (83%), investigators are assigned to agency headquarters, and only 27% of the agencies report having investigators assigned to field units. Investigators appear to be more centrally assigned than they were two decades ago.

Although many agencies assign investigators both as generalists (investigate all cases, including minor ones) and as specialists (investigate only certain cases), overall, generalist assignments are more prevalent. About 67% of the agencies assign investigators as generalists at the headquarters level, and about 44% of the agencies with field units assign investigators as generalists at the field level. About 30% assign investigators as specialists at the headquarters, and about 47% assign them as specialists in the field.

About two-thirds (63%) of agencies with investigators assign them to separate organizational units. Agencies report a wide variety of investigative unit names identified mostly by crime type, function, victim and/or offender type, and/or specific crime targets. The most common types of units are in the persons, property and narcotics categories.

Most agencies indicate that they are organized as they are for reasons related to investigative effectiveness and efficiency, and that the investigative changes they made in the recent past were focused much more on management issues than structural reorganization. This is a change from the significant reorganization efforts that were reportedly undertaken by agencies two decades ago.

Most (82%) agencies meet regularly with other agencies on investigative matters. About two-thirds (63%) of them are involved in task forces, mostly with other agencies. The task forces are targeted primarily against drug-related activities although other types of crime problems are of substantial interest.

(2) Patrol Officers

The role of patrol officers in the investigation process is explored in this section. Questions regarding the extent of patrol officer investigative duties, and how officers are trained and evaluated with respect to those duties, are examined separately. To put results in perspective, a brief review of the pertinent prior research is presented, and then the findings in the present study are described. A summary concludes presentation of the findings.

Investigative Duties

In this sub-section, questions regarding the extent of the investigative duties of the patrol officer are addressed. Agency efforts to enhance those duties are also described.

The Rand Report showed clearly that uniformed patrol officers play a key role in the investigation process. It found that the most important determinant of whether a case was solved was the information, specifically information identifying a perpetrator that was provided by the victim to the patrol officer who initially responded to an incident. As many as 80% of the cases cleared were the product of on-scene arrests, initial identification of suspects and other routine actions of the responding patrol officers (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). Generally, if the perpetrator was not identified at the time the crime was reported, the case remained unsolved. Thus, the activities of the responding patrol officer directly influenced investigative outcomes.

In examining what patrol officers do in investigations, the Rand Report found that in 58% of the agencies, their role was limited to traditional activities, such as preparing reports, securing crime scenes, arresting suspects near a crime scene, and so forth. In the remaining agencies, patrol officer' investigative responsibilities were greater and ranged from more on-scene activities to full responsibility for investigating certain crimes (misdemeanors, burglaries), and even to full investigative responsibility for all investigation of all reported crimes. Generally, agencies with less than 10% of their force in investigative units tended to assign a greater investigative role to the patrol officer (Chaiken, 1975). However, the extent and nature of the specific types of investigative tasks performed by patrol officers were not reported in detail.

In support of the Rand findings, a number of subsequent studies in the U.S. and elsewhere showed that the information provided by victims to responding patrol officers was the most important determinant of case resolution. Further, it was found to be a critical factor in determining whether a follow-up investigation would be conducted (Eck, 1979, 1983; Glick & Riccio, 1979; Miyazawa, 1992; Skogan & Antunes, 1979; Willman & Snortum, 1984).

With regard to the extent of the investigative responsibilities of patrol officers, various team policing studies in the 1970s experimented with assigning more investigative duties and responsibilities to patrol officers, and others reassigned some detectives to work with patrol officers in decentralized neighborhood teams while still maintaining centralized detective units for certain case types (Bloch & Bell, 1976; Elliott, 1978; Gay, Day & Woodward, 1977; Public Systems Evaluation, 1977; Schwartz & Clarren, 1977). Most of these experiments reported at least some successes, e.g., the patrol officers' ability to handle increased investigative duties; higher arrest, clearance and prosecution rates; and improved patrol officer - detective relations (Eck & Spelman, 1987; Walker, 1993).

In the present study, agencies were provided with a list of 16 typical investigative tasks and were asked to indicate the extent to which uniformed officers in their agency performed them.[5]

A majority of all agencies indicated that patrol officers frequently performed the following seven tasks:

- Secure crime scenes (91% of the agencies).
- Testify in court (80%).
- Notify investigative units regarding investigations (73%).
- Conduct records checks (69%).
- Interview victims (64%).
- Interview witnesses (64%).

- Canvass area for witnesses (64%).

Less than one-half of the agencies indicated that their officers frequently performed the remaining nine investigative tasks:

- interview suspects (47% of the agencies).
- conduct drug field tests (44%).
- collect physical evidence from suspects (42%).
- collect physical evidence from crime scenes (42%).
- interrogate suspects (41%).
- submit evidence for analysis (40%).
- coordinate investigations with prosecutors (25%).
- conduct surveillance (20%).
- conduct undercover activities (8%).

Enhancement of investigative role.

When asked if they had attempted to enhance the role of uniformed officers in investigating crime within the past five years, 1,250 (72%) of all agencies said they had. These agencies were then asked how they had done so.

A total of 83% of the 1,250 agencies indicated that patrol officers conducted more investigations at the crime scene prior to giving the case to investigators. Seventy-seven percent reported that investigators could refer cases back to officers for follow-up investigation, and 71% indicated that officers conducted complete follow-up investigations unless cases were complex. Fifty-one percent indicated that officers conducted complete follow-up investigations as part of a team.

Less than one-half (47%) of the agencies reported that officers were temporarily assigned to investigative units as part of their career development. Nine percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

The 1,250 agencies were also asked why they tried to enhance the uniformed officer's role in investigating crime. Each of the following six reasons was selected by a majority of the agencies:

- To improve uniformed officer awareness of the investigation process (selected by 93% of the agencies).
- To improve the quality of reports passed on to investigators (81%).
- To clear more crimes (81%).
- To improve relations between uniformed officers and investigators (78%).
- To improve the morale of uniformed officers (75%).
- To free investigators for major crime investigations (68%).

The least frequently selected choices, chosen by less than one-half of the agencies, were as follows:

- To shorten case closure time (selected by 48% of the agencies).
- To assist in evaluating the work performance of uniformed officers (40%).
- To meet budgetary constraints (29%).

One percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

It can be seen that, among the top six reasons why agencies have tried to enhance the uniformed officers' role in investigations, three were oriented toward enhancing the patrol officers' role (uniformed officer awareness, relations between uniformed officers and investigators, and morale of uniformed officers) and three were primarily investigations-oriented (quality of reports, clear more crimes, and free investigators).

Investigations Training and Evaluation

In this sub-section, questions regarding the investigative role of patrol officers were addressed. Questions that were included concerned the amount of initial and refresher/advanced training patrol officers received, agency training budgets for this training, and whether or not the investigative performance of patrol officers was formally evaluated.

In the survey component of the Rand Report, most agencies (93%) said that new patrol officer recruits received at least some training regarding investigations, presumably as part of their basic police academy training, and in most of these agencies the training was two weeks or less in duration (Chaiken, 1975). However, the Rand Report did not determine if patrol officers received any in-service investigations training after completing the academy, or whether any such training was documented for liability purposes.

Several subsequent studies provide information regarding patrol officer training in investigative matters:

- A survey of state training commission directors reported that, while the duration of police recruit training courses varied considerably, the mean length was 373 hours, with an average of 50% (185 hours) devoted to patrol and investigations (Meadows, 1987).

- A survey of state police and highway patrol agencies found that recruit training in all agencies exceeded the minimum 400 hours of basic training recommended by the 1973 National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, and that they all either met or exceeded the commission's recommended minimum of 35% of training time in the combined patrol/investigations course content area (Edwards, 1993).

- The 1997 LEMAS survey reported that the median number of hours of classroom training required of new officers was 823 for state police agencies, 760 for county agencies, 640 for municipal police, and 448 for sheriffs' agencies. Further, the median number of field training hours required was 360 for state, 480 for county and municipal, and 436 for sheriffs' agencies (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999a). However, the types of training were not specified.

Initial training.

In the present study, when asked if they required uniformed officers to undergo classroom instruction regarding investigations subsequent to basic academy training, 614 of the 1,746 respondent agencies (35%) said Yes. A total of 464 of those agencies reported that the number of instruction hours required ranged from 0 to 540 (10 agencies specified the number of hours as zero), with a mean of 41 hours per agency.

Five general types of investigations training were listed, and most of the 614 agencies indicated that they all were included in uniformed officer investigations training (crime scene procedure – 96%; evidence gathering – 94%; interview/interrogation – 89%; report writing – 88%, and court testimony – 86%). Ten percent of the agencies indicated other types of training were also included.

Ten percent of the 614 agencies indicated that some of the training was documented for liability purposes, 14% indicated that most of it was, and 71% indicated that all of it was. Five percent of the agencies did not provide a response.

Refresher/advanced investigations training.

Agencies were asked if they required uniformed officers to undergo any refresher or advanced investigations training. A total of 515 (30%) of all agencies said Yes.

When asked how often they required uniformed officers to undergo such training, 4% of the 515 agencies said monthly, 66% said annually, and 28% marked the other response. Two percent of the agencies did not provide a response.

When asked how many of their uniformed officers were required to undergo such training, 6% of the 515 agencies said some officers, 22% said most officers, and 70% said all officers. Two percent did not provide a response.

Seven percent of the 515 agencies indicated that some of the training was documented for liability purposes, 11% indicated that most of it was, and 79% indicated that all of it was. Three percent did not provide a response.

Training budget.

A total of 283 (16%) of all agencies reported that they had a specific budget item that reserved funding for investigations training for uniformed officers. These agencies were asked how much money was budgeted for such training (including costs of materials, tuition, travel, per diem, etc., but not salaries), and 221 agencies provided dollar amounts that ranged from $2 to $481,500, with a mean of $15,969 (median = $6,000).

Evaluation.

Agencies were asked if the investigative performance of individual uniformed officers was evaluated separately in their agency. A total of 533 (31%) of all agencies indicated that it was.

Summary

The data in this study provide an overview of specific investigative tasks performed by patrol officers. Tasks that are administrative in nature and those that are related to interviews of victims and witnesses are performed by patrol officers in more than half of the agencies. However, tasks related to the interview/interrogation of suspects, evidence collection and processing, coordination with prosecutors, and some proactive techniques are performed by patrol officers in fewer than half of the agencies. In short, as indicated in previous research, patrol officers generally do not carry out a wide range of investigative tasks.

Lacking comparable data, it is difficult to identify significant changes in the investigative activities of patrol officers over the past two decades. It can be said, however, that there appears to be growing recognition that the patrol officers' role is key to the investigation process, as 72% of the agencies reported efforts to enhance that role within the past five years.

Although the investigative role of uniformed officers may be expanding, only about 35% of all respondents require uniformed officers to undergo some type of initial classroom instruction on investigations after completing basic academy training, and only 30% require refresher or advanced classroom instruction on investigations. Additionally, only 16% have

specific budgets for such training, and only 31% evaluate uniformed officers' investigative performance. It should be noted, however, that while most agencies may not require formal investigations training for their uniformed officers, it is possible that they make this type of training available to at least some officers on a non-mandatory basis. However, the extent to which agencies provide optional investigations training to patrol officers was not explored in the present study.

Virtually any changes in the investigative role of uniformed officers can be expected to alter the balance between the traditional patrol duties of the officers and the traditional duties of investigators. If the officers and investigators are not properly assigned tasks or are not adequately trained in preparation for the changes, the effect on the quality of the investigations conducted and the overall investigative productivity of the agencies can be significant and detrimental. For example, even though physical evidence is collected only in a small proportion (about 10%) of cases, it has been found to improve both clearance and conviction rates, particularly in cases that traditionally have low resolution rates. However, the research on the police investigation process reveals that the primary limitations on the use of physical evidence are the knowledge and skills of the investigator (Horvath & Meesig, 1996). Because most police investigations are conducted by patrol officers, it is likely that, if those officers are not properly trained in performing such tasks, the value of whatever physical evidence is collected will be diminished.

(3) Investigators

In this issue area, the role of the investigator was examined. What investigators do, and how they are selected, trained, ranked and evaluated, were the central issues here. In the presentation of the findings on each of these issues, a brief review of the pertinent past research is given first. This section concludes with a summary of the findings.

What Investigators Do

Questions regarding the types of activities investigators perform are addressed here. The survey component of the Rand Report did not focus on the specific types of investigative activities performed by investigators. However, the subsequent on-site research revealed that investigators spent most of their time on administrative matters, working on cases that have a low chance of being solved, and post-arrest activities (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977). In support of these findings, several subsequent studies reported that a majority of cases received little or no attention by detectives, and that detectives spent most of their time on administrative and post-arrest activities (Eck, 1983; Ericson, 1981; Willman & Snortum, 1984).

Both the Rand Report and a number of other studies reported that the information provided by victims to responding patrol officers was the most important determinant of case resolution, and that most cases were solved by routine investigation (Eck, 1979, 1983; Glick & Riccio, 1979; Miyazawa, 1992; Skogan & Antunes, 1979; Willman & Snortum, 1984). However, contrary to the implication of the Rand Report, other research shows that although the information from the patrol officer's preliminary investigation is key to determining

whether a follow-up investigation will be conducted, the most accurate predictor of an arrest during the follow-up was detective work (Eck, 1983). Additionally, detectives play key roles in routine case solutions, and their activities, particularly with regard to interviews, interrogations and processing clearances, require specialized skills (Willman & Snortum, 1984).

The Rand Report proposed that police agencies "reduce follow-up investigation on all cases except those involving the most serious offenses" (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975, p. x), and that generalist investigators be assigned to work routine cases, thus minimizing the emphasis on specialized skills or centralized coordination. However, various team policing experiments in the 1970s reported that the generalist investigator concept was difficult to implement, and for a variety of reasons few if any of the experiments continued beyond the 1970s (Eck & Spelman, 1987; Walker, 1993).

Based on a review of the major studies on police investigations, Horvath & Meesig (1996) found that the research literature shows that the important and dominant traditional activities of investigators involve simply talking to people; other tasks generally do not contribute as much to case outcomes. As policing has changed over the past two decades, many agencies have experimented with different roles for investigators. The increased use of specialized evidence/crime scene technicians, for example, has affected evidence collection and processing tasks. Team policing experiments in the 1970s enhanced the investigative roles of uniformed officers in some agencies and, as was noted earlier, 72% of the agencies in the present study reported efforts to enhance the investigative role of the patrol officer. With the advent of community policing, at least two-thirds of all large police agencies have community substations, frequent meetings with community groups, community policing-related training for officers and citizens alike, and at least some full-time community policing officers (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999a). Yet, aside from preliminary studies exploring the integration of community policing and investigations (Horvath, Bucqueroux & Meesig, 1997; Horvath & Meesig, 1998; Wycoff, 1998), very little is known about the extent to which these changes have affected the criminal investigation function of agencies in general.

Karchmer and Eck (1998), anticipating this concern, argued that, in general, proactive police investigative efforts appeared to be focused on responses to specific problems that were visible at the street level; they called for a broader perspective on problem solving in order to deal with the underlying economic and organizational aspects of crime. Eck (1996, 1999) also maintained that organizational changes are needed in police agencies in order to develop more fully a problem solving approach to criminal investigations, to deal with heavy investigator workloads, and to re-orient the traditional reactive mode of investigations to an approach more focused on justice and crime prevention goals.

In the present study, questions were focused on what investigators do, i.e., the specific types of investigative activities that they perform. The agencies with investigators were provided a list of 15 activities and asked to indicate the extent to which their investigators performed them. Core investigative activities (i.e., interview/interrogation, record checks, court testimony) were not included because it was assumed that most, if not all, investigators performed them. Instead, activities were included that were the most likely to have been

affected as a result of recent changes in policing. The activities were sorted into three groups -- Investigative Tasks, Community-related Activities, and Activities with Uniformed Officers. In each group, agencies indicated the extent to which the each of the listed activities was performed (see Footnote 5).

In the Investigative Tasks group, the tasks and the percentages of agencies that indicated their investigators regularly performed them were as follows:

- Process crime scene for physical evidence – 69%.
- Prioritize cases based on local area problems – 67%.
- Self-assign cases based on local problems – 33%.
- Do community problem solving – 28%.
- Conduct undercover investigations – 26%.
- Work in pairs – 23%.

Interestingly, only two of the listed tasks were regularly performed by investigators in more than one-half of the agencies. Although the nature of the investigator's involvement in processing crime scenes was not explored, investigators in 69% of the agencies are involved in this task, at least to some extent, even though many agencies employed evidence/crime scene specialists for this purpose. (More information regarding the use of these specialists is presented later in the Investigative Support section). The only other task regularly performed in more than one-half of the agencies – prioritizing cases based on local area problems (67%) – raises the question of why investigators in the remaining one-third of the agencies do not do this. However, this point was not further explored. All of the remaining tasks were regularly performed by investigators in one-third or fewer of the agencies. Excluding working in pairs, these may be viewed as relatively proactive tasks generally requiring more effort than a traditional follow-up investigative response. This suggests that the investigation process in the majority of agencies is primarily reactive, and that relatively few agencies are engaged in proactive investigative tasks on a regular basis.

In the Community-related Activities group, the activities and the percentages of agencies that indicated their investigators regularly performed them are as follows:

- Receive at least eight hours of community policing training – 51%.
- Provide crime information to the public – 41%.
- Regularly participate in community meetings – 23%.

- Work with citizens on community outreach – 10%.
- Use citizen volunteers to assist in investigations – 7%.
- Work in teams with citizen groups – 5%.

Aside from receiving community policing training, none of the six listed activities was regularly performed by agencies with investigators, and four of them were regularly performed by less than one-fourth of them. While this indicates that at least some agencies are involving investigators in community-related activities, the integration of investigations into the community policing movement appears to be lagging behind the general trend among police agencies toward implementing community policing tactics and activities (Horvath, Bucqueroux & Meesig, 1997).

In the group of items related to activities with uniformed officers, the specific activities and percentages of agencies that indicated their investigators regularly worked with uniformed officers to perform them are as follows:

- Analyze crime patterns – 23%.
- Work in decoy units, stakeouts, etc. – 12%.
- Work in teams – 9%.

These three activities were regularly performed by investigators and patrol officers together in less than one-fourth of the agencies. As discussed earlier, it has been shown that patrol officers play a critical role in obtaining crime information, solving crimes, and determining the practicality of follow-up investigations, and also that efforts were under way to enhance that role. This suggests that the interface between patrol officers and investigators is a dynamic one that can have serious ramifications on investigative outcomes. However, based on the available data it is difficult to determine whether or how either the earlier team policing experiments or the more recent role enhancement efforts may have affected the police-investigator relationship. It may be that in the context of the three activities about which they were queried, agencies do not consider the further integration of patrol officer and investigator roles to be feasible or useful, or simply that the activities were not reflective of other ongoing role changes.

Investigator Selection

In this sub-section, the question of how investigators are selected is addressed. Agency practices regarding the use of selection criteria, selection processes, and the extent of cross-agency hiring, are described.

The Rand Report did not explore the selection of investigators. However, Cohen and Chaiken (1987) conducted one of the most comprehensive studies available on the subject.

Their study included a review of the personnel selection literature, interviews of police officials in 12 agencies, onsite visits to three agencies, and reviews of police documents. They found that while police investigators and administrators agreed that choosing the right officers to be investigators was of critical importance, opinions varied considerably as to how this should be done. Nevertheless, based on their assessment of the personnel selection literature, they concluded that investigator performance could be improved by upgrading and refining both the selection criteria and the selection processes (Cohen & Chaiken, 1987).

With regard to selection criteria, one of the important factors that Cohen and Chaiken (1987) found to be a valid predictor of investigator performance was the past performance of the officer on the job, which could be assessed from reviews of arrest records, personnel records, supervisory appraisals, etc. They suggested that a minimum of two years of college education also had value as a selection criterion.

With regard to selection processes, Cohen and Chaiken (1987) reported that "Written civil service exams and tests for verbal ability were the only two factors that achieved the standards of validity established by this report and are also specifically associated with important tasks performed by investigators" (p. 56). Peer evaluation processes and assessment centers were found to be of value in a number of cases also. Interview techniques (personal, oral board, etc.), while being among the most widely used of the selection processes, were found to be implemented so inconsistently (i.e., structured vs. non-structured) that conclusions regarding their validity were conflicting (Cohen & Chaiken, 1987).

In the present study, agencies were queried regarding both the selection criteria and the selection processes they used to select investigators. They were also asked about cross-agency hiring (whether they hired people from other agencies as investigators).

Selection criteria and processes.

Agencies with investigators were provided a list of eight commonly used selection criteria related to past performance and were asked to indicate the extent to which each was used (see Footnote 5).

The selection criterion most frequently used by agencies was investigation skills, used by 83% of the agencies. Next were supervisor/staff ratings or evaluations (73%), personnel records (72%), and minimum number of years of experience (72%). The remaining criteria included education requirements specifically for investigators (39%), arrest record (37%), promotion to a certain grade level (26%), and other (11%, which included additional or more specifically described criteria, various types of selection processes, miscellaneous comments, etc.).

Agencies with investigators were also provided a list of six selection processes by which investigators are selected. They were asked to indicate the extent to which each was used (see Footnote 5).

Two selection processes were selected by more than one-half of the agencies (personal interview - 68%, and oral board interview - 55%). The remaining processes were selected by less than one-third of the agencies (peer evaluation - 30%, tests - 29%, and civil service exams - 1%). Thirteen percent of the agencies wrote in other responses (most of these were more specifically described processes, including appointment by the agency head or other senior official, training school requirements, probationary periods, etc.).

In sum, four of the selection criteria identified by Cohen and Chaiken (1987) as valid predictors of the future performance of investigators were used by more than 70% of the agencies (investigative skills, evaluations, personnel records, and years of experience). Minimal educational requirements and arrest records, also identified as valid predictors, were used by slightly more than one-third of the agencies (39% and 37%, respectively).

The selection processes used by agencies do not appear to be based on their validity as predictors of investigative performance. Interview techniques (personal and oral board), which were found by Cohen and Chaiken (1987) to be among the least consistent predictors, remained the most commonly used by more than half of the agencies (68% and 55%, respectively). On the other hand, verbal ability tests and civil service exams, reported to be among the best predictors, were used by only 29% and 1% of the agencies, respectively.

Thus, while the criteria that agencies most commonly use to select investigators are said to be valid predictors of investigative performance, the processes in which the criteria are applied are among the least valid, according to the available research. The use of certain criteria and specific selection processes, of course, may be influenced by agency size and the number of investigators employed. While most agencies have access to information regarding past performance of their officers through either personnel records or personal knowledge, selection processes other than interview techniques generally require greater commitments of organizational resources. These processes are probably more affordable and effective in larger agencies, and they may be less necessary in smaller agencies where managers and supervisors are more personally familiar with individual officer performance.

Cross-agency hiring.

Finally with regard to investigator selection, agencies were asked if they had hired people from other agencies as investigators in the past five years; only 130 (9%) of them had done so. When asked if they currently permitted the hiring of people from other agencies as investigators, 24% indicated that they did.

One of the potential benefits of cross-agency hiring is the opportunity to select personnel who may already possess the necessary training, experience, special knowledge and/or documented record of past performance and who can immediately fulfill an agency's needs. Yet, the findings here show that very few agencies hire investigators previously employed by other agencies. This is surprising since most agencies meet regularly with other agencies on investigative matters, and most also work with other agencies in investigation task forces. It appears that regular cooperation between agencies extends primarily to operational

matters and does not generally include personnel issues such as the lateral placement of investigators.

Investigator Training

In this sub-section, questions about how investigators are trained are examined. Agency practices regarding the training of new investigators, other types of training, and related issues are also described.

The survey portion of the Rand Report showed that, while over 90% of the agencies indicated that their police recruits received at least some investigations training (generally two weeks or less, presumably as part of their basic police academy training), the majority of agencies did not provide any training at all for new investigators. Some agencies, however, did provide one- or two-week initial training courses and over 70% provided refresher training to experienced investigators. Investigators were reportedly provided an average of 31 hours of some type of training annually (this presumably included training in both investigative and other matters). "The most common pattern was annual refresher training or 'training as needed,' for example when an investigator was promoted or changed specialties" (Chaiken, 1975, p. 17).

Several subsequent studies also provided information regarding investigator training:

- As previously mentioned, Cohen & Chaiken (1987) reported that a key predictor of investigator performance was past performance as an officer. They stated that training was a good way to observe performance and to identify potential disciplinary problems in officers who were being considered for selection as investigators.

- A BJS survey of federal agencies, conducted in 1998, disclosed that approximately 35,000 federal criminal investigators were employed by the federal government. The majority of them were trained at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC), a bureau of the U.S. Department of Treasury, located at Glynco, GA. FLETC classroom training courses for investigators ranged from eight to 22 weeks, and subsequent on-the-job field training requirements extended as long as two years in some federal agencies (Reaves & Hart, 2000b).

- A large national survey conducted in 1984, and again in 1988, to identify recurring state and local police agency training needs identified 20 activities that had been consistently rated by agencies, regardless of their size or type, as among the top 25% in importance (Phillips, 1984; 1988). Of those 20 activities, 13 were investigator-related functions (Meesig, 1995).

One study that directly addressed detective training consisted of ethnographic interviews of 27 state and local police detectives. The interviewees were employed at 12 different agencies in Michigan that ranged in size from small to large, and they had varying

levels of investigative experience (Healey, 1994). The study found that, aside from several two- or three-day courses designed primarily for patrol officers, there were no systematic organized detective training programs in any of the agencies.

Thus, the research shows that while training probably has considerable effects on investigative performance, the most extensive and carefully documented training occurs in federal agencies. Relatively little is known about investigative training in state, county and local agencies, even though they have consistently identified a recurring need for more training in investigative matters.

New investigators.

In the present study, agencies with investigators were asked a series of questions regarding initial training and probation periods for investigators. Their responses are described below.

Initial training. Agencies were asked if newly appointed investigators were required to undergo classroom instruction on investigations-related matters within a specified period of time; 562 (39%) of them said Yes. The number of hours of classroom training required ranged from 0 to 880, with a mean of 75 and a median of 40. (Three agencies reported 0 hours of training; the next lowest number of hours was 8, reported by nine agencies. One agency reported 880 hours of training; the next highest number of hours was 540, reported by one agency also.)

The agencies that required classroom investigative training were then provided a list of four general types of training and asked what types were required. Crime-type training (homicide, crimes against property, drugs, etc.) was indicated by 95% of the agencies; 97% indicated investigative techniques (interviews/interrogations, crime scene management, etc.); 88% indicated legal issues (arrest, search, court testimony, etc), and 67% indicated management/administration (report writing, case management, data systems, etc.). Ten percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

When asked if any of the training was documented for liability purposes, 12% of agencies said Some, 12% said Most, and 75% said All. One percent did not respond.

Probation. Agencies were asked if a probation period was required for newly selected investigators, and 643 (44%) of them said Yes. The number of weeks of probation, reported by 622 of these agencies, ranged from 3 to 180, with a mean of 31 weeks and a median of 26 weeks. (One agency reported 180 weeks of probation; the next highest number of weeks was 78, reported by four agencies.)

When asked who evaluates success in probation, 74% (of the 643 agencies that required probation periods) said the evaluator was an investigator who also was a supervisor; this was by far the most common response. Less than one-fourth of the agencies responded otherwise. In 22% of the agencies, an investigator who is a training officer did the evaluation. In 11% evaluation was done by an investigator, and in another 11% it was done by a uniformed officer

who was also a supervisor. A uniformed officer who was a training officer did the evaluation in 2% of the agencies, and a regular uniformed officer carried out the evaluation in 1% of the agencies. Twenty-five percent of the agencies wrote in other responses. Most of these identified the evaluator either by rank (agency head, captain, sergeant, etc.) or position (commander, supervisor) without specifying whether the individual was a uniformed officer or investigator. The total number of responses exceeded 100% because some agencies provided multiple responses.

A determination of the 562 agencies that required initial classroom instruction and of the 643 agencies that required a probation period revealed that 256 agencies required only classroom training, 343 required only probation periods, and 292 required both.

Other training.

Survey questions addressing the training of investigators after the probationary period are discussed below. The questions are grouped into two categories -- either refresher/advanced training or overall training.

Refresher/advanced training. Agencies were asked whether investigators (aside from new appointees) were required to undergo any refresher or advanced classroom investigations training; 865 (59%) of them said Yes. When asked how often they required such training, 2% said monthly, 66% said annually, and 30% said other. Two percent did not respond. When asked how many of their investigators were required to undergo such training, 3% said Some investigators, 9% said Most, and 87% said All. One percent did not respond.

These agencies were provided with a list of four general types of investigations training and were asked to indicate what types were required. A total of 88% of the 865 agencies indicated crime type training (homicide, crimes against property, drugs, etc.), 89% indicated investigative techniques (interviews/interrogations, crime scene management, etc.), 91% indicated legal issues (arrest, search, court testimony, etc), and 67% indicated management/administration (report writing, case management, data systems, etc.). Eleven percent wrote in other responses. These included types of training on specific issues, the number of hours of training, non-investigative training, and miscellaneous comments.

When asked if any of the training was documented for liability purposes, 8% of the agencies said Some, 9% said Most, and 73% said All. Eleven percent did not respond.

Overall training. To estimate the proportion of investigators who had received at least some type of classroom training, agencies were asked to indicate the proportion of all investigators in their employ who had been trained in each of four types of investigative topics. At least 95% of the agencies responded. On average, 90% of the investigators in these agencies received crime type training, 92% had been trained in investigative techniques and also in legal issues, and 67% had been trained in management/administration topics.

Training issues.

Questions regarding several additional training issues were asked of agencies that employed investigators. They are grouped below into three categories: funding, trainers and training problems.

Funding. Agencies were provided a list of five funding sources. They were asked to indicate the extent to which each provided funding for investigations training.[6]

The agency's own budget was identified as the primary source of funding for investigations training by 1224 (84%) of the agencies. The remaining four funding sources were identified as a primary source by only 16%. Hence, state funds (10%), federal funds (2%), state grants (2%) and federal grants (2%) were not widely used funding sources for investigative training. Five percent of the agencies wrote in a variety of other responses.

Agencies were asked if they had a specific budget item that reserves funding for training of investigators, and 619 (42%) of them said Yes. These agencies were then asked how much money was budgeted specifically for training investigators annually (including costs of materials, tuition, travel, per diem, etc., but not salaries). Five hundred eleven of the 619 agencies (83%) provided responses that ranged from $200 to $2,500,000; the mean was $20,317 per agency and a total of $10,382,028 for all 511 agencies. One state agency reported a $2,500,000 investigations training budget. If this agency is excluded, then the responses ranged from $200 to $275,000, with a mean of $15,455 per agency and a total of $7,882,028.

Agencies were asked what type of support they authorized for investigators who attended investigations training courses. Eighty percent of them said they reimbursed all expenses, 46% authorized time off, and 25% reimbursed some expenses. Eleven percent wrote in other responses (i.e., dependent on types or locations of courses, cost-sharing, case-by-case support, combinations of forms of reimbursement).

Trainers. Agencies were asked to identify who provided classroom instruction to their investigators. They were provided a list of six training sources and were asked to indicate on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = Most, 4 = All) the extent to which each of the sources provided training.

A substantial proportion of the agencies, 84%, said federal agencies provided some training. In decreasing percentages, agencies indicated that some of their training was also provided by other local police departments (73%), by private organizations (70%), by in-house personnel (68%), by state agencies (63%), and by educational institutions (63%). Five percent wrote in other responses.

In an effort to identify the extent to which individual sources were the primary providers of investigations training to agencies, the Most and All responses were combined and items were then rank ordered. Thirty percent of the agencies reported that they received most or all of their training from state agencies; 26% said educational institutions; and 18% said in-house personnel. The remaining sources provided most or all of the investigations training to

fewer than 10% of the agencies (private organizations - 8%; other local agencies - 7%; and federal agencies - 4%).

Training problems. Agencies were provided a list of eight factors and were asked to indicate the extent to which each was a training problem.[7] The results are set forth in Table 6.

Table 6

Ratings of Training Problems by Agencies with Investigators

		Agency Ratings				
Factors	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Personnel ("Manpower") Shortage	1437	12	31	36	21	57
Lack of Funding	1437	16	30	33	22	55
Non-availability of Desired Training	1418	21	47	27	5	32
Excessive Length of Training	1425	39	42	17	2	19
Lack of Quality of Training	1411	40	46	13	1	14
Lack of Management Support	1414	63	27	8	2	10
Ineffectiveness of Training	1418	42	50	8	1	9
Low Individual Motivation	1418	60	33	7	1	8

[1]n=the number of 1,460 agencies with investigators that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

It can be seen in Table 6 that personnel shortages and the lack of funding were the most frequently identified problems for investigative training, but they were selected by only a little more than half of the agencies. The non-availability of desired training courses was seen as a moderate to large problem by about a third of the agencies. Aside from those three factors the others were not considered significant problems agencies face in the training of investigators.

Summary.

Over two decades ago, the Rand Report revealed that less than one-half of the agencies in its survey provided initial training on investigations to newly assigned investigators. The situation has not changed much since then, as only 39% of the agencies in the present study provide this type of training, which typically is less than two weeks in duration. If, however, one considers the probation period required for new investigators as formal training, then, perhaps, the situation can be seen as a little more positive.

A majority (59%) of the agencies requires their investigators to undergo refresher or advanced classroom training. About two-thirds (66%) of these agencies indicated that the

training was provided annually, and most (87%) indicated that all of their investigators were required to undergo the training. The types of training courses provided to investigators were similar whether they were provided to investigators at the initial stage of appointment or as advanced training.

Overall, agencies indicated that most of their investigators received some type of initial, probationary or recurring classroom investigations training during their tenure as investigators. About three-fourths of the agencies said they documented all of the initial and refresher/advanced training for liability purposes. This was similar to the documentation by agencies for the training of uniformed officers.

While most (84%) agencies with investigators rely on funding from their own budgets to support most or all of their investigations training needs, only 42% had a specific budget for such support. Most (80%) agencies reimbursed investigators for training costs and almost half (46%) used time off as a form of reimbursement. The majority of agencies receive at least some investigations training from a variety of sources, especially federal agencies, but a little more than one-fourth of them indicates that most of their training is provided by state and educational institutions.

With respect to investigations training, two factors, personnel shortages and lack of funding, were identified by more than one-half of the agencies as significant concerns. Additionally, even though training was available to most agencies from multiple sources, in a considerable percentage of agencies (32%) there apparently is inadequate access to the training desired. Moreover, although there was no assessment in this study of the quality and duration of specific types of investigative training, it is obvious that these factors need to be considered when assessing training needs and resources.

Personnel Issues

Questionnaire items pertaining to a number of personnel issues concerning investigators are discussed in the paragraphs below. Agency practices with respect to the use of ranks and entitlements, collective bargaining units, time limits and attrition, and evaluation, are described. Findings in the Rand Report that are related to these issues are noted where appropriate.

Ranks and entitlements.

In the past, investigators in many police agencies were considered to be elite members of their organizations. Political connections often gave them influence, and the nature of their duties allowed them to work under lesser degrees of supervision than uniformed officers. This autonomy, combined with the freedom to wear civilian clothes and to drive unmarked vehicles, provided a low level of visibility and thus higher levels of discretion and greater freedom to manipulate information to their advantage in solving crimes. The popular image of police as crime fighters also contributed to the elevation of investigators as the pre-eminent crime solvers in many agencies (Eck, 1983; Ericson, 1981; Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977; Kuykendall, 1986; Sanders, 1977; Sparrow, 1988). However, as police organizations became

more "professional" and police chiefs exercised greater control over their officers, the activities of investigators were re-directed from offender-driven efforts to incident, case-oriented work. This afforded a greater degree of supervision and control over investigator activities (Geller, 1991). Together with the advent of community policing, and its emphasis on crime prevention rather than crime solving, the old mystique surrounding investigators faded somewhat and they began to lose some of their freedoms and perquisites (Reppetto, 1978).

While it is difficult to catalog and measure the many intangible factors that contributed to the perception of position and status regarding investigators, the survey component of the Rand Report provided insight regarding some of the more tangible benefits investigators enjoyed during the 1970s. For instance, it revealed that most city agencies had special titles for investigators; these carried a higher rate of pay in those jurisdictions. This was not true in most county agencies, however. On the other hand, about 60% of the investigators in all agencies did not have civil service rank or tenure; they served at the discretion of the chief (Chaiken, 1975).

In the present study, agencies were asked questions regarding investigator ranks and entitlements. Forty-four percent of the agencies said that investigators were assigned to one rank; 25% said two different ranks were available. Of the remaining agencies, 18% had three ranks, 8% had four, and 3% had five or more. Two agencies indicated they had no ranks and 30 (2%) did not respond.

Fifty-five percent of the agencies indicated that their investigators were entitled to special allowances; 48% indicated that they were entitled to a higher pay scale. Aside from those issues, only 25% of the agencies indicated that their investigators were given a promotion in rank on appointment to investigator status and 14% indicated they were entitled to civil service status. (Their civil status prior to selection was not determined in the present study). Eleven percent wrote in other responses (i.e., amounts of additional stipends for clothing, take-home vehicles, flextime, different shift work hours).

In sum, these results show that only about one-half of police agencies provide multiple ranks or special entitlements to investigators, and only a minority give promotions or civil service status to new investigators. Overall, the elitist status of investigators appears to have diminished during recent years. The tangible benefits they receive appear for the most part to be accorded even less frequently than was found in the Rand Report. Additionally, as will be seen in the next (Investigative Management) section, many agencies are using a variety of supervisory and management processes designed to monitor and control the autonomy and discretion of investigators and the conduct of investigations.

Collective bargaining units.

Agencies were asked if their investigators were represented by a collective bargaining unit; 51% (N=742) said Yes. These agencies were provided a list of seven items and were asked to indicate which of them were covered by their collective bargaining agreements. Salaries were covered in the great majority (92% of the 742) of the agencies; promotion was covered in slightly less than one-half (46%.). The remaining choices were not part of

collective bargaining agreements in most agencies: (e.g., amount of overtime authorized - 34%; purposes for which overtime is authorized - 30%; training - 25%; assignments - 24%; and changes in investigative unit structure - 11%). Ten percent wrote in other responses.)

Time limits/attrition.

Agencies were asked if there were any time limits on how long investigators could serve in investigative positions; only a small proportion (22%) said there were. About one-third (36%) of those agencies said they applied to all investigative positions, 46% said they applied to only some, and 14% said they applied to only vice-crime positions. Four percent did not respond. When time limits were imposed they usually (88%) resulted from a mandatory, periodic rotation cycle. Only a few (15%) agencies said time limits were imposed by a collective bargaining agreement and 13% wrote in other responses (e.g., determined by chief/senior official; limits varied based on crime types; to facilitate promotions and transfers; etc.). Some agencies provided multiple responses.

Agencies were asked why their investigators most commonly leave investigative positions. The results showed that the most common reasons were to improve promotion potential, selected by 47% of the agencies, and retirement, selected by 38%. Less than one-fourth of the agencies gave different responses (periodic rotation cycle - 22%; job stress - 20%; dislike of investigative work - 7%; and collective bargaining agreement - 3%). Eleven percent of the agencies wrote in other reasons, such as better money, better job, disciplinary actions, etc.

Evaluation.

In the survey component of the Rand Report, the most frequently used methods for monitoring the quality of investigative unit performance were success in major investigations and supervisory review. A majority of agencies reported that they used prosecution, indictment and conviction data, and case audits for evaluation purposes (Chaiken, 1975, p. 46). However, during the onsite visits in the Rand Report, it was found that in most agencies much of the data needed to conduct such evaluations were either not readily available or difficult to obtain.

In the present study, agencies were asked how they evaluated investigators and investigation units. They were provided a list of 18 criteria and were asked to indicate which, if any, were used. Their responses for each criterion are set forth in rank order in Table 7.

Table 7

Rank Ordering of Criteria Used by Agencies with Investigators to Evaluate Individual Investigators and Investigative Units

Criteria	Used to Evaluate: Investigators			Used to Evaluate: Investigative Units		
	n[1]	%[2]	Rank	n[3]	%	Rank
Success in a Major Investigation	1,393	83	1	813	82	2
Report Writing	1396	82	2	809	53	9
Clearance Statistics	1,401	81	3	818	85	1
Periodic Caseload Review	1,397	81	4	813	71	5
Caseload Statistics	1,399	78	5	819	79	3
Periodic Written Evaluation by Supervisor	1,397	78	6	807	55	8
Arrest Statistics	1,394	68	7	815	76	4
Evidence Collection/Handling	1,394	62	8	813	52	10
Analysis of Unresolved Cases	1,385	58	9	812	64	6
Property Recovery	1,387	45	10	812	55	7
Incident Reduction/Prevention Activities	1,387	39	11	812	52	11
Audit (Review of Randomly Selected Cases)	1,385	39	12	811	40	15
Crime Pattern Detection Activities	1,385	39	13	813	50	12
Prosecution Statistics	1,388	37	14	813	43	14
Hot Spot Reduction Activities	1,385	35	15	813	48	13
Conviction Statistics	1,391	33	16	815	39	16
Community Policing Related Activities	1,384	32	17	814	35	17
Peer Review	1,388	25	18	803	20	18

[1]n=the number of 1,460 agencies with investigators that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.
[3]A total of 917 agencies reported they had investigative units (see Question #8 in the questionnaire in Appendix A). Therefore, only the responses of those agencies are included in the table.

It can be seen in that table that nine criteria were used by at least half of the agencies to evaluate individual investigators. These same nine criteria, plus three additional ones, were used by at least half of the agencies to evaluate their investigative units. Thus, the majority of agencies used similar criteria to evaluate both investigators and investigative units.

Summary

Among 15 investigator activities that may have been affected by recent changes in policing, only three are regularly performed by more than one-half of the agencies. Overall, the findings indicate that investigators' activities have not been significantly altered in important ways by recent changes in policing.

The criteria most commonly used to select investigators are generally those reported to be among the most valid predictors of the future performance. However, the selection processes used (personal and oral board interviews) are among the least valid.

Similar to what was noted in the Rand Report, most agencies do not provide initial investigation-specific training for new investigators, nor do most have probationary periods of assignment. Only 59% require their investigators to undergo refresher or advanced training. However, most investigators receive some type of training during their tenure. This is typically funded by internal agency budgets. Federal agencies, as opposed to state or other organizations, provide at least some training to most (84%) police departments.

Personnel shortages and the lack of funding are typically seen as the most significant problems affecting the training of investigators. A relatively sizeable proportion of agencies (32%) also identified the lack of access to desired training programs as a problem. Overall, the results suggest that investigators, generally, receive more training than they did two decades ago. Even if true, however, that training appears to be minimal in comparison to what is required by the majority of federal and state investigative agencies.

The majority of the agencies with investigators use only one or two ranks for investigators. In at least one-half of the agencies, investigators are automatically entitled to at least one benefit upon selection. The two most common are special allowances and a higher pay scale.

Investigators in about half of the agencies are represented by collective bargaining units. Salaries and promotions were the two issues most frequently covered by collective bargaining agreements.

Only a few agencies have time limits on how long investigators can serve in investigative positions. When that is done, the restriction is typically applied to all investigative positions and usually is based on agency policy requiring periodic rotation. The common reasons for leaving investigative positions are to improve promotion potential and retirement. Job stress and dislike of investigation work are not seen to be primary factors in departure from investigative work.

In the majority of agencies, the same nine criteria are used to evaluate investigators as well as investigative units in at least one-half of the agencies. The top three criteria for individual evaluations are, in order, investigative success, report writing and case clearances. When considering unit evaluations, caseload statistics replaced report writing in the top three.

(4) Investigation Management

In this issue area, management topics such as supervision, case management, prosecutor relationships and some general issues are examined in separate sub-sections. In each, a brief review of the pertinent past research is presented, and then the findings of the present study are described. This issue area concludes with a summary of the findings.

Supervision

Agency practices regarding supervisor selection, immediate supervision, reporting to supervisors, and the monitoring of investigators, are examined below.

Supervisor selection.

The Rand Report did not explore issues related to the selection of investigator supervisors but they were examined in the present study. To do so, agencies with investigators were provided a list of six selection criteria and five selection processes that can be used to select supervisors. For both the criteria and the processes, agencies were asked to indicate the extent to which each was used (see Footnote 5).

The two criteria most frequently used by agencies to select supervisors were staff ratings (72%) and investigation skills (70%). Following those two, personnel records (66%) and a minimum number of years of experience (65%) were applied. Most agencies did not use special educational requirements (39%) or arrest records (21%) for supervisor selection. Ten percent indicated other responses.

The selection process most frequently used was the personal interview (64%). That was followed by an oral board interview in less than one-half of the agencies (44%). The remaining three processes, used by fewer than 30% of the agencies, were peer evaluation (27%), tests (26%) and civil service exams (12%). A variety of other responses were written in by 12% of the agencies. They included comments relating to selection, assignment or appointment by the agency head or a senior official, promotion, seniority, and staff review.

The four selection criteria that were most frequently used by the agencies to select investigators (evaluations, investigative skills, personnel records and years of experience) were also the most commonly used to select investigator supervisors. Additionally, the two selection processes that were frequently used to select investigators - personal interviews and oral board interviews - were also used by more than half (64% and 44%, respectively) of the agencies to select investigator supervisors. Thus, the majority of agencies used similar selection criteria and selection processes to select investigators and investigator supervisors.

Immediate supervisors.

Agencies with investigators were asked to indicate who carried out immediate supervision of street-level investigators. A total of 53% indicated that such supervision was done by an investigator assigned to headquarters, whereas 14% said it was an investigator assigned to a field unit. Only a small number said that the immediate supervisor was a uniformed officer assigned to headquarters (8%) or a field unit (6%). A total of 410 (28%) agencies wrote in a variety of other responses.

Agency responses to the four questionnaire options were collapsed into either investigator supervisors or uniformed officer supervisors. This permitted all but 63 (4%) of the write-in responses to be sorted into one of the two categories. As a result, it was determined that 74% of the agencies used investigator supervisors and 24% used uniformed officer supervisors for immediate supervision.

Reporting to supervisors.

Agencies with investigators were asked how frequently their investigators most commonly reported to and/or coordinated with supervisors on routine investigations. Sixty-five percent of them said Daily, 26% said Weekly, and 4% said Monthly. Three percent provided other responses and 2% did not respond. Thus, in over 90% of the agencies investigators most commonly have contact with supervisors at least on a weekly basis in routine matters.

How investigator activities are monitored.

The survey component of the Rand Report revealed that in over one-half of the agencies investigators maintained activity logs and that the recorded information was used for management purposes (Chaiken, 1975). However, the content and use of the logs varied widely, and onsite visits to agencies disclosed very few instances where logs provided specific information regarding how investigators spent their time.

In the present study, agencies with investigators were asked if their investigators were routinely required to complete activity logs (written breakdowns of activities and/or amount of time spent on cases) to account for how their time is spent; this was true in 41% (n=593) of the agencies. When asked how frequently activity logs were completed, 50% said Daily, 25% said Weekly, and 25% said Monthly. Review of activity logs by a supervisor, was done in 28% of the agencies on a Daily basis; 35% said it was done Weekly, and 35% said Monthly. The remainder, 2%, did not respond. The content and use of the logs were not explored.

Case Management

In this section, questions regarding investigation case management were addressed. Agency practices with respect to who assigns cases, how cases are assigned, the use of case solvability factors, how reports are prepared and filed, and how reports and investigations are monitored, are described.

Who assigns cases.

In the present study, agencies with investigators were asked who most commonly made the decision to assign cases to investigators. They were provided three choices and could select one or more as appropriate. A total of 81% of the respondents said the immediate supervisor who was an investigator made the decision. A small number, 17%, indicated that investigators themselves decided or that the immediate supervisor who was a uniformed officer made the decision (9%). Eleven percent wrote in a number of other responses: assignment by agency head, senior official or area commander; combinations of methods; varies by case type; rotation; etc.

How cases are assigned.

The survey component of the Rand Report showed that cases were assigned to investigators based on the specialty of the investigator (59%), or by rotation (32%) (Chaiken, 1975, p. 46). In the present study, agencies with investigators were asked how cases were assigned to investigators once a decision was made to proceed with an investigation (see Footnote 5).

The most frequently selected case assignment method was by investigators' specialty, used by 50% of the agencies. The next most frequently selected choices were by the experience of the investigator (36%), and by the size of investigators' caseload (35%). The remaining two choices, by rotation and by the personal characteristics of the investigator, were used by 25% and 14% of the agencies, respectively. Some agencies provided multiple responses and 11% wrote in other responses (assignment by agency head, senior official or area commander; combinations of methods; varies by case type; assignment by rotation; etc.).

In sum, cases typically are assigned in accordance with investigator specialty and by rotation in roughly the same percentages as the Rand Report showed over two decades ago. However, in the present study, it was also determined that investigator experience and caseload methods were used more frequently than the rotation method, and that assignment by the personal characteristics of the investigator was the least frequently used method.

Case solvability factors.

The Rand Report recommended that the number of follow-up investigations be reduced by screening out cases in which the preliminary investigation failed to reveal sufficient information. In other words, only those cases in which the initial response was adequate to suggest that the case was solvable were to be given to investigators. Cases that appeared unsolvable were to receive no attention unless there were other reasons to investigate (i.e., the high visibility or seriousness of the crime). In support of this approach, other studies developed solvability factors that were found to be effective screening methods for burglary and robbery cases. However, efforts to develop accurate solvability factors for other types of cases were unsuccessful (Eck, 1979; Gaines, Lewis & Swanagin, 1983; Greenberg, Elliott, Kraft & Proctor, 1977; Greenberg, Yu & Lang, 1973). Nevertheless, a review of a study of

122 agencies conducted in 1981, disclosed that 83% of them used some form of case screening (Eck, 1992).

In the present study, agencies were asked if they used case solvability factors to determine whether cases were assigned; 50% (N = 722) of the agencies with investigators said Yes. These agencies were then asked three questions. The first was if the case solvability factors were in writing; this was found to be true in 61% of the agencies. The second question was whether the case solvability factors were strictly, moderately or loosely applied. Fifteen percent of the agencies indicated that they were strictly applied, 66% indicated they were moderately applied, and 17% indicated they were loosely applied. Responses to the third question, whether solvability factors were used for all types of crime or just some, showed that in 83% of the agencies they were used for all types and in 2% only for certain, specified crimes. Fifteen percent of the agencies did not respond.

In sum, while 50% of the agencies with investigators use case solvability factors, they generally use them as guides for decisions regarding follow-up investigation, rather than as rigid criteria as suggested by the research. However, most (83%) of the agencies that use such factors apply them to all types of cases even though empirical research identifies their effectiveness in only two case types.

How reports are prepared and filed.

Agencies were asked how investigators most commonly prepare their reports. They were provided four choices and could select one or more as appropriate. In all, 74% of the agencies with investigators indicated that the reports were typed on a computer for data base entry; 52% said they were handwritten or typed. Forty-three percent said they were tape recorded and then transcribed by others, and 9% said they were tape recorded and then transcribed by an investigator.

Agencies were asked how investigation reports were filed in their agency. They were provided two choices and could select either or both. In 76% of the 1,746 respondent agencies, reports were entered into a computer database. In 66% they were filed manually.

In sum, most agencies have taken steps to computerize the preparation and filing of investigation reports. Computers are used for these purposes, at least to some extent, by more than 70% of the agencies.

How reports are monitored.

Agencies were asked how they monitored investigation reports. They were provided three choices and could select one or more as appropriate. A total of 84% of all agencies indicated that reports were reviewed by a supervisor before being filed if no prosecution action was anticipated. The same percentage, 84%, said reports were reviewed by a supervisor if prosecution action was anticipated. Thus, in most agencies the reports were reviewed regardless of whether or not prosecution action was anticipated. Fifty-one percent said interim

reports were required if the case remained open after a specified period of time, and 5% wrote in other responses.

How investigations are monitored.

Agencies were asked how they monitored the progress of investigations. They were provided a list of six stages of an investigation and were asked to indicate if the status of cases in each stage was not monitored, monitored manually, or monitored by computer. They could select more than one choice, as appropriate (i.e., some types of cases not monitored or monitored manually and also other types monitored by computer). The stages and the responses are set forth in Table 8.

Table 8

How All Agencies Monitor the Status of Cases at Different Stages in the Investigation Process

	Type of Monitoring					
Stages	Not Monitored		Monitored Manually		Monitored by Computer	
	n[1]	%[2]	n	%	n	%
Complaint	140	8	1,039	60	592	34
Case Referred to Investigations Unit	135	8	985	56	624	36
Investigator Reports/Efforts	62	4	1,091	63	628	36
Laboratory Analysis of Evidence	123	7	1,290	74	339	19
Referral to Prosecutor	114	7	1,264	72	390	22
Prosecutor Disposition	197	11	1,112	64	436	25
Court Disposition	225	13	1,029	59	503	29

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The majority (range 56% to 74%) of the agencies indicated they manually monitored the status of cases through all of the listed stages of an investigation. Between 19% and 36% of the agencies said they monitored the status of cases through the listed stages by computer, and between 8% and 13% said they did not monitor cases at any of the listed stages. Thus, most agencies monitor the status of cases through various investigation stages by manual means, rather than by computer; this is especially true in the laboratory analysis and referral to prosecutor stages.

Prosecutors

Prosecutors play an important, pivotal role in investigations. In this section, questions related to the nature and extent of the relationship between the police and the prosecutor were examined. Agency practices regarding prosecutor involvement in investigations, prosecutor investigative staffs, the nature of the police and prosecutor relationships, and problems with prosecutors, are described.

Prosecutor involvement.

The survey component of the Rand Report found that police-prosecutor relationships varied greatly between jurisdictions. In some areas prosecutors seemed to work closely with police in serious cases and in other areas they were rarely involved. The survey showed that prosecutors were always involved in investigations prior to arrest in about 25% of the agencies on homicide cases and about 20% on official misconduct cases, but only in about 7% on white-collar crimes and 4% on drug cases (Chaiken, 1975).

In the present study, agencies were asked about contact with their local prosecutor's office about an investigation, other than for the purpose of obtaining a warrant. They were provided a list of eight types of crime investigations and asked to indicate the extent to which they would consult the prosecutor prior to an arrest. They were also asked about the extent to which prosecutors would assist them subsequent to an arrest (see Footnote 6).

Table 9

Percent of All Agencies that Usually or Always Have Contact with Prosecutors Prior to and After Arrest for Specific Types of Crime

	Type of Contact	
Crime Type	Prior to Arrest	After an Arrest
	%[1]	%
Official Misconduct or Corruption	78	62
Homicide	75	68
Organized Crime	70	57
Multiple Jurisdiction Investigations	66	54
Major Drug Case	61	56
Serious Personal Crimes	51	45
White Collar Crime	46	42
Serious Property Crimes	36	37

[1]Percentages rounded to nearest whole percent.

As can be seen in Table 9, the rank order of the frequencies of prosecutor contact on the different crime types is relatively similar for both Prior to Arrest and After an Arrest. However, the percentages of agencies that consult with a prosecutor prior to arrest are higher than the percentages that are assisted by a prosecutor after an arrest for all but the lowest ranked crime (serious property crimes). Additionally, more than one-half of the agencies frequently consult with a prosecutor prior to arrest on six of the listed crimes, while more than one-half frequently are assisted by a prosecutor after an arrest on five of them.

In sum, the majority of agencies frequently have contact with their prosecutor on most serious crimes. Agencies are somewhat more likely to have contact with a prosecutor prior to arrest than after arrest.

In an attempt to compare the agency responses in the present study with the Rand Report findings, the percentage of agencies that indicated they always had contact with the prosecutor prior to an arrest were calculated for each of the four crime types covered in the Rand research. It was found that the levels of contact were at least twice as high in the present study as they were in the Rand Report for all four crime types (official misconduct or corruption – Rand 20%, present study 53%; homicide – Rand 25%, present study 51%; major drug case – Rand 4%, present study 26%; white collar crime – Rand 7%, present study 16%). While it is difficult to draw firm conclusions, these comparisons suggest an increase in the level of involvement with prosecutors when there is an investigation of certain serious cases.

Investigative staff.

In reviewing investigative staff assigned to prosecutors, the survey component of the Rand Report revealed that about three-fourths of the police agencies stated that their prosecutors actually had their own investigators and conducted some investigations independent of the police. In most of these instances, the investigators were not police officers; in 18% some of the investigators were police officers and in 5% all of them were (Chaiken, 1975).

Based on observations in a limited number of police agencies and a comparison of 40 robbery case from prosecutors' offices, the Rand Report concluded that "in relatively few (police) departments do investigators consistently and thoroughly document the key evidentiary facts that reasonably assure that the prosecutor can obtain a conviction on the most serious applicable charges." It also reported that "Police failure to document a case investigation thoroughly may have contributed to a higher case dismissal rate and a weakening of the prosecutor's plea bargaining position" (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975, pp. vii, ix). Although these findings were based on limited observations, subsequent research showed that "the vast majority of all felony cases dropped by the prosecutor are rejected because of insufficiency of evidence – the police fail to produce adequate physical evidence (such as stolen property or implements of the crime) or testimonial evidence from victims or eyewitnesses" (Forst, 1995, p. 366).

To deal with this problem, and possibly because many prosecutors already had their own investigative staff, the Rand Report proposed that agencies "place post-arrest (i.e., suspect

in custody) investigations under the authority of the prosecutor" (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975, p. xii). However, subsequent research that included an assessment of alternative efforts to improve police-prosecutor working relationships and their effectiveness produced mixed results. In some cases, productive relationships were difficult to implement and sustain due to organizational differences in education, goals, rewards and delays between arrest and prosecution (Regan, Nalley & White, 1979). In other situations, varying levels of success in improving relationships were reported (Blakey, Goldstock & Rogovin, 1978; Greenberg & Wasserman, 1979).

In the present study, 61% of all agencies reported that their local prosecutor's office had its own investigative staff. These respondents were then asked if any of the prosecutor's investigators were persons who were assigned from their agency. Surprisingly, 89% of them said No. Only 2% and 8% of the respondents indicated that all or some, respectively, of the prosecutors investigators were from their agency. One percent did not respond.

In sum, the majority (61%) of respondents said their local prosecutor's office had its own investigative staff. This was somewhat lower than what was shown in the Rand Report (75%). Additionally, fewer agencies (9% versus 23% in the Rand Report) now have at least some officers assigned to the prosecutor's staff. However, these differences may be due to the fact that the Rand study included only large agencies, and the present study included both large and small agencies. It is likely that some small agencies are served by smaller prosecutor offices, and that their organizational size limits the assignment of a separate investigative staff.

Relationship.

Seventy-six percent of all agencies reported having a regular and continuing organizational relationship with their prosecutor's office, aside from that required for warrants and arrests. These agencies were provided a list of five different types of relationships and were asked to identify which of them described theirs. Most of the agencies said that prosecutors were available on a regular basis for case coordination and advice (96%) or were assigned to provide legal support on major investigations (81%). Fifty-six percent said regular and periodic meetings were held with prosecutors, 36% said they had a police/prosecutor liaison office(r), and 27% said prosecutors were assigned as part of investigation teams. Three percent wrote in other responses. Thus, while most agencies reported having regular and continuing relationships with prosecutors, the nature and extent of these relationships varied.

Problems.

Agencies were asked to identify factors that had been problems in their relationships with prosecutors. A list of 11 factors were provided to them and they were asked to indicate the degree to which each had been a problem in their agency's relationship with their prosecutor's office.[7]

Table 10

Problems Identified by All Agencies Regarding Relationships with Prosecutors

Problems	n[1]	Agency Ratings % None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Insufficient Feedback from Prosecutor on Cases not Prosecuted	1698	20	35	30	15	45
Insufficient Notice of Prosecutor Needs	1697	21	45	26	8	34
Problems Regarding Court Scheduling	1698	25	42	23	10	33
Poor Communication between Investigators and Prosecutor	1698	23	49	20	8	28
Prosecutor Indifference to Investigations	1698	36	38	19	7	26
Insufficient Advice Regarding Legal Issues	1698	39	45	13	4	17
Prosecutor Non-responsiveness to Agency Requests for Support	1695	48	37	12	4	16
Requests to Conduct Unnecessary Investigative Leads	1688	50	36	10	4	14
Prosecutor Interference with Investigations	1692	62	31	6	2	8
Prosecutor Pressure on Agency Investigations	1694	62	33	5	1	6
Prosecutor Release of Investigative Information to the Media	1693	71	24	4	1	5

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As shown in the table, the police-prosecutor problem of greatest concern was Insufficient Feedback from the Prosecutor on Cases Not Prosecuted; however, it was identified as a moderate to large problem by fewer than one-half (45%) of the agencies. It is important to note that most agencies identified all of the listed items as either no problem or only a slight problem. In other words, most agencies did not identify any significant problems in their relationships with prosecutors.

In sum, the apparently increased levels of coordination with prosecutors on serious crimes and the continuing relationships that most agencies maintain with prosecutors have helped to minimize a number of problems in the police-prosecutor relationship, even though the number of agencies with investigators assigned to a prosecutor's investigative staff may

have declined. It remains unclear, however, whether these good relationships have served to improve prosecution rates or to reduce the number of cases dropped by prosecutors because of the "insufficiency of evidence" as was reported by Forst (1995, p. 366).

General Issues

In this sub-section, results pertaining to a number of investigation management issues are examined. They include current problems, innovations and plans for the future, agency policies regarding notification to victims, and agency perceptions of how the popular media represent investigations work.

Current problems.

As noted earlier in this report, some police tactics employed in the investigation process, especially in high-visibility cases, can lead to public criticism. However, little is known about how the police themselves view the process, or what they consider to be the major problems they experience regarding investigations. To address such issues, agencies were provided with a list of factors that can impact the investigative function. Seventeen of these were related to uniformed officers, 15 to investigators, and four each to productivity and the public. The agencies were asked to indicate the degree to which each factor was a problem (see Footnote 7).

All agencies were asked to respond to the 17 uniformed officer-related factors, and their responses are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11

Ratings by All Agencies Regarding the Impact of Uniformed Officer-related Factors on the Investigative Function

		Agency Ratings				
Factors	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Heavy Investigative Workload	1716	18	29	35	18	53
Heavy Overall Workload	1713	23	32	31	14	45
Heavy Administrative Workload	1718	24	40	29	7	36
Heavy Supervisor Workload	1708	36	34	23	7	30
Lack of Opportunity for Promotion	1710	34	36	21	9	30
Not Enough Overtime for Investigations	1713	43	29	18	10	28
Not Enough Training on Investigations	1714	27	45	21	7	28
Lack of Investigative Expertise	1712	28	46	21	6	27
Low Levels of Experience	1710	25	49	20	6	26
Poor Communication Between Officers and Investigators	1701	28	48	22	3	25
Lateness of Follow-up Investigation	1708	26	54	19	2	21
Low Job Satisfaction/Morale	1710	30	49	16	4	20
Poor Communication Between Officers	1709	28	53	17	2	19
Extensive Role in Investigations	1714	50	34	12	5	17
Poor Investigation Skills	1715	33	51	14	3	17
Lack of Accountability for Investigations	1715	46	39	12	3	15
Lack of Group Cohesion	1707	48	39	12	3	15

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As shown in the table, only one uniformed officer-related factor (Heavy Investigator Workload) was identified as a significant problem by more than one-half (53%) of the agencies. The second and third ranked factors (Heavy Overall Workload and Heavy Administrative Workload – selected by 45% and 36% of the agencies, respectively) also related to burdensome uniformed officer workloads. However, most agencies did not identify any of the remaining items as a significant problem.

In Table 12, the responses of agencies with investigators to the items regarding problems in carrying out their investigative responsibilities are set forth.

Table 12

Ratings by Agencies with Investigators Regarding the Effect of Investigator-related Factors on the Investigative Function

		Agency Ratings				
Factors	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Heavy Investigative Workload	1448	7	28	39	26	65
Heavy Investigator Supervisor Workload	1444	17	33	35	15	50
Heavy Administrative Workload	1448	22	45	25	7	32
Poor Communication Between Investigators and Uniformed Officers	1446	21	55	21	3	24
Not Enough Overtime for Investigations	1445	47	29	15	9	24
Lack of Opportunity for Promotion	1444	37	40	16	6	22
Lateness of Follow-up Investigation	1448	30	55	15	1	16
Not Enough Training on Investigations	1446	38	47	13	3	16
Lack of Accountability for Investigations	1445	50	41	8	2	10
Low Levels of Experience	1445	38	52	9	1	10
Lack of Investigative Expertise	1446	39	52	8	1	9
Low Job Satisfaction/Morale	1448	44	47	8	1	9
Lack of Group Cohesion	1449	53	40	6	1	7
Poor Communication Between Investigators	1445	48	45	6	1	7
Poor Investigation Skills	1446	49	47	4	1	5

[1]n=the number of 1,460 agencies with investigators that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As shown in Table 12, the top three investigator-related problems were similar to the those regarding uniformed officers; they were all related to heavy workloads (Heavy Investigative Workload – 65%; Heavy Investigator Supervisor Workload – 50%; Heavy Administrative Workload – 32%). Only the first two were identified by at least one-half of the agencies, and most agencies did not identify any of the remaining items as significant problems.

The ratings indicated by all agencies regarding four productivity-related factors and four public-related factors are set forth in Table 13.

Table 13

Ratings by All Agencies Regarding the Effects of Productivity- and Public-related Factors on the Investigative Function

		Agency Ratings				
Factors	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Productivity-related						
Low prosecution rates	1706	36	44	17	4	21
Low conviction rates	1706	42	44	11	3	14
Low clearance rates	1708	39	50	10	1	11
Low arrest rates	1704	45	48	7	1	8
Public-related						
Public mistrust of the police	1709	42	50	8	1	9
Poor relations with the media (newspapers, etc.)	1709	55	37	6	1	7
Unauthorized information leaks about Investigations	1706	58	36	5	2	7
Poor public relations	1709	50	44	5	1	6

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As is evident from the tabled data (Table 13), very few agencies considered the listed items to be significant problems with respect to their investigative function. The top-ranked productivity-related problem (Low prosecution rates) was identified by only 21% of the agencies, and the top-ranked public-related problem (Public mistrust of the police) was identified by only 9%.

In sum, of the 40 listed factors that could impact investigative functions, only three - heavy investigative workloads for uniformed officers (53%), for investigators (56%), and for investigator supervisors (50%) - were identified by at least half of the agencies as significant problems. Most of the agencies did not consider operations, management, administration, productivity and the public to be significant problems. Hence, from a police perspective, and aside from the personnel strength issue, most agencies do not view their investigative function as a particularly problematic part of their mission.

Innovations and plans.

In the survey component of the Rand research, 40% of the agencies reported having innovative investigative programs or policies with enough promise that other agencies should know of them. These are summarized below:

- Investigative Management: case screening; form letter to victims whose cases are screened out; computerized case management systems that track the current status of each case, the times at which progress reports or court appearances are scheduled, and the investigator(s) assigned; hand-held tape recorders; and call-in reports by telephone for transcription.

- Technical Resources: mobile evidence technician units; computerized fingerprint retrieval systems; talking rogue's galleries; and computerized MO files.

- Crime Prevention: community oriented projects (mark property, secret witness/anonymous tips, training bank employees, portable burglar alarms); and proactive activities.

In the present study, 266 (15%) of the respondents reported innovative investigation-related programs. These agencies described briefly each of these innovations within seven predetermined categories.

In all, the agencies identified almost 500 innovative programs. In some instances the information provided was ambiguous and, in others, respondents gave multiple responses without categorizing them. These were resorted where possible but in the event the information given was too vague to process, the item was not counted. The results, within each of the seven categories, were as follows:

- Organizational: 134 responses pertained to organizational restructuring issues, including the formation of new investigative units/teams (73 responses), task forces (21), other multi-agency and interagency units (15), decentralization (20) and centralization (5).

- Personnel: 27 responses related to training (8), number of sworn officers (6), assignments (6), and miscellaneous (7) personnel items.

- Investigator Roles: 21 responses related to investigators working more closely with uniformed officers (7) and to increasing uniformed officer investigative responsibilities and performance through training, rotation, accountability, etc. (14).

- Investigation Management: 152 responses pertained to operational and supervisory management programs (70), new programs and initiatives (58), and community policing (24).

- Records and Technology: 63 responses related to record management systems (20), computerized databases (18), computerized investigative techniques (8), and computer hardware and software (about 17).

- Evidence Management: 37 responses related to computerized inventory and tracking systems (about 27), personnel (5), policy (3), and facility improvements (2).

- Investigative Effectiveness: 61 responses that were similar to innovations that were included in one or more of the above six categories (i.e., organizational – 21; investigation management – 32; and miscellaneous – 8).

In all, only 15% of the agencies have implemented innovative changes in recent years; this is considerably less innovation than what was indicated in the Rand Report. The innovations revealed here appear quite diversified but most deal primarily with organizational and management issues.

In addition to innovations already made by agencies, it was of interest to determine what future plans the agencies had with regard to their investigative function. Twenty-four percent (N=423) of them identified major changes planned during the next three years. These are briefly described using the same seven categories used to identify innovative programs.

More than 800 future programs were identified and many agencies provided multiple responses without categorizing them. In those few cases where the nature or purpose of the plan was too ambiguous to be determined, it was excluded from the count. The results were as follows:

- Organizational: 106 responses pertained to reorganization (34), unit/team changes (32), decentralization (16), centralization (5), generalist investigators (4), and specialized investigators (15).

- Personnel: 184 responses related mostly to investigator personnel increases (137), also including changes in assignments and schedules (25), training (13), and pay and promotion issues (9).

- Investigator Roles: 38 responses related to uniformed officer responsibility and accountability (14), investigators working with uniformed officers (10), and uniformed officer rotation and training (14).

- Investigation Management: 201 responses related to operations and supervisory management programs (88), case management (46), new programs and initiatives (43), and community policing (24).

- Records and Technology: 111 responses related primarily to upgrades and improvements in computer hardware and software (66), and record management systems (45).

- Evidence Management: 113 responses related primarily to computerized inventory and tracking systems (63), equipment and facilities (34), personnel (11), and policies (5).

- Investigative Effectiveness: 60 responses pertained to plans that were included in one of more of the above six categories (i.e., organizational – 7; personnel – 23; investigation management – 26; and records and technology – 4).

Only 24% of the agencies indicated they had plans for major changes in the investigation function during the next one to three years. Of the more than 800 plans these agencies identified, almost one-half (385) were directed toward personnel and investigation management issues. Again, most of the plans dealt with internal changes and very few addressed the recommendation in the Rand Report regarding the need for greater citizen involvement in the investigation process.

Notification of victims.

The Rand telephone survey of crime victims, which consisted of interviews of 36 out of 72 burglary and robbery victims identified in one police jurisdiction, disclosed that "crime victims in general strongly desire to be notified officially as to whether or not the police have 'solved' their case, and what progress has been made toward convicting the suspect after his arrest" (Greenwood, Chaiken, Petersilia & Prusoff, 1975, p. 126).

In support of this, a subsequent assessment study of five police agencies reported that victims were satisfied when they had been notified of the outcomes of investigations (Regan, Nalley & White, 1979). A more recent study reported that, in 1982, the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime found that there was a serious imbalance between the rights of criminal defendants and the rights of crime victims; however, since then all 50 states and the federal government have enacted victims rights statutes to address this problem (Kilpatrick, Beatty and Howley, 1998). As part of that study, more than 1,300 crime victims were surveyed regarding the extent to which they considered their rights under these statutes to be important. They were asked to rate the importance of their right to be informed of, and/or involved in, 12 decision points during the investigation, prosecution, court, sentencing and parole processes. At least three-fourths of the victims rated their rights as "very important" regarding all 12 decision points.

Although the research has supported greater police interaction with victims, little is known about what police are doing in this regard. In the present study, agencies were asked to

indicate the degree to which victims were kept apprised of investigations. They were provided a list of five stages in the investigation process and asked to indicate the extent to which they notified victims of each stage (see Footnote 5).

A total of 85% of all agencies frequently notified victims after an arrest of a suspect, and 83% notified victims if their case was cleared. Sixty-four percent notified victims of case prosecution status, 58% if a case was no longer actively investigated, and 57% told victims of court dispositions. Four percent wrote in other responses.

In sum, agencies generally appear to take actions in investigations that involve victim notification. This is particularly true when a suspect is arrested and when a case has been cleared.

Popular media.

The popular media portrays a variety of images of the police and investigators. Such images are likely to shape and impact public perceptions of the investigation process. To the extent that the media images misrepresent or distort that process, they contribute to unrealistic perceptions among the public regarding what police investigators actually do. In its review of common stereotypes of detectives, the Rand Report described the media portrayal as follows:

> The media image of the working detective, particularly pervasive in widely viewed television series, is that of a clever, imaginative, perseverant, streetwise cop who consorts with glamorous women and duels with crafty criminals. He and his partners roam the entire city for days or weeks trying to break a single case, which is ultimately solved by means of the investigator's deductive powers. This image is the one that some investigators prefer – perhaps with a degree of sanitizing. They would concede that criminals are rarely as crafty or diabolical as depicted in the media, but may not quarrel with the media characterization of their own capabilities.
>
> Some current investigative practices appear mainly as a means to preserve a media-like image or to give a victim the kind of services he expects largely because of that image. That is, fingerprint dusting, mug shot showing, or questioning witnesses are often done without any hope of developing leads, but simply for public relations (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977, p. 9).

To learn more about the police perspective of this subject, agencies were asked if they thought investigations work in general was misrepresented in the popular media (television, movies, etc.). A total of 1,278 (73%) of all agencies said Yes.

These agencies were then provided a list of 11 items (pertaining to investigative issues) and asked to indicate the degree to which each was misrepresented in the media (see Footnote 5). The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14
Ratings by Agencies that Indicated Investigations Work is Misrepresented in the Popular Media Regarding the Extent to Which Specific Factors are Misrepresented

		Agency Ratings				
Factors	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Use of Excessive Force	1264	2	4	22	72	**94**
Interrogations	1267	1	10	38	51	**89**
Relationships with Suspects	1267	2	17	43	38	**81**
Investigator Discretion	1267	2	18	45	35	**80**
Use of Informants	1252	3	18	38	42	**80**
Relationships with the Public	1264	2	27	42	29	**71**
Investigator Physical Ability	1265	6	28	38	28	**66**
Relationships with Supervisors	1267	6	29	39	26	**65**
Investigator Intellectual Ability	1267	4	31	42	22	**64**
Relationships with Victims and/or Witnesses	1266	3	35	41	22	**63**
Relationships with Uniformed Officers	1265	5	36	38	21	**59**

[1]n=the number of agencies that responded to each item amongst the 1,278 that said Yes.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The data displayed in Table 14 shows that the majority of agencies find considerable misrepresentation of investigative functions in the media. The two functions at the top of the list, Use of Excessive Force and Interrogations, selected by 94% and 89% of the agencies, respectively, are, of course, suggestions of physical violence and intimidation on the part of the police. Misrepresentation of such activities, to the extent to which it provides a guiding image to the public, is likely to influence the police-public relationship--a very critical concern in police investigations--and probably not in a positive direction. It can also be seen in the tabled data that the police find considerable misrepresentation of other aspects of investigative work. Although it seems likely that their views are related to how they carry out their daily activities and how they engage in efforts to counteract perceived negative public perceptions, we were unable to explore such issues here.

Summary

Agencies generally use similar methods for selecting both investigators and investigator supervisors. Most agencies also have policies and procedures that allow investigative supervisors to directly influence the investigation process and what investigators do.

Supervisors monitor the status of investigations through regular personal contact with investigators, reviews of investigator activity logs, and reviews of investigation reports. Additionally, they make decisions regarding what cases to investigate and to whom cases are assigned. About half of the agencies use case solvability factors to screen cases, and most of these agencies use them to screen all types of cases, even though the available research has developed rigorous criteria for only two case types. In most agencies, investigation reports are prepared and filed on computers, but the majority of agencies monitor case management activities manually.

Although most agencies do not have anyone in their agency assigned to a prosecutor's staff, they do have regular meetings and ongoing relationships with their prosecutors and do not identify any significant problems here.

From a list of 40 items that may affect investigative functions, only three are identified as significant problems. These are heavy investigative workloads for uniformed officers, and heavy investigative workloads both for investigators and for their supervisors. Other factors relating to personnel, operations, management, administration, productivity, and the public, are not seen as significant problems by most agencies.

Although most agencies do not have innovative investigative programs underway, among the 15% that do, many cited programs focused on investigation management. Moreover, only a small group (24%) of the agencies plan major changes in their investigative function in the near future. These are primarily planned changes in personnel matters (e.g., personnel increases, apparently to address the heavy investigative workload problem) and investigation management.

In line with a Rand Report recommendation and with subsequent widespread legislation mandating improvement in police dealings with crime victims, agencies report that they now do keep victims apprised of investigative progress. This is especially true with respect to notification of the police disposition of an investigation.

There is broad agreement amongst the respondents that a variety of investigative functions are misrepresented in the popular media. The two items on which there is the greatest agreement are the use of excessive force and interrogation.

(5) Investigative Support

Investigative support services provided during the investigation process are explored in this portion of the report. Specifically, questions regarding investigative support personnel, crime laboratory services, and support files, equipment and plans are examined. In each sub-section, a brief review of the pertinent past research is presented, and then the findings in the present study are described. This section concludes with a summary of the findings.

Personnel

In this sub-section, questions regarding the number of civilian investigative support personnel that agencies employ are addressed. Additionally, agency practices regarding the employment of evidence technicians are described, along with specialized experience and/or training requirements for evidence technicians.

Civilians.

The survey component of the Rand Report found that less than one-half of the agencies had civilians (excluding evidence technicians) assigned to the investigative function. Those agencies generally had fewer than ten such employees and they tended to be criminalists, attorneys or physicians (Chaiken, 1975).

In their book on rural and small-town policing, Weisheit, Falcone and Wells (1999) cited a study (Crank, 1989) indicating that rural agencies are "civilianizing at nearly twice the rate of large urban departments" (p. 107). They also reported that UCR data showed that while civilians comprised a little more than 20% of the employees in large urban agencies, they constituted over 30% in rural agencies. While their study indicates that civilians account for a significant proportion of agency personnel, particularly in rural areas, it did not address the proportions of civilians employed in investigative functions.

In the present study, it was determined that 1,526 (87%) of all agencies employed civilians (full-time non-sworn personnel). The total number of civilians employed by these agencies was 137,512, and the number employed per agency ranged from 1 to 7,163 (mean = 90, median = 19). This is an average of 28% of the personnel of the 1,526 agencies.

These agencies were specifically asked if they had civilians assigned to investigative support tasks (e.g., evidence collection, crime analysis/intelligence, polygraph, etc.) and 490 (32%) of the 1,526 agencies said Yes. When asked how many, 458 (30%) of them provided responses that ranged between 1 and 933, with a mean of 10 civilians per agency. This is 3% of the personnel strength of the respondents. The particular job specialties of the civilian investigative support personnel were not identified in the present study.

In sum, in the present study most (87%) agencies employ full-time civilian personnel. They comprise an average of 28% of the personnel of those agencies. This is comparable to the data reported by Weisheit, Falcone and Wells (1999). However, in the present study only a few (32%) agencies with civilians assign them to investigative support duties. This indicates that there has been minimal change over the past 25 years as the Rand Report found that less than one-half of the agencies employed civilian investigative support personnel, excluding evidence technicians. Finally, in the present study, the number of civilian investigative support employees represented an average of only 3% of agency personnel.

Evidence technicians.

Eck (1983), in a study of burglary and robbery investigations in three police agencies, found that physical evidence is collected in only about 10% of the cases, and that the patrol officer who initially responds to the crime scene is the one who collects most of the physical evidence. The Rand Report cited several earlier studies that recorded similar findings (President's Commission, 1966; Institute for Defense Analysis, 1967). However, it also found that 87% of the agencies indicated that they had evidence technicians who could be dispatched to crime scenes. Nevertheless, even though evidence was collected in only a small proportion of cases, an analysis of physical evidence collection and processing activities at six agencies disclosed that "most police departments collect more evidence than can be productively processed" (Chaiken, 1975; Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977; Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). This was apparently due primarily to factors relating to the lack of an identified suspect for evidence comparison purposes, the inability of the evidence to identify positively an unknown suspect, crime laboratory issues, etc.

A later study that included a survey of cases within four police jurisdictions revealed that evidence technicians submitted the most evidence to laboratories, compared to patrol officers or investigators, and that case clearance and conviction rates for burglary and robbery cases were significantly higher when physical evidence was collected and examined (Peterson, Mihajlovic & Gilliland, 1984). A follow-on study also found that forensic evidence had an effect on the sentencing process, particularly with regard to increasing both the likelihood and length of incarceration (Peterson, Ryan, Houlden & Mihajlovic, 1987).

In an attempt to provide a perspective of the role of physical evidence in the investigation process, Horvath and Meesig (1996) conducted a review of the major empirical studies on that process. They found that the "research on the investigation process shows clearly that physical evidence is not collected in most cases investigated by the police; when it is collected, much of it is not scientifically analyzed; and when it is analyzed, it is used not to promote investigative efficiency, but rather to bolster prosecutorial proceedings" (p. 965). However, the research on which that statement was based was conducted in the 1970s and 1980s.

Earlier in the present study, the roles of patrol officers and investigators in evidence collection and processing were addressed. It was found that between 40% and 47% of the agencies indicated that their patrol officers were usually or always involved in evidence handling tasks (see the Patrol Officers section), and that 69% of the agencies indicated their investigators usually or always processed crime scenes for physical evidence (see the Investigators section).

Agencies in the present study were asked if they employed any evidence technicians (persons specifically designated to collect evidence at crime scenes), and 781 (45%) of all agencies said Yes. These agencies were then asked to indicate how many evidence technicians were sworn officers and civilians, and how many of each were authorized full-time, part-time, or as an additional duty. Their responses were as follows:

- 60% employed sworn officers as evidence technicians; the mean number of full-time sworn officers serving in this capacity was 7, ranging between 1 and 400.

- 4% employed sworn officers as part time evidence technicians; the mean was 4 and the range was between 1 and 14.

- 22% employed sworn officers who did evidence collection as an additional duty; the mean number of such sworn officers per agency was 6, ranging from 1 to 65.

- 38% employed full-time civilians as evidence technicians. The mean was 5 and the range was from 1 to 40.

- 4% employed civilians as part-time evidence technicians. The mean was 2 per agency with a range from 1 to 10.

- 4% employed civilians who were assigned evidence collection as an additional duty. The mean number of such persons employed was 3, ranging between 1 and 12.

In sum, whereas the Rand Report found that most (87%) large agencies employed evidence technicians, only 45% (N = 781) of the agencies of all sizes in the present study indicated they did so. Sixty percent of these agencies employed full-time sworn officers as evidence technicians, and 38% employed full-time civilians. In only a few agencies were evidence technicians assigned on a part-time basis or as an additional duty. Overall, it appears that the number of agencies that employ evidence technicians has not changed dramatically over the past two decades, and may have even decreased somewhat, despite the apparent advances in technology and in evidence collection and analysis. Further, in most agencies evidence-related duties are not assigned predominantly to any one type of individual or position. Rather, they are more likely to be shared among patrol officers (perform evidence-related duties in 40% to 47% of agencies), investigators (perform evidence-related duties in 69% of agencies), and evidence technicians (perform evidence-related duties in 45% of agencies).

Evidence technician training.

Little information is available regarding police agency job qualifications for evidence technicians. Therefore, in the present study, agencies were asked if their evidence technicians were required to have any specialized experience or training, and 679 (87%) of the 781 agencies that employed evidence technicians said Yes. These agencies were provided a list of six types of experience/training and asked to indicate whether or not each one was required.

A total of 88% of the 679 agencies require specialized training outside of their agency, and 88% require specialized in-house training. Sixty-one percent require sworn officer

experience, and 42% require investigative experience. Only 20% require some college education, and 8% require a college degree. Four percent of the agencies wrote in other responses.

In sum, most agencies require their evidence technicians to have specialized training either outside or within their agency, and 61% require sworn officer experience. Less than one-half require investigative experience or college coursework.

Crime Laboratory Services

In this sub-section, questions addressing police perspectives of how crime laboratory services affect investigations are explored. Agencies were asked about the kind of laboratory facility they use, the services provided and several questions related to DNA analysis and AFIS.

Crime laboratory services support.

Agencies with investigators were asked what type of laboratory they generally used for routine crime laboratory services. They were provided a list of four choices and could select one or more. As our interest was in describing crime laboratory services available to investigators, we counted only the answers of the agencies with investigators. Their responses were as follows:

- 80% stated that they used a crime laboratory that is part of another state/federal police agency.
- 30% indicated they used a crime laboratory that is part of another local/county police agency.
- 26% used their agency's own crime laboratory.
- 23% used a state laboratory not part of a police organization.

Agencies with investigators were then asked how their investigative staff would describe access to routine laboratory services, and they were provided a list of four choices. They responded as follows:

- 50% said access was readily available in all cases.
- 28% said it was available but difficult to get timely access.
- 16% said it was readily available but only in serious cases.
- 5% said access was limited, hindering some investigations.

- 1% did not respond to the question.

Finally, agencies with investigators were asked how they would describe the average turn-around time for routine use of crime laboratory services, other than for drug/alcohol cases, and they were provided four choices. They responded as follows:

- 23% said turn-around was timely.
- 48% said it was somewhat slow.
- 25% said it was very slow.
- 4% said it was completely inadequate.
- 1% did not respond to the question.

In sum, most (80%) agencies used a crime laboratory that is part of another state/federal police agency for routine crime analysis services. Therefore, problems regarding access and turn-around time are most closely associated with state/federal laboratories. Only one-half of the agencies report ready access to routine laboratory services and more than 75% of the agencies report that laboratory turn-around time is something other than timely. Whether and how these perceptions are related to the use (or disuse) of laboratory services are not explored here.

DNA analysis.

In 1994, the federal Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act established a national DNA database program known as the FBI Combined DNA Index System (CODIS), and required all 50 states to collect various categories of DNA samples, primarily from convicted offenders. A survey of the publicly operated crime laboratories in the U.S. disclosed that in 1997 they had received about 21,000 known or unknown subject cases for DNA analysis, an increase of 6,000 cases over the previous year. It was also determined that these laboratories had DNA backlogs of 6,800 cases and 287,000 convicted offender samples (Steadman, 2000). Further, a recent news article reported an FBI estimate that "more than 530 offenders have been linked to crime scenes with the use of DNA technology since states set up their own genetic systems in the early 1990s" (Briggs & Goldberg, 2000).

Our questionnaire included a question asking for the number of cases which, as a result of DNA analysis, were cleared but probably would not have been cleared otherwise. Amongst all agencies, 1406 (missing cases=340) answered this item. Of those, 812 (47% of all respondents) said they had no cases (that is, their response was a "0") of this type. A total of 594 (34%) said they had at least one such case; the number of "cleared" cases reported, excluding the "0" values, ranged from 1 to 1,000 with a mean of 24 and a median of 4. The sum of all such cleared cases was 14,098. Amongst the agencies that employed investigators (n=1,460), 1,176 responded to this item. Six hundred and eight reported not having any

"cleared" cases as a result of DNA analysis. In the 568 agencies that had experienced such clearances, the range was between 1 and 1,000, with a mean of 25, a median of 4, and a total of 14,004 cleared cases.

Agencies were asked if they currently had any unsolved cases that were backlogged because there was no DNA analysis readily available; 163 (9%) of all agencies said Yes. These agencies were then asked to identify why DNA analysis was not available. Of the agencies that answered Yes to the initial item, only 130 responded to one or both of the follow-on contingency questions. One of these asked if the backlog was due to a lack of personnel qualified to carry out DNA analysis; 88 of the 130 respondents (68%) chose this option. The other contingency question asked if the backlog was due to a lack of funding; 85 (65%) responded affirmatively to this item. Fifty-six respondents also made additional written comments indicating that their backlog in DNA analysis was also due to heavy caseloads at laboratories, time constraints, the non-availability of DNA analysis at some crime laboratories, and police agency evidence collection and processing issues.

When asked how many cases were awaiting DNA analysis, 8 of the 163 agencies that reported having backlogged cases indicated "0" and 30 did not provide further data. Analysis of the responses of the remaining 125 agencies showed that the number of cases awaiting DNA analysis ranged from 1 to 16,000; the mean was 175, the median 4 and the sum was 21,897.

Among the 163 agencies that had unsolved cases awaiting DNA analysis, 65 of them also indicated how much funding was needed to carry out analysis in all of these cases. Their responses ranged between "0" (zero) dollars (15 agencies) and $4,000,000. Among the 50 agencies that listed dollar amounts greater than "0," the mean amount was $218,173 (median = $20,000) and the total funding necessary was $10,908,660. Similarly, the funding necessary to carry out analysis in only those cases judged to be in critical need of DNA findings was indicated by 61 agencies. These responses ranged between "0" dollars (16 agencies) and $1,000,000. Among the 45 agencies that listed dollar amounts greater than "0," the mean amount was $82,570 (median = $15,000) and the total funding necessary was $3,715,655.

In sum, about one-third of the respondents reported, on average, 24 cases per agency that had been cleared as a result of DNA analysis that probably would not have been cleared otherwise. Only a few (9%) agencies indicated they had unsolved cases that were backlogged because of the unavailability of DNA analysis; when this was a problem it was due, almost equally, to both the lack of qualified personnel and funding. The total number of cases awaiting DNA analysis was estimated to be 21,897. Additionally, the amount of funding needed to conduct DNA analysis for all of these cases was estimated to be about $10.9 million, and the amount of funding needed for cases in critical need of such analysis was estimated to be about $3.7 million. Thus, while only a small number of agencies report backlogs for DNA analysis, the number of cases affected and the costs involved for the analysis are relatively significant.

AFIS.

The Rand Report, in an analysis of the physical evidence collection and processing activities at six agencies, disclosed that most of them "collect more physical evidence than can be productively processed," and that, while "latent fingerprints rarely provide the only basis for identifying a suspect," cold searches of latent fingerprints are "far more effective in increasing the apprehension rate than are routine follow-up investigations" (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975, p. viii). As a result, it was recommended that agency evidence processing capabilities, specifically fingerprint processing, be strengthened, and that the use of information processing systems to scan and monitor crime information be increased.

In the 1997 LEMAS survey, it was reported that a majority of the state and local large agencies (including four-fifths of county police and nearly three-fourths of sheriffs' agencies) either owned or had access to AFIS, a computerized fingerprint identification and matching system (BJS, 1999).

In the present study, agencies were asked who provided AFIS service to them, and they were provided three choices:

- 74% of all agencies said they obtained service from a state administered AFIS.
- 19% said they had their own AFIS.
- 16% said they obtained service from a federally administered AFIS.
- 10% wrote in other responses.

The total percentages exceed 100%, as some agencies apparently were able to obtain AFIS service from more than one provider.

In line with the Rand recommendation to enhance fingerprint-processing capabilities, AFIS services have become available to most agencies from the state (74%), local (19%) and/or federal (16%) levels. If the Rand Report findings, this should show a positive effect on both clearance rates and follow-up investigative activities. This was not explored in the present study.

Support Files, Equipment and Plans

In this sub-section, the types of criminal records and investigative support files maintained by agencies are reported. Additionally, the types of personal communication devices available to officers and investigators are described, and agency plans to improve investigative support resources are examined.

Criminal records.

The survey component of the Rand Report found that over one-half (56%) of the agencies maintained computer files on crime and arrest reports and monthly FBI statistics, and that 26% had computerized court disposition records (Chaiken, 1975). As previously mentioned, the study recommended an increase in the use of information processing systems to scan and monitor crime information.

At least three subsequent studies in the 1970s and 1980s showed that police data processing, analysis and management systems were generally inadequate with regard to accessibility, compatibility, and practical utility (Eck, 1983; Police Executive Research Forum, 1981; Skogan & Antunes, 1979). These studies supported the Rand recommendation for improvement

A more recent study examined two surveys (1976 and 1988) of a purposive sample of 44 cities with populations exceeding 50,000 regarding computerization in local governments; it showed that there had been significant increases in computer usage among police agencies during that period (Northrop, Kraemer & King, 1995). An estimated 80% of case investigations were reported to have used computer systems to some degree, and information from computer systems was reported to be essential in resolving at least one-half of the cleared cases.

In the 1997 LEMAS survey, it was reported that between 86% and 90% of the large agencies still used paper reports to transmit field reports to their central information systems. However, between 71% and 94% maintained computerized files on arrests, calls for service, criminal histories, incident reports, evidence and warrants (BJS, 1999).

In the present study, agencies were provided a list of six types of records and asked to indicate their availability status in their agency. The record types and responses of agencies with investigators are set forth in Table 15.

Table 15

Number and Percent of Different Types of Criminal Records Available to Investigators in Agencies with Investigators

Records	Availability					
	Not Readily Available		Available Manually		Available On Computer	
	n[1]	%[2]	n	%	n	%
Crime reports	31	2	732	50	1014	70
Arrest reports	12	1	710	49	1056	72
Case dispositions	101	7	608	42	975	67
Prosecution dispositions	261	18	661	45	650	45
Court dispositions	264	18	604	41	708	49
Summary crime statistics	198	14	532	36	854	59

[1]n=the number of 1,460 agencies with investigators that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent. The total percentages exceed 100% as it was possible for the availability of some records in each type to vary within an agency (i.e., records were available both manually and on computer in some agencies).

As illustrated in the table, between 45% and 72% (mean = 60%) of the agencies indicated that the six types of records listed were available on computer in their agencies. Between 36% and 50% (mean = 44%) indicated they were available manually, and between 1% and 18% (mean = 10%) of the agencies indicated they were not readily available.

In sum, the majority of agencies (mean = 60%) indicated the listed criminal records were available on computer, and only a few (mean = 10%) indicated they were not readily available. The 1997 LEMAS study indicated that higher proportions (between 71% and 94%) of large agencies were computerized for similar types of records than either the Rand Report, which included only large agencies, or the present study, which included both large and small agencies. Questions regarding improvements in the technological capabilities of computers currently used by agencies or their effect on case resolution rates were not addressed in the present study. However, because of advances in the development and sophistication of information processing systems over the past two decades, it is likely that agencies are for the most part using much more powerful systems than in the past.

Investigative support files.

The Rand Report showed that only a few agencies had computerized investigative support files; these included hot (stolen) cars (40%), known offenders (15%), modus operandi (13%), sex offenders (10%), organized crime intelligence (10%), fingerprints (4%), and mug shots (4%) (Chaiken, 1975). The 1977 LEMAS survey reported that some large agencies used

digital imaging for fingerprints (44%), mug shots (51%) and suspect composites (34%) (BJS, 1999).

In the present study, agencies were asked what types of investigative support files were available to investigators. They were provided a list of nine types of files and asked to indicate whether they were Not Readily Available, Available Manually, or Available on Computer in their agency. The agency responses are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

Number and Percent of Different Types of Investigative Support Files to Investigators in Agencies with Investigators

Files	Availability					
	Not Readily Available		Available Manually		Available On Computer	
	n[1]	%[2]	n	%	n	%
Stolen Vehicles	42	3	481	33	1144	78
Stolen Property	85	6	520	36	1060	73
Sex Offender	89	6	709	49	875	60
Known Offender	202	14	605	41	810	56
Mug Shots	75	5	812	56	752	52
Narcotics Intelligence	253	17	748	51	576	40
Modus Operandi	635	44	403	28	453	31
Organized Crime Intelligence	636	44	482	33	399	27
Fingerprints	227	16	1000	69	345	24

[1]n=the number of 1,460 agencies with investigators that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent. The total percentages exceed 100% as it was possible for the availability of some files in each type to vary within an agency (i.e., files were available both manually and on computer in some agencies).

As shown in the table, between 24% and 78% (mean = 49%) of the respondents indicated that the nine types of files listed were available on computer in their agencies. Between 28% and 69% (mean 44%) agencies indicated they were available manually, and between 3% and 44% (mean = 17%) agencies indicated they were not readily available.

In sum, only about one-half of the agencies indicated the listed investigative support files were available on computer. However, this appears to be a large increase over the Rand Report findings for large agencies and roughly similar to the LEMAS large agency findings for similar files. Thus, according to the present study, the proportions of some computerized

investigative support files in large agencies appear to have increased considerably over the past two decades in almost one-half of the agencies. With respect to the availability of files, regardless of whether they are available manually or on computer, the two that are most frequently available of the nine types are Stolen Vehicles (78%) and Stolen Property (73%), and the two that are least frequently available are Modus Operandi (44%) and Organized Crime Intelligence (44%) files.

Personal communication devices.

In an effort to learn more about the availability of different types of communications technology among officers, agencies were asked if their uniformed officers and investigators had daily access to five different types of personal communication devices. Their responses are set forth in Table 17. In order to compare responses pertaining to patrol officers to those relevant to investigators, only the respondents who employed investigators were included in the table.

Table 17

Number and Percent of Agencies with Investigators Whose Uniformed Officers and Investigators Have Daily Access to Five Types of Personal Communication Devices

	Officer Type			
Personal Communication Devices	Uniformed Officer Access		Investigator Access	
	n[1]	%[2]	n	%
Pagers	665	46	1380	95
Cell Telephones	698	48	1293	89
Internet	484	33	1077	74
E-mail	638	44	1058	73
Voice Mail	591	41	1056	72

[1]n=the number of 1,460 agencies with investigators that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Between 33% and 48% of the agencies indicated that uniformed officers had daily access to the five listed types of personal communication devices. However, between 72% and 95% indicated that their investigators had daily access to them. The highest percentage of agencies providing access to a device for uniformed officers (cell telephone – 48%) was lower than the lowest percentage of agencies providing access to a device for investigators (voice mail – 72%). This is likely attributable to the different roles and duties of uniformed officers and investigators in the investigation process and the possible access of patrol officers to other types of communication devices (ex.: vehicle and hand radios, computers in vehicles, etc.). Nevertheless, research has repeatedly pointed out that uniformed officers play a key role in the investigation process (conducting critical preliminary investigations, expanding investigative

roles, clearing as much as 80% of the cases, etc.). This at least raises the question of whether, or how, their less ready access to personal communication devices influences the effectiveness of their investigative efforts.

Planned improvements.

In an effort to learn more about agency intentions regarding the enhancement of investigation-related technology, agencies were provided with a list of five types of resources related to investigations and were asked if they had any plans to upgrade or enhance any of them within the next year.

At least one-half of all agencies indicated they planned upgrades or enhancements regarding all five types of resources, as follows:

- Computers in vehicles – 58%.
- Crime analysis capabilities – 54%.
- Investigative support files – 52%.
- Personal communication devices – 51%.
- Crime report and case disposition files – 51%.

One percent wrote in other responses.

These planned upgrades or enhancements combined with the small but perceptible increase in computerization of criminal records and the large increase in investigative support files, suggest a continuing trend toward technological dependence in investigations. We note, however, that reports of such enhancements are limited to about one half of the respondents; moreover, the effect of these changes on investigative activities is not well documented.

Summary

Some (32%) agencies have civilians assigned to investigative support tasks. This is similar to the 25 year-old Rand Report findings for large agencies. However, while the Rand Report found that most (87%) large agencies employed evidence technicians, the present study, which included both large and small agencies, found that only 45% do so. Even though the inclusion of small agencies likely affected that percentage, it appears that the number of agencies employing evidence technicians has not been greatly affected by recent technological advances in the forensic area. About 60% of the agencies with evidence technicians employ them full-time, and they tend to be sworn officers more than civilians. Most agencies require evidence technicians to have specialized training.

Most agencies with investigators use state/federal police crime laboratories, but about one-half indicate problems with access to laboratories and about three-fourths indicate problems with timeliness of service. Although one-third of the agencies said they had cases in which DNA played a critical role, only 9% report backlog problems for such analysis. However, the backlog involves more 21,897 cases and analysis costs are estimated at about $10.9 million. While funding appears to be an important factor related to the backlog, the lack of qualified laboratory personnel is also a factor. Limitations in laboratory resources and backlogs nationwide indicate that it may be several years before DNA analysis services become routinely available to agencies for most investigations.

Most (74%) agencies receive their AFIS services from state level agencies. About one-half of the agencies with investigators indicate that a number of different types of crime records and investigative support files are available to investigators on computers. The proportion of agencies with access to computerized crime records is similar to the Rand Report but the proportion with access to investigative support files is considerably higher. Investigators are much more likely to have daily access to various types of modern personal communication devices (pagers, cell phones, e-mail, etc.) than uniformed officers, even though uniformed officers play a key role in the investigation process. At least one-half of all respondents plan upgrades and/or enhancements of investigative technology resources within the next year.

(6) Investigative Effectiveness

In this issue area, matters relating to the effectiveness of the investigation process are explored. Specifically, the general questions regarding the goals of the process, agency views of investigative effectiveness, and the types of investigation-related research of interest to them, are examined. In each sub-section, a brief review of the pertinent past research is presented, and then the findings of the present study are described. This section concludes with a summary of the findings.

Goals

In this sub-section, questions regarding the goals of the investigation process are addressed. Police agency perspectives of the crime-related and other goals of the criminal investigation function are described.

Organizational goals can have profound effects on the direction and performance of organizations. However, a review of the literature suggests that there is no general consensus regarding the goals of the police investigation process. Rather, different perspectives of goals and objectives of investigations are often cited; they tend to be vaguely worded, ambiguous in meaning, and possibly even conflicting with each other. Some examples are described below.

In 1973, the American Bar Association advanced eleven police organizational objectives. The first one was to identify criminal offenders and activities, to apprehend offenders, and to participate in subsequent court hearings (American Bar Association, 1973). However, during the same time period, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice

Standards and Goals, whose job it was to formulate for the first time national criminal justice standards and goals for crime reduction and prevention at the state and local levels, only developed standards for the internal investigation of complaints against the police and did not address the larger police criminal investigation function (1973). Then, in a 1976 participant-observer study conducted in the Crimes Against Persons branch of a police agency detective unit, Pogrebin (1976) described the major responsibilities traditionally assigned to a criminal investigations unit as identifying and locating offenders; locating witnesses; arresting suspects; collecting and preserving physical evidence; and recovering and returning stolen property.

The Rand Report offered its own view of the police investigation function by describing objectives as follows (Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977, p. 29):

- Deterring and preventing crime.
- Uncovering the occurrence of crime.
- Recovering stolen property.
- Supporting the prosecution of arrested offenders.
- Maintaining public confidence in the police.

More recently, Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) provided a description of the major goal of the investigative function based on reviews of prior studies (Cawley, Miron, & Araujo, 1977; Forst, 1982; Waegel, 1982; and Wycoff, 1982). They stated that the major goal is "to increase the number of arrests for crimes that are prosecutable and that will result in a conviction," and that "as a by-product of this goal, investigators recover stolen property and produce information that may be useful in other crimes, often through the development and manipulation of informants" (p. 293). From a broader perspective, Geller (1991) described the goals of the criminal investigation function as controlling crime, pursuing justice, and addressing problems.

These examples illustrate how the goals of the investigation process are often described. While many of these views may be representative of police perspectives of the process, in the present study police agencies were asked directly what they think the major goals are. They were provided a list of ten crime-related investigative goals and nine general goals associated with the investigation process. They were asked to indicate how important they considered each goal to be with regard to their investigation process (see Footnote 7). The results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Ratings by All Agencies Regarding Goals Associated with the Criminal Investigation Function

Goals	n[1]	Agency Ratings % None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Crime-related						
Investigate all serious crimes	1713	1	1	10	88	98
Prosecute suspects	1714	1	4	31	65	96
Clear cases	1712	---	5	32	63	95
Convict suspects	1712	1	4	29	66	95
Protect victims and witnesses	1712	1	5	20	75	95
Reduce crime	1712	1	8	25	67	92
Solve problems	1681	1	10	35	54	89
Collect intelligence about other crimes	1714	1	13	50	37	87
Prevent crime	1713	2	14	35	49	84
Investigate all crimes	1712	3	16	41	40	81
General						
Protect the public	1712	1	2	15	82	97
Citizen satisfaction	1715	---	3	30	66	96
Maintain community support	1712	1	5	28	67	95
Recover/return property	1709	1	5	39	56	95
Secure justice in the community	1694	1	5	26	68	94
Provide support/feedback to victims	1708	1	8	39	53	92
Inform the community	1714	1	11	48	40	88
Prevent crime	1709	2	12	30	57	87
Plan/implement crime prevention strategies	1712	3	20	41	37	78

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item. [2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

It can be seen in the table that most agencies consider all of the goals to be relatively important. Each of the ten crime-related goals were identified as important by at least 81% of the respondents, and the nine general goals were identified as important by at least 78% of the respondents. Generally, crime prevention activities were of lesser concern than other listed goals.

Eleven of the 19 goals were identified by at least 90% of the agencies as important. These related to direct investigative issues (Investigate all serious crimes, Prosecute suspects, Clear cases, and Convict suspects), the public (Protect victims and witnesses, Protect the public, Citizen satisfaction, Maintain community support, Secure justice in the community, and Provide support/feedback to victims) and the recovery/return of property. The remaining eight goals, those that were seen to be of somewhat lesser importance, related to providing support/feedback to victims, informing the community, problem solving, collecting intelligence, preventing crime, investigating all crimes, and planning/implementing crime prevention strategies.

In sum, most police agencies consider goals associated with the criminal investigation function to be relatively equal in importance. From the police perspective, the primary goal of most agencies is to investigate all "serious" crimes rather than all crimes. Although the police are also primarily interested in direct investigative issues, protecting the public, and the recovery/return of property, overall they are slightly less concerned about solving problems, informing victims and the community, collecting intelligence, crime prevention/reduction, and investigating all crimes.

Agency Views Regarding Clearance Rates

In this sub-section, issues regarding agency UCR data, the declines and improvements in clearance rates, and funding needs to improve investigative effectiveness are addressed. Additionally, agency views with respect to the use of clearance rates as evaluation criteria and the extent to which legal problems have affected investigations are presented.

Using 1972 UCR data to analyze the investigative effectiveness of the agencies in its sample, the Rand Report found that UCR arrest and clearance rates depended primarily on crime rates, agency size and geographic location, and did not appear to be affected in any major way by agency organizational functions. The Rand Report stated that UCR data generally reflect the activities of patrol officers and the public more than what investigators do, and administrative discretion in applying criteria for counting UCR data varies both within and between agencies. It was concluded that agency arrest and clearance statistics were "not suitable measures of the effectiveness of investigative operations" (Chaiken, Greenwood & Petersilia, 1977, p. 190-191).

More than 80% of criminal case clearances are the result of on-scene arrests made by patrol officers (30%), the identification of perpetrators when a crime is initially reported (50%), patrol officer investigative activity, or spontaneous information provided by the public, all of which investigators have little control over. Additionally, investigators typically comprise an average of only 17% of an agency's sworn officers, and they spend something less

than a third of their time actually investigating unsolved cases (45% on non-case activities, 26% on post-arrest activities, 22% on cases that are never solved, and 7% on cases that are eventually solved) (Chaiken, Greenwood & Petersilia, 1977, pp. 192, 198). Therefore, it was concluded that "clearance rates cannot be expected to vary substantially according to the organization of investigative units, the training and selection of investigators, whether they specialize by crime type or not, their workload and other variables" (Greenwood, Chaiken, Petersilia & Prusoff, 1975, p. 82). Additionally, while a number of proposed investigative reforms were presented in the Rand Report, it was emphasized that although the reforms might improve clearance rates somewhat, significant improvements were much more heavily influenced by patrol unit activities and cooperation between citizens and the police than by investigative activities.

In a related study mentioned earlier in Chapter 1, Cordner's (1989) examination of UCR clearance rates in agencies in the state of Maryland found that, contrary to the Rand findings, neither agency size nor crime workload were correlated with investigative effectiveness, but that region and crime mix were. Cordner (1989), however, did not examine the relationship between investigator productivity and clearance rates. Taken together, the different findings of the Rand and Cordner (1989) studies indicate that the relationship between agency characteristics and clearance rates is complex and not well understood, and that agency-level clearance rates are probably not sufficiently sensitive to provide a useful assessment of the effectiveness of investigators.

For purposes of content, a review was conducted of the FBI Index crime clearance rates reported for all agencies in the UCRs for the 25-year period since the 1972 data that was used in the Rand Report. Between 1973 and 1997, the overall annual reported clearance rates ranged between 19.2% in 1980 to 21.8% in 1996 (a range of 2.6%) and the mean of the rates was 20.9% (Maguire & Pastore, 2000).

UCR data.

In the present study, agencies were asked to provide the total number and percentage of UCR Index crimes reported and cleared by their agency during 1 January – 31 December 1998. If 1998 data were not available, they were asked to provide the data for the most recent year for which they were available.

Agency responses were generally incomplete. Between 58% and 68% of them provided at least some data regarding the numbers of crimes reported in the eight Index crime categories, and between 40% and 59% provided at least some data regarding either the number or percentage of clearances reported in the eight Index crime categories. A number of agencies provided data for some crime categories or some clearance categories but not for others, and some agencies provided either crime data or clearance data but not both. Additionally, about 6% provided data for years other than 1998 (1996 – 4 agencies, 1997 – 40 agencies, 1999 – 69 agencies). The reasons for agencies' failure to provide their UCR data are unknown.

An alternate source of crime and clearance rates was located that provided more comprehensive data regarding agency respondents in the present study. The Uniform Crime

Reporting Program Data (U.S.) Part 95: Offenses Known and Clearances by Arrest, 1997 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999b) provided the most recent UCR data available regarding both reported crime and clearance rates at the individual agency level for seven UCR Index crimes (arson was not included). It was determined that, of all agencies in the present survey, data from 1,668 (96%) were included in this report. Of these, 1,366 reported known offenses in their areas of jurisdiction during 1997, and 302 reported no known offenses. Additionally, 1,291 agencies reported crimes cleared by arrest and 377 reported no clearances. A summary of the report information regarding the respondents in the present study is set forth in Table 19.

Table 19

Offense and Clearance Data Extracted from the 1997 UCR Regarding All Agencies in the Study

	Offense and Clearance Data			
Index Crimes	Total Offenses Reported[1]	Number of Agencies that Reported Clearance Data	Number and Percent of Clearances Reported by Agencies	
			n	%
Murder/Non-negligent Manslaughter	11,442	716	6,475	68.9
Forcible Rape	47,348	1,107	22,997	50.9
Robbery	346,931	1,152	78,494	35.9
Aggravated Assault	1,857,277	1,345	952,622	58.8
Burglary	1,228,694	1,349	143,193	15.4
Larceny-theft	3,797,458	1,358	640,400	19.8
Motor Vehicle Theft	837,178	1,323	90,924	22.8
Total	8,126,328		1,935,105	

[1]The 1997 UCR reported information regarding offenses for each Index crime for 1,668 of the 1,746 agencies in the present study (1,366 reported known offenses and 302 reported no known offenses).

As shown in the table, the number of agencies that provided offense data for each Index crime category was 1,668, and the number reporting clearance data ranged from 716 for murder to 1,358 for larceny. The percentage of clearances among agencies that reported clearance data ranged from 68.9% for murder to 15.4% for burglary. The overall 1997 Index crime clearance rate for agencies in the present study, which was obtained by dividing the total clearances (1,935,105) by the total reported offenses (8,126,328), was 23.8%. This is slightly higher than the overall Index crime clearance rate (21.6%) for all 18,921 agencies reported in the 1997 UCR.

In sum, only about two-thirds of the agencies provided at least some UCR crime data for their agencies, and only about one-half provided at least some clearance data. More

comprehensive crime and clearance data was available in a 1997 UCR report for 1,668 (96%) of the 1,746 agencies.

Decline in clearance rates.

Agencies were asked whether, in general, they had experienced a decline in clearance rates for serious crimes in the past ten years, and 387 (22%) of all agencies said Yes. These agencies were provided a list of 20 factors and were asked to indicate how important they considered each factor to be with regard to contributing to the decline.[7] In Table 20 the responses to each factor are shown.

Table 20

Ratings of Factors Contributing to a Decline in Clearance Rates
by All Agencies in the Sample that Reported Declines in the Past Ten Years

		Agency Ratings				
Factors	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Lack of Time to Investigate Cases	377	14	32	35	20	55
Prosecutors Who Are Reluctant to Accept Cases	376	18	29	39	13	52
Too Many Crimes to Investigate	378	15	36	27	22	49
Lack of Witness Cooperation	379	10	46	33	11	44
Changes in the Role of Patrol Officers	379	22	39	31	9	40
Lack of Public Help in Police Investigations	377	20	43	29	9	38
Lack of Victim Cooperation	379	11	53	26	9	35
Poor Initial Report Preparation by Patrol Officer	377	16	49	28	6	34
Implementation of Community Policing	374	40	32	18	10	28
Evidence-related Problems	374	27	46	23	4	27
Technology-related Problems	374	31	43	19	8	27
Not Enough Training for Investigators	376	24	52	17	7	24
Court Restrictions on Admissibility of Evidence	379	23	53	18	6	24
Changes in the Role of Investigators	380	29	48	20	4	24
Organizational Changes in Your Agency	376	34	43	17	6	23
Court Restrictions on Police Interrogation Practices	376	29	48	16	7	23
Decline in Work Ethic of Investigators	376	48	37	13	2	15
Poor Patrol Officer/Detective Relationship	376	36	49	12	2	14
Investigations Passed from One Shift to Another	372	58	30	9	3	12
Improper Selection of Investigators	376	51	40	8	1	9

[1]n=the number of the 387 agencies that reported a decline in clearance rates and that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As indicated in the table, the top four factors that the agencies considered to have affected the decline in clearance rates in the past ten years were Lack of Time to Investigate Cases (55%), Prosecutors Who Are Reluctant to Accept Cases (52%), Too Many Crimes to Investigate (49%), and Lack of Witness Cooperation (44%). The remaining 16 factors were considered to be of moderate to large importance by between 9% and 40% of the respondents.

In sum, less than one-fourth (22%) of all agencies indicated a decline in clearance rates for serious crimes in the past 10 years. Out of a list of 20 factors that could have contributed to the decline, only four were selected by more than 40% of the respondents.

Improving clearance rates.

Agencies were provided a list of 20 factors related to clearance rates and were asked to indicate the degree to which they believed that doing them for investigators in their agencies would help to improve clearance rates (see Footnote 7). The responses from agencies with investigators are displayed in Table 21.

Table 21

Ratings by Agencies with Investigators Regarding Factors That Might Help to Improve Clearance Rates

		Agency Ratings				
Factors	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Mod-erate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Increase in Investigator Personnel ("Manpower")	1413	5	16	35	44	79
Improvements in Technology-related Areas	1414	5	24	46	25	71
Formal Training Upon Appointment as Investigator	1410	8	23	44	25	69
More Time to Work Unsolved Cases	1412	6	28	42	24	66
Closer Work Relations with Uniformed Officers	1414	8	32	45	15	60
More Computerized Investigative Files	1412	7	34	39	20	59
Reduction in Investigator Caseload	1408	11	31	35	23	58
Improvements in Evidence-related Areas	1413	10	35	40	16	56
Formal Refresher Training	1415	9	42	39	10	49
Improvements in Police/prosecutor Relationship	1411	12	40	34	15	49
Give Patrol Officers More Investigative Responsibility	1411	11	42	38	10	48
Closer Supervision of Investigative Efforts	1414	14	43	36	7	43
Further Investigative Specialization	1413	19	40	33	8	41
Better Public Relations	1412	13	46	33	8	41
Improvements in Investigation Management	1411	11	48	32	9	41
More Frequent Meetings Among Investigators	1412	17	46	32	6	38
Assign Investigators to Work in Pairs	1410	27	40	27	7	34
More Emphasis on Clearance Rates for Evaluation	1406	24	53	20	3	23
Organizational Restructuring	1406	43	38	15	4	19
Give Patrol Officers Less Investigative Responsibility	1400	68	25	6	1	7

[1]n=the number of 1,460 agencies with investigators that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As shown, the top two important factors that would help improve clearance rates were an Increase in Investigator Personnel, selected by 79% of the agencies, and Improvements in Technology-related Areas, selected by 71%. Formal Training Upon Appointment as an Investigator (69%) and More Time to Work Unsolved Cases (66%) were third and fourth. The remaining 16 factors were considered to be of moderate to large importance by between 7% and 60% of the agencies. The three lowest ranked factors, selected by less than one-fourth of the agencies, were More Emphasis on Clearance Rates for Evaluation (23%), Organizational Restructuring (19%), and Give Patrol Officers Less Investigative Responsibility (7%).

In sum, the top four factors, selected by at least 66% of the agencies, that might help to improve clearance rates dealt with increases in personnel, technology and training.

Funding needs.

Agencies were asked about their need for additional funding in order to improve investigative effectiveness. They were provided a list of eight items and were asked to indicate the degree to which they needed additional funding for each item (see Footnote 7). The results are displayed in Table 22.

Table 22

Ratings by All Agencies Regarding the Need for Additional Funding to Improve Investigative Effectiveness

		Agency Ratings				
Items	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Mod-erate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Personnel	1717	6	17	35	42	77
Equipment (e.g., vehicles, surveillance)	1720	5	23	41	32	73
Technology (e.g., computers, software)	1720	5	24	38	33	71
Training	1708	8	31	38	23	61
Evidence Processing (e.g., crime labs, DNA analysis)	1714	17	30	34	19	53
Investigative Operations (e.g., task forces, stings)	1715	15	37	32	16	48
Evidence Collection Issues	1716	12	41	36	11	47
Funding for Informants	1716	19	40	27	14	41

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The five highest-ranked items, identified by at least 53% of the respondents as items necessary to improve investigative effectiveness, related to personnel, equipment, technology, training

and evidence processing. The remaining three items, relating to evidence collection, operations and informants, were selected by less than one-half of the agencies.

We noted earlier that about one-half of the agencies that experienced a decline in clearance rates in the past 10 years identified personnel related issues (Lack of Time to Investigate Cases and Too Many Crimes to Investigate) as two of the top four concerns. When agencies were asked what they needed to improve clearance rates, their top choices, selected by at least 66%, were: an Increase in Investigator Personnel, Improvements in Technology-related Areas, Formal Training Upon Appointment as an Investigator, and More Time to Work Unsolved Cases. Here, when asked what they needed additional funding for in order to improve investigative effectiveness, the top choices are similar. It is apparent that most agencies view personnel, technology and training as the three primary factors affecting clearance rates.

Clearance rates and evaluation.

Agencies were asked to indicate how important clearance rates were in judging individual investigator performance in their agency by marking on a scale of four choices – No Importance, Low Importance, Moderate Importance, and High Importance.

Fifteen percent of the agencies with investigators indicated clearance rates were of high importance and 58% indicated they were of moderate importance. The remaining agencies indicated they were either of low importance (23%) or of no importance (3%). Eleven agencies did not respond to the question.

Agencies were also asked to indicate how important clearance rates were in judging the overall performance of investigative units in their agency by marking on the same scale of four choices – No Importance, Low Importance, Moderate Importance, and High Importance. Only the responses of the 917 agencies that indicated they had investigative units were considered.

Twenty percent of the 917 agencies indicated clearance rates were of high importance and 60% indicated they were of moderate importance. The remaining agencies indicated they were either of low importance (17%) or of no importance (3%). Eight agencies did not respond to the question.

In sum, at least 74% of the agencies indicate clearance rates are of moderate or high importance in evaluating the performance of investigators and investigative units. This is comparable to the findings reported earlier (in the Investigators section) that success in a major investigation and clearance statistics were two of the three criteria used by at least 81% of the agencies to evaluate investigators and investigative units. However, the Rand Report argued that clearance rates were not suitable measures of agency-level investigative effectiveness, and, as shown in earlier Table 21, most agencies with investigators do not favor more emphasis on clearance rates as a way to improve effectiveness.

Legal problems.

Agencies were asked to indicate the degree to which a number of important legal issues affected their investigations in the last five years. They were provided a list of 12 issues and were asked to indicate the degree to which they had posed legal problems (see Footnote 7). The results are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Ratings by All Agencies Regarding Legal Problems Affecting the Conduct of Investigations During the Past Five Years

		Agency Ratings				
Problems	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Moderate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Searches	1699	43	51	6	1	7
Use of Informants	1688	56	38	6	1	7
Interview/Interrogation	1703	49	46	5	1	6
Relations with the Media	1703	62	33	5	1	6
Arrests	1698	50	45	5	---	5
Relations with Police Unions	1698	85	12	2	1	3
Surveillance	1702	76	22	2	---	2
Undercover Activities	1699	71	27	2	---	2
Sting Operations	1696	80	18	2	---	2
Coercion	1705	85	14	1	---	1
Corruption	1700	93	7	1	---	1
Covert Listening Devices	1699	88	11	1	---	1

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As is evident in the table, the overwhelming majority of agencies (over 90%) did not identify any of 12 listed issues as important legal problems encountered in their investigations. The most frequently cited problems, searches and the use of informants, were only seen as problems by 7% of the respondents.

Research

In this sub-section, questions regarding agency interests in investigation-related research are addressed. Agency views of the influence of research, their research priorities, and their willingness to participate in research, are described.

Research influence.

Agencies were asked to what extent research had directly influenced agency policy and/or practice regarding the criminal investigation process within the past five years. They were provided a list of eight areas and were asked to indicate the degree to which each area influenced their process (see Footnote 7). The results are displayed in Table 24.

Table 24

Ratings by All Agencies Regarding Research that has Influenced Their Criminal Investigation Policies and Practices within the Past Five Years

			Agency Ratings			
Research Areas	n[1]	% None[2]	% Slight	% Mod-erate	% Large	% Moderate & Large
Computerized Databases (e.g., AFIS)	1688	14	23	39	24	63
Forensic Science Applications (e.g., DNA)	1680	25	31	28	15	43
Criminal Investigations Management	1682	22	42	31	6	37
Relationship Between Investigations and Community Policing	1688	30	35	29	7	36
Case Screening	1678	38	40	19	4	23
Team Policing	1669	46	32	16	5	21
Investigator Selection Techniques	1677	44	37	16	3	19
Decentralization/Centralization of Investigators	1677	59	25	11	5	16

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

As shown in the table, the research area that has most directly influenced agency policy and/or practice (in investigations) has been Computerized Databases (e.g., AFIS) (63%). The second item, Forensic Science Applications (e.g., DNA), was ranked considerably lower at 43%. These responses are consistent with the identification of technological improvements as one of the three primary factors affecting clearance rates and investigative effectiveness. Only a few agencies (between 16% and 37%) identified the remaining six factors as significant influences.

Research priorities.

Agencies were asked about their research interests. They were provided a list of 17 research areas and were asked to prioritize each one on a four-point scale from 1 to 4 (1 = None, 2 = Low, 3 = Moderate, and 4 = High). The Moderate and High responses of the agencies for each were combined and the items were ranked accordingly in Table 25.

Table 25

Ratings by All Agencies Regarding Research Priorities
Related to the Criminal Investigation Process

Research Areas	n[1]	Agency Ratings % None[2]	% Low	% Mod-erate	% High	% Moderate & High
Technological Improvements in Investigative Techniques	1660	2	10	46	42	88
Investigator Training	1662	3	10	43	44	87
Technological Improvements in Investigations Management	1659	3	15	47	35	82
Crime Intelligence/Mapping/Information Systems	1656	4	17	47	32	79
Interagency Cooperation	1663	4	16	46	33	79
Management of Continuing Investigations	1661	3	20	53	24	77
The Investigative Role of Patrol Officers	1656	3	20	50	27	77
Investigator Relationships Within Communities	1655	5	23	47	25	72
Clearance Rates	1654	6	30	48	16	64
Police/Prosecutor Relations	1660	6	30	40	24	64
Investigator Selection	1659	10	27	43	20	63
Performance Evaluation of Investigators	1655	6	31	46	17	63
Integration of Community Policing and Investigations	1663	9	29	42	20	62
Prosecution and Conviction Rates	1658	6	31	41	21	62
Case Screening	1649	8	35	46	11	57
Generalization/Specialization of Investigator Roles	1654	12	32	43	13	56
Decentralization/Centralization of Investigators	1654	27	44	21	8	29

[1]n=the number of 1,746 agencies that responded to each item.
[2]Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The top three significant research priorities identified by agencies were Technological Improvements in Investigative Techniques (88%), Investigator Training (87%), and Technological Improvements in Investigations Management (82%). These responses are

consistent with earlier findings that revealed technology and training to be among the primary factors affecting investigative effectiveness.

Research participation.

Agencies were asked if they would be willing to consider participation in research projects regarding criminal investigations. Fifty-three percent of all agencies said Yes, 41% said No, and 6% did not respond to the question. The matter of why they would or would not be willing to participate was not addressed. However, the relatively high interest in investigative issues (as shown in Table 25), and the openness of most respondents to involvement in research, suggest opportunities for more attention on this important aspect of police work in the future.

Summary

Most agencies consider most identified goals of the criminal investigation function to be important. Direct investigation issues, protecting the public, and recovery/return of property were ranked slightly higher than keeping victims and the community informed, even though the public is the primary and predominant source of crime information for the police.

It was determined that the percentage of crimes cleared by arrest for respondents in 1997 was 23.8%, slightly higher than the 21.6% clearance rate for all 18,921 agencies in the UCR in 1997. Nevertheless, 22% of the respondents indicated they experienced a decline in clearance rates for serious crimes in the past 10 years. The top four factors affecting that decline were lack of time, prosecutor reluctance to take action, too many crimes, and lack of witness cooperation. Increases in personnel, technology, and training are the three main factors that would help improve clearance rates. The same issues were clearly identified as items for which agencies needed additional funding to improve investigative effectiveness. At least 74% of the agencies indicate that clearance rates are of moderate to large importance in judging the performance of individual investigators and investigative units. Clearance rates are also among the most frequently used criteria for evaluation purposes at those levels.

Most agencies did not identify any (of the specified) legal issues as important legal problems. The top two issues, searches and use of informants, were selected by only 7% of the agencies. Clearly, agencies do not view legal issues as significant problems affecting investigations or investigative effectiveness.

The two research areas identified as those that most directly influence agency policy and/or practice are computerized databases and forensic science applications. Additionally, the two top priorities for future research identified by agencies are technological improvements in investigative techniques and investigator training. These responses are consistent with those given as the primary factors affecting clearance rates and investigative effectiveness.

Police agencies find heavy workloads to be their major criminal investigation problem and believe that computers (databases) and related technological advances have influenced investigations the most in the past five years. Advances in those two areas and (more and

better) investigative training appear to be what is necessary for the improvement of investigative performance and the enhancement of clearance rates. Continued research in these areas will meet with robust approval of police officials.

CHAPTER 4 – DISCUSSION

This study, the first-ever nationally representative description of police agency policies and practices regarding the criminal investigation process, reveals that in many fundamental respects, the process has been relatively uninfluenced by seemingly significant changes in policing, the crime problem and technological advances made in the past thirty years. Nevertheless, there are some promising developments, though not widespread, that warrant attention. In addition, there seems to be keen interest in this area on the part of many police administrators. Perhaps, they await more solid information than what has been available in order to make decisions about their investigative efforts based on knowledge of the most useful developments in other jurisdictions. Moreover, it must be recognized that a sweeping descriptive account, such as that presented in this report, is not particularly sensitive to the changes that may be underway in isolated, individual agencies. Although we have noted these where appropriate, it was not possible in this report to explore these developments and their possible effects on the investigation process.

Noting these general points, however, it is worthwhile to summarize what our data show. We have done so in the following paragraphs, organized according to the six interest areas set forth in this report previously. This overview sets the stage for a presentation of highlights concerning what in our view are the most significant changes that have occurred in the past three decades, since the time the Rand Report was published. Subsequent to these highlights, we devote commentary to issues of importance that appear to us to have been unaffected over time; these are, in our view, topics that deserve further attention. We conclude the report with a number of general observations on the police criminal investigation process that deserve special mention.

Overview of Findings

Our results, it will be recalled, are based upon the responses of 1,746 general-purpose state, county and municipal police agencies in the U. S. It is understood that these agencies not only differ by type but also by size, available resources, population served, location and so forth. Any or all of these characteristics, as well as many others, may be related (perhaps, as some literature suggests, strongly so) to how agencies perform their investigative function and how effective they are in doing so. Detailed explorations of these differences as they relate to the numerous issues in the six interest areas are necessary and useful; however, these analyses were beyond the scope of this study. Except in those instances where specific mention is made of differences in results based on agency characteristics, the overview to follow, of necessity, ignores differences and focuses on highlighting the state of the art, if you will, of the police investigation process in the U. S.

(1) Organization

Respondent agencies employ about one-half (more than 350,000) of the full-time sworn officers in the U.S. Eighty-four percent of the respondents reported employment of investigators; on average, investigators account for 16% (more than 50,000) of agency

personnel. About one-half (56%) employ both female and male investigators but very few employ part-time or non-sworn investigators. Most agencies (83%) assign their investigators centrally, at the agency headquarters level, rather than in the field, and in most agencies (67%) investigators are generalists (that is, they investigate all cases) rather than specialists (investigate only certain cases). About two-thirds (63%) of the agencies with investigators assign them to a wide variety of separate organizational (investigative) units, the most common of which are related to persons, property and narcotics crimes. Agencies indicate that investigative units are organized, not unexpectedly, for reasons generally related to internal investigation management facilitation. Most agencies (82%) meet regularly with other police agencies on investigative matters and about two-thirds (63%) have been involved in drug-related and other types of task forces with other agencies during the past year. Multi-jurisdictional task forces and other arrangements appear to be a widespread and still developing investigative management tactic.

(2) Patrol Officers

Patrol officers typically carry out limited administrative tasks related to investigations but in more than half of the agencies they also interview victims of and witnesses to crimes. However, interviewing and interrogation of criminal suspects, evidence collection and processing, coordination with prosecutors, and some proactive techniques are not usually performed by patrol officers. In short, patrol officers generally do not carry out a wide range of investigative tasks.

There appears to be growing recognition that the patrol officer's role is key to the investigative process, as 72% of the agencies reported efforts to enhance that role within the past five years. Nevertheless, most agencies do not require of uniformed officers classroom instruction on investigative matters beyond that presented in the basic academy training. Additionally, most agencies do not have specific budgets for such training, and most do not specifically evaluate uniformed officers' investigative performance.

(3) Investigators

Overall, investigators' activities have not been significantly altered by recent changes in either policing or in police organizational developments. In addition to traditional investigative tasks, investigators in many agencies perform tasks related to evidence collection and handling. Investigators in fewer than one-third of the agencies perform less-traditional tasks, such as those related to community policing or those that require the investigator to work closely with uniformed officers on proactive investigations or in team assignments. Agencies generally use similar methods for selecting investigators. These include a personal interview, an oral board interview and, to a lesser degree, peer evaluations and written tests. Usually "investigation skills," supervisory ratings, prior performance and years of experience are the criteria on which investigators are selected. When selecting investigators, agencies most commonly use selection criteria validated by research as good predictors of future performance, but they also commonly use selection processes (interviews) that are said to be among the least valid predictors (Cohen & Chaiken, 1987).

Most police agencies do not provide initial, formal training for investigators. Only 39% provide such training and it is typically less than two weeks in duration. In many instances (59%) though, refresher or advanced training is offered, presumably to supplement what is learned during the investigator's probationary period and what was provided in recruit training programs. This is usually provided annually and the types of courses provided are similar whether at the initial step of appointment or in advanced training. However, such recruit training is largely seen as inadequate and incomplete by those who undergo the training, especially with respect to "investigative" matters (Traut, Feimer, Emmert & Thom, 2000).

While most agencies (84%) with investigators rely on funding from their own budgets to support investigative training needs, only 42% have a specific budget for such support.

Federal agencies typically provide some training in investigative matters to most local and state police departments. In some agencies, however, investigators receive most of their training from state agencies, educational institutions and in-house personnel. Two factors, personnel shortage and lack of funding, are seen as significant issues hindering investigative training and, even though the training is available from multiple sources, about one-third (32%) of the agencies report inadequate access to the training desired.

One-half of the agencies automatically give special entitlements to investigators upon selection; these most frequently cover salary and promotion. These may be related to investigators' representation by collective bargaining units in some agencies. Investigators typically are assigned to either one or two organizational ranks and upon selection they are automatically entitled to at least one benefit, such as special allowances or a higher pay scale. Investigators in little more than one-fifth of the agencies have time limits on how long they may serve in their positions but, aside from that, the most common reasons for investigators to leave their positions are related to promotion and retirement. Performance evaluations of both investigators and investigative units rest on the same nine criteria. The top three of these for individual investigators are, in order, investigative success, report writing and case clearances. When considering unit evaluations, caseload statistics replace report writing in the top three.

(4) Investigation Management

Agencies use similar methods to select both investigators and investigative supervisors. Most agencies follow policies and procedures that allow supervisors to influence directly the investigation process and investigators' activities. Supervisors monitor the status of investigations through regular personal contact, reviews of activity logs and reviews of investigation reports. Additionally, they take decisions regarding what cases to investigate and to whom cases are assigned. Case solvability factors are used to screen cases in about half of the agencies, and typically those factors are applied to all types of cases. In most agencies, investigation reports are prepared and filed on computers, but case management activities are performed manually.

Most agencies do not have investigators assigned to prosecutors' offices but they do have regular meetings and ongoing relationships with prosecutors and do not identify significant problems or hindrances in that relationship.

Aside from what is seen as a heavy workload for uniformed officers, investigators and investigator supervisors, agencies do not identify significant problems in their investigative programs. Only about 25% of the agencies plan to make major changes in their programs in the near future. These were typically related to personnel matters (e.g., personnel increases, apparently to address the heavy investigative workload problem) and investigation management issues. In the small number of agencies (15%) that reported implementation of innovative investigative programs, the programs typically involved changes in investigative management, not operational practices.

Consistent with current attempts to be more attentive to victim needs, most agencies notify victims regarding an arrest of a suspect in their case. Many agencies also reported victim notification of prosecution, court scheduling and other case dispositions.

There is broad agreement that a variety of investigative functions are misrepresented in the popular media. The two items on which there is the greatest agreement are the use of excessive force and interrogation.

(5) Investigative Support

Only 32% of the agencies employ civilians in investigative support roles and only 45% employ evidence technicians. Such technicians in most agencies are mainly full-time sworn officers who are required to have specialized training, offered either internally or externally.

Most agencies use state and federal police crime laboratories for forensic analysis of physical evidence submitted from crime scenes. About half of them, however, report problems in gaining ready access to such laboratories, and about three-fourths indicate problems with the timeliness of crime laboratory service. That is, turn-around time for the processing of submitted evidence is slow.

With respect to DNA analysis, a forensic technique becoming much more widespread and seemingly important to police investigation, only about one-third of the police agencies indicate they had processed cases in which DNA analysis played a critical role. Only 9% report experiencing backlog problems for such analysis. However, the number of cases (21,897) that are pending in which DNA analysis was being sought and the costs involved (about $10.9 million) regarding these backlogged cases are relatively significant. Both the lack of funding and a lack of qualified personnel appear to be almost equally important factors accounting for the backlog.

Most (74%) agencies obtain AFIS services from state-administered programs, and roughly half indicate that agency crime records and investigative support files are available on computers. In the majority of agencies investigators have daily access to personal communication devices (pagers, cell phones, e-mail, etc.); typically patrol officers, even though they play a key role in the investigation process, do not. At least half of the agencies plan to upgrade and enhance various investigative technology resources within the next year.

(6) Investigative Effectiveness

Although most agencies consider the goals associated with the criminal investigation function to be important, goals relating to direct investigative issues - protecting the public and the recovery/return of property - are ranked slightly higher than goals relating to keeping victims and the community informed.

A little over 20% of the agencies report a decline in clearance rates for Index crimes during the past ten years. The lack of time, prosecutor reluctance to take action, too many crimes, and the lack of witness cooperation were the top four factors said to account for that decline. The majority of agencies identify personnel, technology and training as the primary factors that would help to improve clearance rates, and they identify the same three factors as those in need of additional funding in order to improve clearance rates. Most agencies indicate that clearance rates are important in judging the performance of individual investigators and investigative units. Indeed, the clearance rate is the most important criterion in evaluating investigators.

Agencies clearly do not view any of a number of specified legal issues as a significant impediment to investigative effectiveness. The two top legal issues considered to be the most significant problems (searches and the use of informants) were viewed in that way by only 7% of the agencies.

Agencies identify computerized databases and forensic science applications as the two research areas that have most directly influenced investigative policies and practices within the past five years. Their top two research priorities and interests were also related to technology and investigator training. Along with personnel problems, these choices were consistent with the selection of technology and training as the factors having the most impact on clearance rates.

What Has Changed

In Chapter 1, a number of developments that have been noted in policing over the past three decades were presented. These included: changes in the nature, amount and costs of crime; organizational, administrative and personnel changes in policing; new research on crime and policing; and, increasing resource availability for police agencies. In this section we discuss the apparent influence of some of these changes in policing in relation to what seems to have changed in the police investigation process.

This study reveals that in many fundamental respects, the police criminal investigation process has remained relatively unaffected by the significant changes that have occurred in policing, the crime problem and technology in the past thirty years. Nevertheless, there are some promising developments, though not widespread, that warrant attention. In addition, there seems to be keen interest in this area on the part of many police administrators. Perhaps, they await more solid information than what has been available in order to make decisions about their investigative efforts based on knowledge of the most useful developments in other jurisdictions. Moreover, it must be recognized that a sweeping descriptive account, such as

that presented in this report, is not particularly sensitive to the changes that may be underway in isolated, individual agencies. Although these changes were noted where appropriate, it was not possible to explore them and their potential effects on the investigation process.

The increased recruitment and hiring of females as police officers seems to have influenced the proportion of female investigators. That is, although there are no firm statistics on this issue, our results suggest that the proportion of females involved in police investigative activities has probably increased since the 1970s. In addition, the proportion of agencies with specific investigative units seems a bit higher than was the case in previous years, and the types of investigative units are certainly more diversified and specialized today. Although it is difficult to discern overall whether relations between agencies have changed, either for better or worse, it is clear that the involvement of agencies in various kinds of multi-jurisdictional task forces is now relatively common.

Most agencies have attempted to enhance the investigative role of patrol officers. On the other hand, the role of investigators in performing less-traditional tasks, such as those that might accompany community policing efforts (in which many patrol officers have become involved), appears to have changed only slightly, if at all. The overall level of training provided to investigators may have increased somewhat but in most agencies and for most investigators, the training still appears to be quite inadequate, inconsistent and incomplete. We obtained more specific data about who provides training, and what types of training are made available to investigators, than has been collected previously. Nevertheless, this topic is in need of much greater attention. There apparently are large gaps in the training of investigators, a point made clear in our data and which, though recognized by police agencies themselves, is one that they are unwilling or unable to support financially.

Investigation management, the role of investigator supervisors, and how investigators and cases are managed are not well-documented topics in previous research. For that reason, useful comparisons are not possible. Regarding other related issues, our findings show that agencies do not consider police-prosecutor relations to be problematic. This is encouraging since it is that relationship which is at the core of the processing of criminal cases. In addition it is worth noting that, perhaps because of changing legal requirements to do so, most agencies now notify victims of crime about developments in their case. Finally, most agencies indicate few problems in their investigative efforts and some have implemented innovations in those efforts; many of these, however, deal with internal investigation management rather than what might be seen as dramatic departures from traditional practices.

Our data regarding investigative support personnel (civilians and evidence technicians) and those pertaining to DNA analysis are not directly comparable to any data previously reported. Yet, it is clear that the changes occurring in these and related areas are altering some aspects of the police investigative effort. More attention to these topics is in order.

In a related area we noted slight increases (from what has been observed previously) in the computerization of criminal records and considerable increases in the computerization of investigative support files; neither of these, though, seems to have developed as fully as necessary. Similarly, access to AFIS data bases and to personal communication devices, both

of which have potential for improving police investigative efforts, appear to have taken hold; their effects on enhancing the success of investigative activities remain to be fully documented, even though there is some evidence of their promise (Technology Update, 1999; Kirkpatrick & Loudermilk, 2001).

Personnel, technology and training are identified by agencies as the primary factors affecting crime clearance rates; they are also the major factors seen to be in greatest need of additional funding and research. Legal issues, on the other hand, appear to be of lesser concern. This is a considerable change from the controversy about due process problems that arose in the late 1960s and 1970s, about the time that the Rand Report was published.

What Has Not Changed

Although the police and policing have changed considerably since the 1970s, the proportion of investigators in agencies has remained constant at about 16% of agency sworn personnel resources. Additionally, the reasons why agencies organize investigative efforts as they do remain focused on internal rather than external factors. It is generally acknowledged that patrol officers play a key role in collecting crime information from the public, in clearing cases, and in influencing the follow-up activities of investigators. Yet, even though team policing experiments, intended to broaden patrol officers' investigative responsibilities, showed some success, and despite agency efforts to enhance patrol officers' investigative roles, such officers in most agencies have quite limited responsibility for investigative tasks. Moreover, spite of the recognized and well-documented role they play in investigations, they receive little or no training in such matters beyond what they receive in their basic academy instruction and this is judged to be inadequate and incomplete (Traut, Feimer, Emmert, & Thom, 2000). Further research in this critical area is clearly warranted.

Similarly, the training that investigators receive appears to be considerably less than what is called for. Most do not receive any pre-appointment formal, classroom training. It is typical for police agencies to rely on "on-the-job" training (i.e., a probationary period) and some exposure to post-appointment seminars for their investigators. Whether these are adequate is a question that, it would appear from our data, agencies themselves would answer negatively.

In spite of the changes that community policing has brought about, the majority of police departments do not involve investigators in tasks related to "community policing" efforts. The primary methods for selecting and evaluating investigators remain relatively unchanged, and much of the investigation management process is still manually driven rather than computerized. Access to and timeliness of services supported by crime laboratories continue as long-standing problems for many agencies, and the development of new forensic techniques and technologies, without concomitant increases in personnel and funding, may exacerbate these problems.

Personnel, technology and training also continue to be identified as major problems affecting the investigation process, even though significant improvement is reported to have occurred in some of these areas. It is important to emphasize, moreover, that despite the many

advances in technology and the forensic sciences that have occurred in recent years, clearance rates, whether at the individual agency or the state and national levels, remain relatively stable. For certain violent crimes, moreover, those rates appear to be declining in some locations, even in the face of more and better technological improvements and personnel enhancements. What accounts for variation in clearance rates is poorly understood. This is no doubt due to the fact that those rates, whether at the investigator or the investigative unit levels, have not been the focus of researchers' in policing – in spite of the dramatic change in the amount, and perhaps the quality, of research in policing since the Rand Report.

Concluding Observations

Two issues, the role of the public as the primary provider of crime information to the police, and the role of the patrol officer in solving crimes, remain unchallenged as the critical elements underpinning the police criminal investigation process. The nation-wide popularization of community policing focuses attention on these two points. This is seen, first, through community-building efforts by which the police attempt to enhance the trust and rapport between themselves and community members. It would be assumed that such developments would strengthen the flow of useful crime-related information between the police and the public; there would be an anticipated benefit in crime resolution (Horvath, Meesig & Bucqueroux, 1997). Second, the patrol officer's role, considered in the light of the "Broken Windows" perspective as advanced by Wilson and Kelling (1982), calls attention to ameliorating crime-conducive environments and shows the need for better relations between all resources of the police in order to focus on both criminal and non-criminal concerns. Community policing and "Broken Windows" advocate a better relationship between the public and the police, which is the foundation upon which the police investigation process itself rests.

Yet, the police investigative function seems, in the main, to be isolated from these two trends in policing. In 1979, Herman Goldstein argued that police agencies in general seemed to be focused more on the means of policing than on the ends, and that they should be concerned more with the broader outcomes of their efforts in addressing crime issues within communities rather than internal management issues that may not deal effectively with resolving those problems. It can still be argued more than twenty years later that Goldstein's insights on policing have a special resonance with regard to the current state of the police investigation process.

Those who give investigators direction appear to be preoccupied with internal organizational and management issues and with hope for new technology to solve investigative problems. There is – or so it would seem – less focus on improving relationships with the primary source of crime-related information (the public), or on cultivating better working relationships between investigators and patrol officers, who by default already serve as organizational intermediaries between the police and the public, than on concerns of perhaps lesser overall significance.

For a variety of reasons, some of which may be beyond their control, investigators use case screening and rudimentary case solvability factors (among other things) to weed out hard-to-solve or less serious cases that may never be investigated. They do this in order to pursue

more solvable and serious cases, or to deal with the prosecution of solved cases. However, by not dealing directly with the public and patrol officers as important elements in the investigation process, the use of such case management techniques can make investigations even more daunting. They may accentuate – or at least not ameliorate, the unwillingness of the public to cooperate in an investigation and this in turn could restrict the degree to which the collection and use of information, including the discovery and processing of physical evidence, plays a role in solving crime,

The application of technology has made great strides in policing during the last quarter-century, and the prospects that computerized databases, investigative support files, AFIS, DNA analysis, and other technological advances hold for investigators at times seem very promising. Yet, all these developments, taken together, do not appear to have had any measurable impact on agency-level crime clearances. It is ironic that these advances have not been accompanied by a corresponding improvement in investigative effectiveness, except, perhaps in the most visible but relatively infrequent situations. Thus, while technology is playing an increasingly influential role in the criminal investigation process, it for the most part remains supportive of and reliant upon the relationship between the public and the police in solving crime.

As reported in Investigative Effectiveness section in Chapter 3, the best available data indicate that, while most crimes are not solved by the police, the great majority of crimes that are solved are cleared by on-scene arrests, the initial identification of suspects, and other routine actions of patrol officers, rather than by the follow-up activities of investigators. It does not follow from this, however, that the investigative responsibilities of the police ought to be de-emphasized. Rather the data suggest the opposite. For example, police investigations suffer from low clearance rates and the police do not collect physical evidence in most cases. If training is presumed to be able to improve performance, then the amount and quality of investigative and evidence-related training that most agencies currently provide to their personnel may need to be increased in order to enhance investigative outcomes. Additionally, if patrol officers and investigators remain untrained, or at least under-trained, on investigative and evidence-related matters, as seems to be the case, it is also likely that they will struggle with the use of complex computerized crime information management systems and the effective application of other sophisticated technology during the conduct of their routine investigations. In other words, the training question, a long-standing issue in policing, is destined to become an even more important one with respect to investigative matters in the future. These are problems that are in need of correction and, judging from our data, appear to suffer in the competition for the limited resources within most police agencies.

It is understood that were investigators (and investigations) to become more proficient and to show a corresponding increased productivity in arrests, this could even further overwhelm crime laboratories and other justice system resources. This "systems effect" in the justice system, of course, is well known, though not often the focus of attention. Decisions and actions at one point can often lead to subsequent behaviors that may result in counterintuitive and even counterproductive outcomes (e.g., isolation from sources of crime information, problems in the acquisition and use of technology, and so forth). Police agencies cannot, and most likely do not, ignore such consequences. However, further useful commentary on this issue is not found in our data.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study was to provide a more current and comprehensive description of the police criminal investigation process. This has revealed a picture of the process that, while still not entirely in focus, is a bit clearer than that seen before. Our data indicate that, over the passage of some two and a half decades since the first major report on this topic, some things have changed and some things have not. We have detailed some of these. In the main, however, it is our view that the investigation process seems to have been relatively uninfluenced by significant changes in the crime problem, policing and technology that have transpired during this period. Progress in police investigative efforts remains largely isolated from broader attempts in policing to respond more efficiently, more effectively and more resolutely to the crime problem in genera. Nevertheless, there have been some promising advances and many police administrators have expressed a keen interest in this area. Hopefully, those advances and that keen interest will spur continued research on the investigative dimension of the police mission.

FOOTNOTES

1. Index crimes include murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft and arson, as reported in the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) published annually by the FBI (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999b). However, Index crimes do not include victimless crimes (crimes such as drug offenses, prostitution and gambling, that involve a "willing and private exchange of goods or services that are in strong demand but are illegal"), occupational crimes ("violations of the law committed through opportunities created in the course of a legal business or profession," such as crimes committed in private or state-based organizations by professionals or organizational employees), organized crimes (crimes committed by social frameworks organized "for the perpetration of criminal acts rather than specific types of offenses"), political crimes (activities such as terrorism, treason, sedition and espionage), or disorders (Cole, 1995, pp. 47 – 52).

2. A clearance, or cleared crime, refers to the solution of a particular crime either by the arrest of an offender or by an exceptional clearance. A crime is cleared by arrest when an offender has been identified, sufficient evidence to formally charge the identified offender has been obtained, and the offender has been ordered to appear in court. An exceptional clearance is made when an investigation has established an offender, there is sufficient information to support an arrest, and the location of the offender is known, but there is a reason beyond police control that precludes the arrest of the offender. A single arrest can, and in many cases, does "clear" a number of crimes (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999b).

3. Forensic evidence--The terms "physical evidence," "forensic evidence" and "scientifically analyzable evidence" are used interchangeably throughout this paper. This is done because, unfortunately, in most of the research on the criminal investigation process a distinction is seldom made between physical evidence that can be and typically is submitted for scientific analysis and that which is not. Because researchers have not been specific with respect to physical evidence that is "forensic" in nature and that which either was not

scientifically analyzed or was not capable of being so analyzed, we have assumed that the availability of physical evidence indicates an ability to carry out standard forensic tests.

4. Forty-one returned questionnaires were unusable for the following reasons:

- 17 agencies said they did not have an investigative function.
- 7 agencies provided no data or incomplete data.
- 6 agencies said they had no time to complete the questionnaire.
- 4 agencies declined to participate.
- 4 agencies had been deactivated.
- 3 agencies could not be located or contacted.

5. Agencies were asked to respond to the listed items on a scale from 1 to 4, where 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Usually, and 4 = Always. The Usually and Always responses for each item were combined and the items were then ranked accordingly.

6. Agencies were asked to respond to the listed items on a scale from 1 to 4, where 1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = Most, and 4 = All. The Most and All responses for each item were combined and the items were then ranked accordingly.

7. Agencies were asked to respond to the listed items on a scale from 1 to 4, where 1 = None, 2 = Slight, 3 = Moderate, and 4 = Large. The Moderate and Large responses for each item were combined and the items were then ranked accordingly.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND TRANSMITTAL LETTERS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

NATIONAL SURVEY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES – THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION PROCESS

Dear Chief Law Enforcement Administrator:

Policing has changed considerably in the past three decades. But there has been no large-scale evaluation of police detective work, investigative efforts and how they relate to other developments in policing. This survey is the first national assessment of these issues. Your agency has been selected for this research because you participated in the recent Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey conducted by the U. S. Department of Justice. The enclosed questionnaire supplements the LEMAS data. Your participation is critical to ensure that both surveys are compatible.

IN RETURN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION, you will be mailed a special summary of the key findings of the survey. In addition, you will have access to an Internet web site (www.ciol.org) dedicated to investigations research that will provide:

- Updates on what other agencies are doing about investigations
- Updates and summaries of the key survey findings
- News items related to police detective work and investigations
- A site for posting and exchange of investigations-related information
- Summaries of hard-to-find research on investigative work
- E-mail for quick responses to questions on research and related issues
-

Please have someone in your agency who is well acquainted with your investigation process complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, postage paid envelope **within seven days** of receipt. The questionnaire will require one hour to complete. Your response is requested regardless of whether or not your agency conducts criminal investigations.

This research is supported by funding from the National Institute of Justice. It will lead to a comprehensive, nationally representative description of the investigative response of the nation's law enforcement agencies to the changing crime problem. It addresses major policies and practices, organizational changes, and personnel, management and performance issues. It also assesses ways in which agencies have adapted their investigative function to take advantage of community policing, technology and other new developments. The results will identify ways to improve agency investigative effectiveness. Questions about this study can be sent to the address indicated in the box below. Thank you for your cooperation and the prompt return of the questionnaire.

Frank Horvath, Ph.D., Professor

PERSON COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE:			
Name:			
Title:			
Agency name:			
Agency address:			
City:	State:	Zip:	
Tel – Area code:	Number: ☐	Extension:	
Fax – Area code:	Number: ☐	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■	
E-mail address:			
RETURN TO:	FRANK HORVATH, Ph.D., Professor MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY School of Criminal Justice 122 Baker Hall East Lansing, MI 48824	Tel: 517/432-4658 Fax: 517/432-1787 E-mail: ciol@pilot.msu.edu WEB SITE: www.ciol.org	

Any questions about participant's rights that may be raised by this study should be referred to: David E. Wright, Ph.D., Chairperson, University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824 (tel: 517/355-2180).

NATIONAL SURVEY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES: THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS PROCESS

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: In this questionnaire we ask for information regarding the criminal investigation function of law enforcement agencies in the U.S. Responses should be recorded on the questionnaire by circling a number, by placing an "X" in the appropriate space, or by writing in a response.

SECTION I - INVESTIGATORS

INVESTIGATORS ARE SWORN AND NON-SWORN OFFICERS WHO:

- Generally wear **civilian clothes**
- Perform **primarily investigative duties**
- Have specially designated **titles** such as "detective," "investigator," "agent," etc.
- May be managers or supervisors who **primarily supervise either investigators or investigations matters**

DOES NOT INCLUDE: **Sworn and non-sworn officers** having **investigative support** duties, such as crime scene or laboratory technicians, legal staff, crime analysts, and intelligence or information specialists.

****

1. Which term best describes your law enforcement agency? Mark (X) only one.

a. City ..... [ ]
b. County ..... [ ]
c. State Agency (Police) ..... [ ]
d. State Agency (Highway Patrol) ..... [ ]
e. Township ..... [ ]
f. Other – Specify: _____

2. Approximately how many square miles does your jurisdiction cover? ..... ___, ___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___

3. Does your agency employ officers who are investigators, as defined above?

a. Yes [ ] IF YES, go to Question 4.
b. No [ ] IF NO, skip to SECTION II on Page 9

4. How many investigators are there in your agency? (Includes investigators working in areas such as internal affairs, homicide, burglary, juvenile, vice, narcotics, fraud, etc.)

Male ___ ___ ___
Female ___ ___ ___
TOTAL = ___ ___ ___

a. Of the total number of investigators, how many are non-sworn? ..... ___ ___ ___
b. Of the total number of investigators, how many are part-time? ..... ___ ___ ___

5. Are any investigators in your agency assigned to Headquarters? ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES, what kinds of cases do they generally investigate?

	Yes	No
(1) All cases, including minor cases (but uniformed officers do preliminary investigations) ...	1	2
(2) Only certain cases, such as major, complex or lengthy investigations	1	2
(3) All cases, including minor cases, but within specific geographic areas	1	2
(4) Only certain cases (major, complex, lengthy, etc.) but within specific geographic areas	1	2
(5) Other – Specify: _____		

6. **Are any investigators in your agency assigned to field level units?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES, please indicate which field levels.

	Yes	No
(1) District or precinct stations	1	2
(2) Fixed neighborhood or community substations	1	2
(3) Mobile neighborhood or community substations	1	2

(4) Other locations – Specify: _____

b. What kinds of cases do field level investigators <u>generally</u> investigate?

	Yes	No
(1) All cases in their geographic work area (major and minor cases)	1	2
(2) Only certain cases	1	2

(3) Other – Specify: _____

7. **What are the reasons that your agency has for organizing investigators and cases the way it does?**

	Yes	No
a. To be more proactive in investigations	1	2
b. To develop better community relations	1	2
c. To develop expertise in investigations	1	2
d. To improve communication with or assist uniformed officers	1	2
e. To improve familiarity with criminals and crime patterns in the area	1	2
f. To make more efficient use of personnel and resources	1	2
g. To solve/clear more crimes	1	2

h. Other – Specify: _____

8. **In your agency are investigators assigned to separate organizational units?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES, please list the names of the separate units and the number of investigators assigned (i.e., homicide, internal affairs, juvenile, vice, narcotics, fraud, etc.). If there is not enough space, please continue on a separate piece of paper. Please <u>DO NOT INCLUDE INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT UNITS</u> such as those involved in evidence collection or analysis, crime analysis, etc. These units will be addressed later.

Name of Unit/Section	Number of Investigators	Name of Unit/Section	Number of Investigators

9. **Does your agency have any investigators who investigate "cold cases" (old unsolved crimes)? ... Yes [ ] No [ ]**

   a. **IF YES:**

   (1) What is the approximate percentage of cold cases that were cleared in 1998? ..... ___ ___ ___%

   (2) How many investigators are assigned cold cases? ..... ___ ___ ___

   (3) Are investigators assigned cold cases on a permanent or temporary basis? **Permanent [ ] Temporary [ ]**

   (4) How long have investigators been assigned cold cases in your agency?

   Less than one year [ ] Between one and three years [ ] More than three years [ ]

   (5) What types of cases are usually assigned?

   Homicides only [ ] Serious crimes against persons [ ] Any serious crime [ ]

10. **In your agency, how frequently do investigators <u>most commonly</u> report to and/or coordinate with supervisors on routine investigations? Mark (X) only one.**

Daily [ ] Weekly [ ] Monthly [ ] Other [ ]

11. **Who are the immediate supervisors of street-level investigators in your agency?**

		Yes	No
a.	Investigator(s) assigned to headquarters	1	2
b.	Investigator(s) assigned to field unit(s)	1	2
c.	Uniformed officer(s) assigned to headquarters	1	2
d.	Uniformed officer(s) assigned to field unit(s)	1	2
e.	Other - Specify: _____		

12. **For each of the items listed below, circle a response that most closely describes what investigators do in your agency in investigating serious crimes.**

a. **Tasks**	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
(1) Conduct undercover investigations	1	2	3	4
(2) Do community problem solving	1	2	3	4
(3) Process crime scenes for physical evidence	1	2	3	4
(4) Prioritize cases based on local area problems	1	2	3	4
(5) Self-assign cases based on local problems	1	2	3	4
(6) Work in pairs	1	2	3	4
b. **<u>Work with Uniformed Officers:</u>**				
(1) In teams	1	2	3	4
(2) On decoy units, stakeouts, etc.	1	2	3	4
(3) To analyze crime patterns	1	2	3	4
c. **<u>Community-related Activities</u>**				
(1) Provide crime information to the public	1	2	3	4
(2) Receive at least 8 hours of community policing training	1	2	3	4
(3) Regularly participate in community meetings	1	2	3	4
(4) Use citizen volunteers to assist in investigations	1	2	3	4
(5) Work in teams with citizen groups	1	2	3	4
(6) Work with citizens on community outreach	1	2	3	4

13. Listed below are a number of criteria and processes that can be used to select investigators. For each one, please indicate whether or not it is used in your agency.

a. Criteria:	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
(1) Arrest record	1	2	3	4
(2) Education requirements specifically for investigators	1	2	3	4
(3) Investigation skills	1	2	3	4
(4) Minimum number of years of experience	1	2	3	4
(5) Personnel records (commendations, complaints, etc.)	1	2	3	4
(6) Promotion to a certain grade level	1	2	3	4
(7) Supervisor/staff ratings or evaluations	1	2	3	4
(8) Other – Specify: _____				

b. Processes:	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
(1) Civil service exam	1	2	3	4
(2) Oral board interview	1	2	3	4
(3) Peer evaluation	1	2	3	4
(4) Personal interview	1	2	3	4
(5) Tests (writing, verbal ability, etc.)	1	2	3	4
(6) Other – Specify: _____				

14. In the past five years has your agency hired people from other agencies as investigators? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. Does your agency policy currently permit the hiring of people from other agencies as investigators? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

16. When a person is selected as an investigator, is he/she automatically entitled to any of the following?

	Yes	No
a. Civil service status	1	2
b. Higher pay scale	1	2
c. Promotion in rank	1	2
d. Special allowances	1	2
e. Other – Specify: _____		

17. In your agency are investigators represented by one or more collective bargaining units? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES, what areas are covered by collective bargaining contracts?	Yes	No
(1) Amounts of overtime authorized	1	2
(2) Assignments	1	2
(3) Changes in investigative unit structure	1	2
(4) Promotion	1	2
(5) Purposes for which overtime is authorized	1	2
(6) Salaries	1	2
(7) Training	1	2
(8) Other – Specify: _____		

18. How many ranks for investigators are there in your agency?

One [ ] Two [ ] Three [ ] Four [ ] Five or more [ ]

19. Is a probationary period required for newly selected investigators? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES:

(1) Number of weeks of probation: ..... ___ ___ **(weeks)**

(2) Who evaluates success in probation?

	Yes	No
(a) An investigator	1 ...	2
(b) An investigator who is a training officer	1 ...	2
(c) An investigator who is a supervisor	1 ...	2
(d) A uniformed officer	1 ...	2
(e) A uniformed officer who is a training officer	1 ...	2
(f) A uniformed officer who is a supervisor	1 ...	2

(g) Other – Specify: _____

20. Are newly appointed investigators required to undergo classroom instruction on investigations within a specified period? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES:

(1) Number of classroom training hours required: ..... ___ ___ ___ **(hours)**

b. What type of training?

	Yes	No
(1) Crime type training (homicide, crimes against property, drugs, etc.)	1 ...	2
(2) Investigative techniques (interviews/interrogations, crime scene management, etc.)	1 ...	2
(3) Legal issues (arrest, search, court testimony, etc.)	1 ...	2
(4) Management/administration (report writing, case management, data systems, etc.)	1 ...	2

(5) Other – Specify: _____

c. Is any of the required training documented for liability purposes? Some [ ] Most [ ] All [ ]

21. Aside from new appointees, are investigators in your agency required to undergo any refresher or advanced classroom investigations training? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES:

(1) How many investigators? ..... **Some [ ] Most [ ] All [ ]**

(2) How often? ..... **Monthly [ ] Annually [ ] Other [ ]**

b. What type of training?

	Yes	No
(1) Crime type training (homicide, crimes against property, drugs, etc.)	1 ...	2
(2) Investigative techniques (interviews/interrogations, crime scene management, etc.)	1 ...	2
(3) Legal issues (arrest, search, court testimony, etc.)	1 ...	2
(4) Management/administration (report writing, case management, data systems, etc.)	1 ...	2

(5) Other – Specify: _____

c. Is any of this training documented for liability purposes? ..... Some [ ] Most [ ] All [ ]

22. Approximately what proportion of all investigators in your agency has received classroom investigative training in any of the areas listed below?

a. Crime type training (homicide, crimes against property, drugs, etc.) ..... ___ ___ ___%

b. Investigative techniques (interviews/interrogations, crime scene management, etc.) ..... ___ ___ ___%

c. Legal issues (arrest, search, court testimony, etc.) ..... ___ ___ ___%

d. Management/administration (report writing, case management, data systems, etc.) ..... ___ ___ ___%

23. What does your agency authorize for investigators who attend investigations training instruction?

	Yes	No
a. Reimburse all expenses	1	2
b. Reimburse some expenses	1	2
c. Time off	1	2

d. Other – Specify: _____

24. Does your agency have a specific budget item that reserves funding for training for investigators? ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES:

(1) About how much money is budgeted specifically for training investigators annually? (Includes costs of materials, tuition, travel, per diem, etc., but NOT SALARIES) $___, ___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___

25. If classroom instruction on investigations is provided for investigators and/or uniformed officers, who does the training?

	None	Some	Most	All
a. Educational institutions	1	2	3	4
b. Federal agencies	1	2	3	4
c. In-house personnel	1	2	3	4
d. Other local agencies	1	2	3	4
e. Private organizations	1	2	3	4
f. State agencies	1	2	3	4

g. Other - Specify: _____

26. Who provides the funding for investigations training in your agency?

	None	Some	Most	All
a. Agency budget	1	2	3	4
b. State funds	1	2	3	4
c. State grants	1	2	3	4
d. Federal funds	1	2	3	4
e. Federal grants	1	2	3	4

f. Other - Specify: _____

27. To what degree has each of the factors listed below been a problem regarding training of investigators?

Factor	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
a. Excessive length of training	1	2	3	4
b. Ineffectiveness of training	1	2	3	4
c. Lack of funding	1	2	3	4
d. Lack of management support	1	2	3	4
e. Lack of quality of training	1	2	3	4
f. Low individual motivation	1	2	3	4
g. Manpower shortage	1	2	3	4
h. Non-availability of desired training	1	2	3	4
i. Other - Specify: _____				

28. Approximately what percentage of investigators in your agency has investigations experience at the levels indicated below (not counting experience prior to becoming an investigator)?

a. Three years or less ..... ___ ___%

b. At least 3 but less than 6 years ..... ___ ___%

c. At least 6 but less than 10 years ..... ___ ___%

d. Ten or more years ..... ___ ___%

29. In your agency are there any time limits on how long investigators may serve in investigative positions? ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES, what positions do the time limits apply to?

All positions [ ] Only some positions [ ] Only vice positions [ ]

b. What determines the time limits?	Yes	No
(1) Periodic rotation cycle according to agency policy	1	2
(2) Collective bargaining agreement	1	2
(3) Other – Specify: _____		

30. What are some of the reasons why people most commonly leave investigative positions in your agency?

	Does Not Apply	Not Common	Common
a. Collective bargaining agreement	1	2	3
b. Dislike of investigations work	1	2	3
c. Improve promotion potential	1	2	3
d. Job stress	1	2	3
e. Periodic rotation cycle	1	2	3
f. Retirement	1	2	3
g. Other – Specify: _____			

31. **Listed below are a number of criteria and processes that can be used to select investigator supervisors (persons who supervise investigators on a daily basis). For each one, please indicate whether or not it is used in your agency.**

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
a. Criteria:				
(1) Arrest record	1	2	3	4
(2) Education requirements specifically for investigators	1	2	3	4
(3) Investigation skills	1	2	3	4
(4) Minimum number of years of experience	1	2	3	4
(5) Personnel records (commendations, complaints, etc.)	1	2	3	4
(6) Supervisor/staff ratings or evaluations	1	2	3	4
(7) Other – Specify: _____				
b. Processes:				
(1) Civil service exam	1	2	3	4
(2) Oral board interview	1	2	3	4
(3) Peer evaluation	1	2	3	4
(4) Personal interview	1	2	3	4
(5) Tests (writing, verbal ability, etc.)	1	2	3	4
(6) Other – Specify: _____				

32. **Once a decision is made to investigate a case, how is it assigned to an investigator?**

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
a. By rotation	1	2	3	4
b. By size of investigator caseload	1	2	3	4
c. By the experience of the investigator	1	2	3	4
d. By the personal characteristics of the investigator	1	2	3	4
e. By the specialty of the investigator	1	2	3	4
f. Other - Specify: _____				

33. **Who most commonly makes the decision to assign cases to investigators?**

	Yes	No
a. The investigators themselves decide	1	2
b. The immediate supervisor who is an investigator decides	1	2
c. The immediate supervisor who is a uniformed officer decides	1	2
d. Other - Specify: _____		

34. **Are investigators routinely required to complete activity logs (written breakdown of activities and/or amount of time spent on cases) to account for how their time is spent?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly
a. IF YES:			
(1) How frequently?	1	2	3
(2) How often are they reviewed by a supervisor?	1	2	3

35. **Agencies have different ways to evaluate investigators and investigation units. For each item below, please indicate whether or not it is used in your agency.**

Criteria	To Evaluate Investigators		To Evaluate Investigation Units	
	Used	Not Used	Used	Not Used
a. Analysis of unresolved cases	1	2	1	2
b. Arrest statistics	1	2	1	2
c. Audit (review of randomly selected cases)	1	2	1	2
d. Caseload statistics	1	2	1	2
e. Clearance statistics	1	2	1	2
f. Community policing related activities	1	2	1	2
g. Conviction statistics	1	2	1	2
h. Crime pattern detection activities	1	2	1	2
i. Evidence collection/handling	1	2	1	2
j. Hot spot reduction activities	1	2	1	2
k. Incident reduction/prevention activities	1	2	1	2
l. Peer review	1	2	1	2
m. Periodic caseload review	1	2	1	2
n. Periodic written evaluation by supervisor	1	2	1	2
o. Property recovered	1	2	1	2
p. Prosecution statistics	1	2	1	2
q. Report writing	1	2	1	2
r. Success in a major investigation	1	2	1	2

SECTION II – UNIFORMED OFFICERS

36. **Which of the following investigative functions do uniformed officers perform in your agency?**

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
a. Canvass areas for witnesses	1	2	3	4
b. Collect physical evidence from crime scene	1	2	3	4
c. Collect physical evidence from suspect	1	2	3	4
d. Conduct drug field tests	1	2	3	4
e. Conduct records checks	1	2	3	4
f. Conduct surveillance	1	2	3	4
g. Conduct undercover activities	1	2	3	4
h. Coordinate investigations with prosecutors	1	2	3	4
i. Interrogate suspects	1	2	3	4
j. Interview suspects	1	2	3	4
k. Interview victims	1	2	3	4
l. Interview witnesses	1	2	3	4
m. Notify investigation units	1	2	3	4
n. Secure crime scene	1	2	3	4
o. Submit evidence for forensic analysis	1	2	3	4
p. Testify in court	1	2	3	4

37. Within the past five years, has your agency attempted to enhance the role of uniformed officers in investigating crimes? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES, in what way(s)?

	Yes	No
(1) Investigators can refer cases back to officers for follow-up investigation	1	2
(2) Officers conduct complete follow-up investigation as part of a team	1	2
(3) Officers conduct complete follow-up investigation unless complex case	1	2
(4) Officers conduct more investigation at scene prior to handing case to investigator ...	1	2
(5) Officers temporarily assigned to an investigation unit as part of career development ...	1	2

(6) Other – Specify: _____

b. Why did your agency try to enhance the uniformed officer's role in investigating crime?

	Yes	No
(1) To assist in evaluating the work performance of uniformed officers	1	2
(2) To clear more crimes	1	2
(3) To free investigators for major crime investigation	1	2
(4) To improve the morale of uniformed officers	1	2
(5) To improve the quality of reports passed to investigators	1	2
(6) To improve the relationship between uniformed officers and investigators	1	2
(7) To improve uniformed officer awareness of the investigation process	1	2
(8) To meet budgetary constraints	1	2
(9) To shorten case closure time	1	2

(10) Other – Specify: _____

38. Are uniformed officers required to undergo classroom instruction on investigations after basic academy training? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES:

(1) Number of classroom investigations training hours required: ..... ___ ___ ___ **(hours)**

(2) What types of investigations training are provided?

	Yes	No
(a) Crime scene procedures	1	2
(b) Court testimony	1	2
(c) Evidence gathering	1	2
(d) Interview/interrogation	1	2
(e) Report writing	1	2

(f) Other – Specify: _____

(3) Is any of the training documented for liability purposes? **Some [ ] Most [ ] All [ ]**

39. Are uniformed officers required to undergo any refresher or advanced investigations training? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES:

(1) How often? ..... **Monthly [ ] Annually [ ] Other [ ]**

(2) How many officers? ..... **Some [ ] Most [ ] All [ ]**

(3) Is any of the training documented for liability purposes? **Some [ ] Most [ ] All [ ]**

40. **Does your agency have a specific budget item that reserves funding for investigations training for uniformed officers?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. **IF YES,** about how much money is budgeted specifically for training uniformed officers annually? (Includes costs of materials, tuition, travel, per diem, etc., but NOT SALARIES) .$___ ___ ___ , ___ ___ ___

41. **Is the investigative performance of individual uniformed officers evaluated separately in your agency?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

SECTION III – INVESTIGATIVE MANAGEMENT

42. **During the past 12 months have any investigators or uniformed officers in your agency been assigned to any investigations task forces?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. **IF YES:**

(1) How many investigation task forces involved just your agency? ..... ___ ___ ___

(2) How many investigation task forces involved work with other agencies? ___ ___ ___

(3) If other agencies were involved, what types were they?

	Yes	No
(a) Local police agencies	1	2
(b) Sheriff agencies	1	2
(c) State agencies	1	2
(d) Federal agencies	1	2

(e) Other – Specify: _____

b. **What types of single- and/or multi-agency investigation task forces was your agency involved in?**

	Yes	No
(a) A specific case (ex: a single murder)	1	2
(b) A specific case type (ex: a series of murders)	1	2
(c) Drug-related	1	2
(d) Organized crime-related	1	2

(e) Other – Specify: _____

43. **Does your agency have civilians (non-sworn) assigned to investigative support tasks (e.g., evidence collection, crime analysis/intelligence, polygraph, etc.)?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. **IF YES, how many?** ..... ___ ___ ___ **(civilians)**

44. **Has your agency introduced any of the following investigative changes within the past five years?**

Projects	Yes	No
a. A crime analysis/intelligence function	1	2
b. Centralization of investigation units	1	2
c. Decentralization of investigation units	1	2
d. Formal case screening	1	2
e. Improved management and monitoring of continuing investigations	1	2
f. Police/prosecutor liaison programs	1	2
g. Responsibility for problem solving	1	2

h. Other – Specify: _____

45. Listed below are a number of factors that can impact the investigative function. For each factor, please indicate the degree to which it is a problem in your agency.

		Problem			
a.	**Uniformed Officer-related Factors**	**None**	**Slight**	**Moderate**	**Large**
	(1) Extensive uniformed officer role in investigations	1	2	3	4
	(2) Heavy administrative workload	1	2	3	4
	(3) Heavy investigative workload	1	2	3	4
	(4) Heavy uniformed officer supervisor workload	1	2	3	4
	(5) Heavy uniformed officer overall workload	1	2	3	4
	(6) Lack of accountability for investigations	1	2	3	4
	(7) Lack of group cohesion	1	2	3	4
	(8) Lack of investigative expertise	1	2	3	4
	(9) Lack of opportunity for promotion	1	2	3	4
	(10) Lateness of follow-up investigation	1	2	3	4
	(11) Low levels of experience	1	2	3	4
	(12) Low uniformed officer job satisfaction/morale	1	2	3	4
	(13) Not enough overtime for investigations	1	2	3	4
	(14) Not enough training on investigations	1	2	3	4
	(15) Poor communication between uniformed officers	1	2	3	4
	(16) Poor communication between uniformed officers and investigators	1	2	3	4
	(17) Poor investigation skills	1	2	3	4
b.	**Investigator Factors**	**None**	**Slight**	**Moderate**	**Large**
	(1) Heavy administrative workload	1	2	3	4
	(2) Heavy investigative workload	1	2	3	4
	(3) Heavy investigator supervisor workload	1	2	3	4
	(4) Lack of accountability for investigations	1	2	3	4
	(5) Lack of group cohesion	1	2	3	4
	(6) Lack of investigative expertise	1	2	3	4
	(7) Lack of opportunity for promotion	1	2	3	4
	(8) Lateness of follow-up investigation	1	2	3	4
	(9) Low levels of experience	1	2	3	4
	(10) Low investigator job satisfaction/morale	1	2	3	4
	(11) Not enough overtime for investigations	1	2	3	4
	(12) Not enough training on investigations	1	2	3	4
	(13) Poor communication between investigators	1	2	3	4
	(14) Poor communication between investigators and uniformed officers	1	2	3	4
	(15) Poor investigation skills	1	2	3	4
c.	**Productivity Factors**	**None**	**Slight**	**Moderate**	**Large**
	(1) Low arrest rates	1	2	3	4
	(2) Low clearance rates	1	2	3	4
	(3) Low prosecution rates	1	2	3	4
	(4) Low conviction rates	1	2	3	4

(Question #45 continued)

d. Public-related Factors	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
(1) Poor public relations	1	2	3	4
(2) Poor relations with the media (newspapers, etc.)	1	2	3	4
(3) Public mistrust of the police	1	2	3	4
(4) Unauthorized information leaks about investigations	1	2	3	4
(5) Other – Specify: _____				

46. Listed below are a number of different goals that may be associated with the criminal investigation function. For each goal, circle a number to indicate how important your agency considers it to be with regard to criminal investigations.

	Importance			
a. Crime-related Goals	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
(1) Clear cases	1	2	3	4
(2) Collect intelligence about other crimes	1	2	3	4
(3) Convict suspects	1	2	3	4
(4) Investigate all crimes	1	2	3	4
(5) Investigate all serious crimes	1	2	3	4
(6) Prevent crime	1	2	3	4
(7) Prosecute suspects	1	2	3	4
(8) Protect victims and witnesses	1	2	3	4
(9) Reduce crime	1	2	3	4
(10) Solve problems	1	2	3	4
(11) Other – Specify: _____				

b. Other Goals	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
(1) Citizen satisfaction	1	2	3	4
(2) Inform the community	1	2	3	4
(3) Maintain community support	1	2	3	4
(4) Plan/implement crime prevention strategies	1	2	3	4
(5) Prevent crime	1	2	3	4
(6) Protect the public	1	2	3	4
(7) Provide support/feedback to victims	1	2	3	4
(8) Recover/return property	1	2	3	4
(9) Secure justice in the community	1	2	3	4
(10) Other – Specify: _____				

47. For follow-up investigation of unsolved crimes, does your agency use case solvability factors to determine whether cases will be assigned? ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES:

(1) Are the case solvability factors in writing? ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

(2) How strictly are they applied? ..... **Strictly [ ] Moderately [ ] Loosely [ ]**

(3) What types of crimes are they used for? ... **All types [ ] Some types – Specify:** _____

48. What is the total number and percent of Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) Index crimes reported and cleared by your agency during 1 January – 31 December, 1998? If 1998 data is not available, please complete for the most recent year for which the data is available and indicate that year here: 19 __ __.
If you prefer, you may staple a copy of the data to the questionnaire rather than writing it below.

UCR Part I Crime Category	(1) Number of Crimes Reported	(2) Percent Cleared
a. Murder/non-negligent manslaughter	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%
b. Forcible rape	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%
c. Robbery	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%
d. Aggravated assault	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%
e. Burglary	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%
f. Larceny-theft	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%
g. Motor vehicle theft	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%
h. Arson	___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___%

49. Does your agency have any innovative investigative programs or policies that are showing enough success or promise that other agencies would be interested in them? ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES, briefly describe these programs in the categories listed below:
(1) Organizational: _____
(2) Personnel: _____
(3) Investigator Roles: _____
(4) Investigation Management: _____
(5) Records/Technology: _____
(6) Evidence Management: _____
(7) Investigative Effectiveness: _____

50. Does your agency have any plans for major changes in the investigation function during the next one to three years? ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. IF YES, briefly describe any planned changes in the categories listed below:
(1) Organizational: _____
(2) Personnel: _____
(3) Investigator Roles: _____
(4) Investigation Management: _____
(5) Records/Technology: _____
(6) Evidence Management: _____
(7) Investigative Effectiveness: _____

51. In your agency how do investigators most commonly prepare their reports?

	Yes	No
a. Handwritten/typed	1	2
b. Tape recorded and then transcribed by investigator	1	2
c. Tape recorded and then transcribed by others	1	2
d. Typed on computer for data base entry	1	2

52. How are investigation reports filed in your agency?

	Yes	No
a. Filed manually	1	2
b. Entered into a computer data base	1	2

53. How are investigation reports monitored?

	Yes	No
a. Interim reports required if case remains open after a specified period of time	1	2
b. Reports are reviewed by a supervisor before being filed if no prosecutorial action is anticipated	1	2
c. Reports are reviewed by a supervisor if prosecutorial action is anticipated	1	2
d. Other - Specify: _____		

54. How is the progress of investigations monitored? For each item below, indicate if it is not monitored, or whether it is tracked manually or by computer.

	Not Monitored	Monitored Manually	Monitored By Computer
a. Complaint	1	2	3
b. Case referred to investigations unit	1	2	3
c. Investigator reports/efforts	1	2	3
d. Laboratory analysis of evidence	1	2	3
e. Referral to prosecutor	1	2	3
f. Prosecutor disposition	1	2	3
g. Court disposition	1	2	3

55. In some jurisdictions recording of police-witness and/or -victim interviewing is legally required. Is this true in your agency's jurisdiction? Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES, how are you required to record interviews?

	Yes	No
(1) Only written recording (by stenographer, court reporter) is required	1	2
(2) Only audio is required	1	2
(3) Both audio and visual recording is required	1	2

56. In some jurisdictions recording of police-suspect interrogations is legally required. Is this true in your agency's jurisdiction? Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES, how are you required to record interrogations?

	Yes	No
(1) Only written recording (by stenographer, court reporter) is required	1	2
(2) Only audio is required	1	2
(3) Both audio and visual recording is required	1	2

b. Have you had cases that were denied prosecution or which did not go to trial because the required interrogation recording was not available? Yes [ ] No [ ]

57. Even if not legally required, do your investigators routinely record by audio or audio/visual means interrogation of suspects? Yes [ ] No [ ]

58. Please indicate the extent to which victims are kept apprised of investigations by your agency.

		Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
a.	Notify victim of arrest of a suspect	1	2	3	4
b.	Notify victim if case is cleared	1	2	3	4
c.	Notify victim if a case is no longer actively investigated	1	2	3	4
d.	Notify victim of case prosecution status	1	2	3	4
e.	Notify victim of court disposition	1	2	3	4
f.	Other - Specify: _____				

59. Please indicate the extent to which each of the items listed below have posed legal problems during the conduct of investigations in your agency during the past 5 years.

Item		Problem: None	Slight	Moderate	Large
a.	Arrests	1	2	3	4
b.	Coercion	1	2	3	4
c.	Corruption	1	2	3	4
d.	Covert listening devices	1	2	3	4
e.	Interview/interrogation	1	2	3	4
f.	Relations with police unions	1	2	3	4
g.	Relations with the media	1	2	3	4
h.	Searches	1	2	3	4
i.	Surveillance	1	2	3	4
j.	Sting operations	1	2	3	4
k.	Undercover activities	1	2	3	4
l.	Use of informants	1	2	3	4
m.	Other – Specify: _____				

60. What is the extent of your agency's need for <u>additional funding</u> in the areas listed below in order to <u>improve investigative effectiveness</u>?

Item		None	Slight	Moderate	Large
a.	Equipment (e.g., vehicles, surveillance)	1	2	3	4
b.	Evidence collection issues	1	2	3	4
c.	Evidence processing (e.g., crime labs, DNA analysis)	1	2	3	4
d.	Funding for informants	1	2	3	4
e.	Investigative operations (e.g., task forces, stings)	1	2	3	4
f.	Personnel	1	2	3	4
g.	Technology (e.g., computers, software)	1	2	3	4
h.	Training	1	2	3	4
i.	Other – Specify: _____				

61. **Does your agency meet regularly with other criminal justice agencies to share information regarding investigative activities?** ..... **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. **IF YES, what types of agencies?**

	Yes	No
(1) Local police agencies	1	2
(2) Sheriff agencies	1	2
(3) State agencies	1	2
(4) Federal agencies	1	2

(5) Other – Specify: _____

SECTION IV– INVESTIGATIVE EFFECTIVENESS

62. **In your agency, how important are clearance rates in judging individual investigator performance?**

No importance [ ] Low importance [ ] Moderate importance [ ] High importance [ ]

63. **In your agency, how important are clearance rates in judging the overall performance of investigative units?**

No importance [ ] Low importance [ ] Moderate importance [ ] High importance [ ]

64. **It has been shown that in many police agencies in the U.S., clearance rates for serious crimes have declined. Has your agency, in general, experienced such a decline in the past ten years?** **Yes [ ] No [ ]**

a. **IF YES, in your agency's experience, to what extent have the following items contributed to this decline?**

	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
(1) Changes in the role of investigators	1	2	3	4
(2) Changes in the role of patrol officers	1	2	3	4
(3) Court rulings that restrict admissibility of evidence	1	2	3	4
(4) Court rulings that restrict police interrogation practice	1	2	3	4
(5) Decline in work ethic of investigators	1	2	3	4
(6) Evidence-related problems (collection, analysis, funding, etc.)	1	2	3	4
(7) Implementation of community policing	1	2	3	4
(8) Improper selection of investigators	1	2	3	4
(9) Investigations are passed from one shift to another	1	2	3	4
(10) Lack of public help in police investigations	1	2	3	4
(11) Lack of time to investigate cases	1	2	3	4
(12) Lack of victim cooperation	1	2	3	4
(13) Lack of witness cooperation	1	2	3	4
(14) Not enough training for investigators	1	2	3	4
(15) Organizational changes in your agency	1	2	3	4
(16) Poor initial report preparation by patrol officers	1	2	3	4
(17) Poor patrol officer/ detective relationship	1	2	3	4
(18) Prosecutors who are reluctant to accept cases	1	2	3	4
(19) Technology-related problems (computerized data bases/files, etc.)	1	2	3	4
(20) Too many crimes to investigate	1	2	3	4

65. Even if your agency has not experienced a decline in clearance rates, for each of the items below please indicate the degree to which you believe that doing these for investigators in your agency would help to improve clearance rates?

Item	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
a. Assignment of investigators to work in pairs	1	2	3	4
b. Better public relations	1	2	3	4
c. Closer supervision of investigative efforts	1	2	3	4
d. Closer working relationships with uniformed officers	1	2	3	4
e. Formal refresher training	1	2	3	4
f. Formal training upon appointment as investigator	1	2	3	4
g. Give patrol officers more investigative responsibility	1	2	3	4
h. Give patrol officers less investigative responsibility	1	2	3	4
i. Further investigative specialization	1	2	3	4
j. Improvements in evidence-related areas (collection, analysis, funding, etc.)	1	2	3	4
k. Improvements in technology-related areas (computerized data bases/files, etc.)	1	2	3	4
l. Improvements in police/prosecutor relationships	1	2	3	4
m. Improvements in investigations management (case screening, reports, etc.)	1	2	3	4
n. Increase in investigator manpower	1	2	3	4
o. More computerized investigative files	1	2	3	4
p. More emphasis on clearance rates for evaluation	1	2	3	4
q. More frequent meetings among investigators	1	2	3	4
r. More time to work unsolved cases	1	2	3	4
s. Organizational restructuring (decentralization/centralization, etc.)	1	2	3	4
t. Reduction in investigator case load	1	2	3	4

66. Does your local prosecutor's office have its own investigative staff? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES, are any of the prosecutor's investigators persons who are assigned from your agency? Mark (X) only one.

Yes, all of them [ ] Yes, some of them [ ] None [ ]

67. For each of the crime types listed below, indicate the extent to which a representative of your local prosecutor's office would usually be consulted about an investigation prior to an arrest, other than for the purpose of obtaining a warrant.

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
a. Homicide	1	2	3	4
b. Major drug case	1	2	3	4
c. Multiple jurisdiction investigations	1	2	3	4
d. Official misconduct or corruption	1	2	3	4
e. Organized crime	1	2	3	4
f. Serious personal crimes	1	2	3	4
g. Serious property crimes	1	2	3	4
h. White collar crime	1	2	3	4

i. Other – Specify: _____

68. For each of the crime types listed below, indicate the extent to which a representative of your local prosecutor's office would assist in an investigation after an arrest, other than for the purpose of obtaining a warrant.

		Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
a.	Homicide	1	2	3	4
b.	Major drug case	1	2	3	4
c.	Multiple jurisdiction investigations	1	2	3	4
d.	Official misconduct or corruption	1	2	3	4
e.	Organized crime	1	2	3	4
f.	Serious personal crimes	1	2	3	4
g.	Serious property crimes	1	2	3	4
h.	White collar crime	1	2	3	4
i.	Other – Specify: _____				

69. Does your agency have a regular and continuing organizational relationship with your prosecutor's office aside from that required for warrants and arrests? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES, what type of relationship?

		Yes	No
(1)	Your agency has a police/prosecutor liaison office(r)	1	2
(2)	Prosecutors are available on a regular basis for case coordination and advice	1	2
(3)	Prosecutors are assigned to provide legal support on major investigations	1	2
(4)	Prosecutors are assigned as part of investigation teams	1	2
(5)	Regular periodic meetings are held with prosecutors	1	2
(6)	Other – Specify: _____		

70. Consider each of the factors listed below and indicate the degree to which each has been a problem in your agency's relationship with your prosecutor's office.

			Problem		
	Factor	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
a.	Insufficient advice regarding legal issues	1	2	3	4
b.	Insufficient feedback from prosecutor on cases not prosecuted	1	2	3	4
c.	Insufficient notice of prosecutor needs	1	2	3	4
d.	Poor communication between investigators and prosecutor	1	2	3	4
e.	Problems regarding court scheduling	1	2	3	4
f.	Prosecutor indifference to investigations	1	2	3	4
g.	Prosecutor interference with investigations	1	2	3	4
h.	Prosecutor non-responsiveness to agency requests for support	1	2	3	4
i.	Prosecutor pressure on agency investigations	1	2	3	4
j.	Prosecutor release of investigative information to the media	1	2	3	4
k.	Requests to conduct unnecessary investigative leads	1	2	3	4
l.	Other – Specify: _____				

SECTION V – INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT/GENERAL

71. Does your agency employ any evidence technicians (persons specifically designated to collect evidence at crime scenes)?

Yes [ ] IF YES, continue on to Question 72

No [ ] IF NO, SKIP to Question 74

72. How many evidence technicians are authorized full-time, part-time, or as an additional duty?

	(1) Full-time	(2) Part-time	(3) Additional Duty
a. Number of sworn officers	___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___
b. Number of non-sworn (civilians) ...	___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___	___ ___ ___

73. Are people who are designated as evidence technicians in your agency required to have any specialized experience or training? ..... **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]

a. IF YES, what type?

	Yes	No
(1) A college degree	1	2
(2) Investigative experience	1	2
(3) Some college education	1	2
(4) Specialized in-house training	1	2
(5) Specialized training outside of your agency	1	2
(6) Sworn officer experience	1	2
(7) Other – Specify: _____		

74. When your investigators make use of routine crime laboratory services, what type of laboratory is generally used?

	Yes	No
a. Your agency's own crime laboratory	1	2
b. A crime laboratory that is part of another local/county police agency	1	2
c. A crime laboratory that is part of another state/federal police agency	1	2
d. A state laboratory not part of a police organization (e.g., public health)	1	2

75. How would the investigative staff in your agency describe their access to routine crime laboratory services? Mark (X) only one.

a. Readily available in all cases ..... [ ]
b. Readily available but only in serious cases [ ]
c. Available but difficult to get timely access ... [ ]
d. Access is limited, hindering some investigations [ ]

76. When your investigators make use of routine crime laboratory services, how would they describe the average turn-around time for analysis other than for drug/alcohol cases? Mark (X) only one.

a. Timely [ ] b. Somewhat slow [ ] c. Very slow [ ] d. Completely inadequate [ ]

77. What is the approximate number of cases that your agency has cleared as a result of DNA analysis that probably would not have been cleared otherwise? ..... ___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___

78. **Does your agency currently have any unsolved cases that are "backlogged" because there is no DNA analysis readily available?** ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. **IF YES, why is DNA analysis not readily available?**

	Yes	No
(1) Lack of funding	1	2
(2) Lack of qualified personnel	1	2

(3) Other – Specify: _____

b. **About how many cases are awaiting DNA analysis?** ..... ___ ___ ___

c. **About how much funding is needed to conduct DNA analysis for all of these cases?** ... $___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___

d. **About how much funding is needed to conduct DNA analysis for cases that are judged to be in critical need of DNA analysis?** ..... $___ ___ ___, ___ ___ ___

79. **When your agency uses the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS), who provides the service?**

	Yes	No
a. Your agency's own AFIS	1	2
b. A state administered AFIS	1	2
c. A federally administered AFIS	1	2

d. Other – Specify: _____

80. **Are the types of records listed below available to investigators in your agency in manual or computer form? Circle all that apply.**

Records	Not Readily Available	Available Manually	Available on Computer
a. Crime reports	1	2	3
b. Arrest reports	1	2	3
c. Case disposition	1	2	3
d. Prosecution disposition	1	2	3
e. Court dispositions	1	2	3
f. Summary crime statistics	1	2	3

81. **Please identify the files that are maintained by your agency to support investigations. Circle all that apply.**

Files	Not Readily Available	Available Manually	Available on Computer
a. Fingerprints	1	2	3
b. Known offender	1	2	3
c. M.O. file	1	2	3
d. Mug shot	1	2	3
e. Organized crime intelligence	1	2	3
f. Narcotics intelligence	1	2	3
g. Sex offender	1	2	3
h. Stolen property	1	2	3
i. Stolen vehicles	1	2	3

j. Other – Specify: _____

82. Do uniformed officers and/or investigators have daily access to any of the following? Circle all that apply.

Item	Uniformed Officers	Investigators
a. Cell telephones	1	2
b. E-mail	1	2
c. Internet	1	2
d. Pagers	1	2
e. Voice mail	1	2

83. Within the next year, does your agency plan to upgrade or enhance any of the following?

	Yes	No
a. Computers in vehicles	1	2
b. Crime analysis capabilities	1	2
c. Crime report and case disposition files (reference Question 80 above)	1	2
d. Investigative support files (reference Question 81 above)	1	2
e. Personal communication devices (reference Question 82 above)	1	2
f. Other – Specify: _____		

84. In your agency's view is investigations work in general misrepresented in the popular media (television, movies, etc.)? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. IF YES, to what degree do you think investigations work is misrepresented in the following areas?

Factor	None	Slight	Moderate	Large
(1) Interrogations	1	2	3	4
(2) Investigator discretion	1	2	3	4
(3) Investigator intellectual ability	1	2	3	4
(4) Investigator physical ability	1	2	3	4
(5) Relationships with supervisors	1	2	3	4
(6) Relationships with suspects	1	2	3	4
(7) Relationships with the public	1	2	3	4
(8) Relationships with uniformed officers	1	2	3	4
(9) Relationships with victims and/or witnesses	1	2	3	4
(10) Use of excessive force	1	2	3	4
(11) Use of informants	1	2	3	4
(12) Other – Specify: _____				

85. Some agencies that respond to this questionnaire may be considered for additional research regarding criminal investigations. This may involve interviews with agency officials, case file reviews, observations of investigative activities, or collection of other data for analysis. Would your agency be willing to consider participation in such projects? ..... Yes [ ] No [ ]

86. Within the past 5 years, to what extent has research in the areas identified below directly influenced your agency policy and/or practice regarding the criminal investigation process?

		None	Slight	Moderate	Large
a.	Case screening	1	2	3	4
b.	Computerized data bases (e.g., AFIS)	1	2	3	4
c.	Criminal investigations management	1	2	3	4
d.	Decentralization/centralization of investigators	1	2	3	4
e.	Forensic science applications (e.g., DNA)	1	2	3	4
f.	Investigator selection techniques	1	2	3	4
g.	Relationships between investigations and community policing	1	2	3	4
h.	Team policing	1	2	3	4
i.	Other – Specify: _____				

87. If additional research on the criminal investigation process were carried out, what priority would you give to each of the following areas?

Research		None	Low	Moderate	High
a.	Case screening	1	2	3	4
b.	Clearance rates	1	2	3	4
c.	Crime intelligence/mapping/information systems	1	2	3	4
d.	Decentralization/centralization of investigators	1	2	3	4
e.	Generalization/specialization of investigator roles	1	2	3	4
f.	Integration of community policing and investigations	1	2	3	4
g.	Interagency cooperation	1	2	3	4
h.	Investigator relationships within communities	1	2	3	4
i.	Investigator selection	1	2	3	4
j.	Investigator training	1	2	3	4
k.	Management of continuing investigations	1	2	3	4
l.	Performance evaluation of investigators	1	2	3	4
m.	Police/prosecutor relations	1	2	3	4
n.	Prosecution and conviction rates	1	2	3	4
o.	Technological improvements in investigations management	1	2	3	4
p.	Technological improvements in investigative techniques	1	2	3	4
q.	The investigative role of patrol officers	1	2	3	4
r.	Other – Specify: _____				

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE BE SURE THE ADDRESS BLOCK ON THE FRONT IS COMPLETED AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE TO:

FRANK HORVATH, Ph.D., Professor
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
School of Criminal Justice
122 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824

Tel: 517/432-4658
Fax: 517/432-1787
email: ciol@pilot.msu.edu
WEBSITE: www.ciol.org

FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION ON THE RESULTS OF THIS SURVEY AND WHAT OTHER AGENCIES ARE DOING REGARDING THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION PROCESS, VISIT OUR WEBSITE (www.ciol.org).

U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

National Institute of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20531

1 SEP 1999

Dear Law Enforcement Administrator:

The National Institute of Justice has recently celebrated its 30th Anniversary. During those three decades, the Institute has promoted research and disseminated findings to practitioners and policy makers. We are proud to continue building new partnerships between researchers and practitioners where they work closely in developing important and useful knowledge.

The National Institute of Justice is supportive of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University in its re-examination of how law enforcement agencies carryout their investigative function. This is the first national re-examination of the investigative function in more than twenty years. The study is designed to provide a current assessment of the criminal investigative process as well as generate information necessary to inform police and other public decision-makers.

On behalf of the National Institute of Justice I ask for your participation in this important and timely study.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Travis
Director
National Institute of Jusitice

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE • SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
BAKER HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1118

December 27, 1999

Dear Law Enforcement Administrator:

In October we sent you a questionnaire that was part of a survey designed to collect information about the criminal investigation process in law enforcement agencies across the country. The survey is sponsored by the National Institute of Justice, and the questionnaire requests information from agencies that conduct criminal investigations as well as those that do not.

Because we have not yet received a completed questionnaire from your agency, we are sending a second copy in the event that the first one has been misplaced.

We want the survey to be as complete and accurate as possible, and for that reason we would be extremely grateful if you would take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. Of course, if you have already returned the first copy of the questionnaire, you need not return this one.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Frank Horvath, Ph.D.
Professor
Michigan State University
School of Criminal Justice
122 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
Tel: 517/432-4658
Fax: 517/432-1787
E-mail: ciol@pilot.msu.edu
Web Site: www.ciol.org

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE • SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
BAKER HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1118

February 15, 2000

Dear Law Enforcement Administrator:

In October, and again in December, of 1999, we sent you a questionnaire designed to collect information about the criminal investigation process in law enforcement agencies across the country. The survey is sponsored by the National Institute of Justice of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The questionnaire requests information from agencies that conduct criminal investigations **as well as those that do not**. Because we have not yet received a completed questionnaire from your agency, we are sending you a third copy.

We want the survey to be as complete and accurate as possible, and for that reason we would be extremely grateful if you would take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. Of course, if you have already returned a previous copy, you need not return this one. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Frank Horvath, Ph.D.
Professor
Michigan State University
School of Criminal Justice
122 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
Tel: 517/432-4658
Fax: 517/432-1787
E-mail: ciol@pilot.msu.edu
Web Site: www.ciol.org

APPENDIX B

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS AND MISSING DATA FOR QUESTIONS IN THE SURVEY

APPENDIX B

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS AND MISSING DATA FOR QUESTIONS IN THE SURVEY

Question Number	Total Number of Respondents	Missing Data
3	1746 (Yes-1460) (No-286)	---
4-Male	1437	23
Female	1126	334
Total	1386	74
4a	1376	84
4b	1366	94
5	1435	25
6	1430	30
7f	1320	140
7g	1238	222
7c	1237	223
7a	1209	251
7e	1179	281
7d	1185	275
7b	1144	316
8	1413	47
9	1429	31
10	1437	23
11a	967	493
11b	646	814
11c	607	853
11d	594	866
12a3	1449	11
12a4	1445	15
12a5	1430	30
12a2	1438	22
12a1	1449	11
12a6	1435	25
12b3	1433	27
12b2	1439	21
12b1	1428	32
12c2	1438	22
12c1	1448	12
12c3	1443	17
12c6	1442	18
12c4	1444	16
12c5	1437	23
13a3	1427	33
13a7	1409	51
13a5	1427	33
13a4	1431	29
13a2	1414	46
13a1	1410	50
13a6	1409	51
13b4	1394	66
13b2	1404	56
13b3	1372	88
13b5	1343	117
13b1	1356	104
14	1455	5
15	1444	16
16a	1361	99
16b	1417	43
16c	1398	62
16d	1401	59
17	1432	28
18	1430	30
19	1428	32
20	1445	15
21	1429	31
22a	1416	44
22b	1419	41
22c	1412	48
22d	1380	80
23a	1348	112
23b	966	494
23c	786	674
24	1452	8
25f	1379	81
25a	1388	72
25c	1375	85
25e	1340	120
25d	1348	112
25f	1375	85
26a	1433	27
26b	1161	299
26d	1123	337
26c	1124	336
26e	1103	357
27g	1437	23
27c	1437	23
27h	1418	42
27a	1425	35
27e	1411	49
27d	1414	46
27b	1418	42
27f	1418	42
29	1438	22
30c	1378	82
30f	1393	67

30e	1375	85
30d	1369	91
30b	1366	94
30a	1360	100
31a6	1388	72
31a3	1390	70
31a5	1388	72
31a4	1392	68
31a2	1383	77
31a1	1378	82
31b4	1369	91
31b2	1367	93
31b3	1345	115
31b5	1335	125
31b1	1333	127
32e	1380	80
32c	1371	89
32b	1379	81
32a	1365	95
32d	1363	97
33b	1349	111
33a	1282	178
33c	1226	234
34	1399	61
35e invr	1401	59
35r invr	1393	67
35d invr	1399	61
35b invr	1394	66
35m invr	1397	63
35a invr	1385	75
35o invr	1387	73
35n invr	1397	63
35q invr	1396	64
35I invr	1394	66
35k invr	1387	73
35h invr	1385	75
35j invr	1385	75
35p invr	1388	72
35c invr	1385	75
35g invr	1391	69
35f invr	1384	76
35l invr	1388	72
35e unit	818	99
35r unit	813	104
35d unit	819	98
35b unit	815	102
35m unit	813	104
35a unit	812	105
35o unit	812	105
35n unit	807	110
35q unit	809	108
35I unit	813	104
35k unit	812	105

35h unit	813	104
35j unit	813	104
35p unit	813	104
35c unit	811	106
35g unit	815	102
35f unit	814	103
35l unit	803	114
36n	1722	24
36p	1730	16
36m	1730	16
36e	1725	21
36k	1723	23
36l	1721	25
36a	1722	24
36j	1725	21
36d	1722	24
36c	1723	23
36b	1721	25
36i	1723	23
36o	1722	24
36h	1719	27
36f	1724	22
36g	1720	26
37	1699	47
38	1721	25
39	1668	78
40	1706	40
41	1665	81
42	1728	18
43	1719	27
44e	1427	33
44a	1416	44
44f	1416	44
44g	1403	57
44d	1409	51
44b	1408	52
44c	1408	52
45a3	1716	30
45a5	1713	33
45a2	1718	28
45a4	1708	38
45a9	1710	36
45a13	1713	33
45a14	1714	32
45a8	1712	34
45a11	1710	36
45a16	1701	45
45a10	1708	38
45a12	1710	36
45a15	1709	37
45a1	1714	32
45a17	1715	39
45a6	1715	31

45a7	1707	39
45b2	1448	12
45b3	1444	16
45b1	1448	12
45b14	1446	14
45b11	1445	15
45b7	1444	16
45b8	1448	12
45b12	1446	14
45b4	1445	15
45b9	1445	15
45b6	1446	14
45b10	1448	12
45b5	1449	11
45b13	1445	15
45b15	1446	14
45c3	1706	40
45c4	1706	40
45b2	1708	38
45c1	1704	42
45d3	1709	37
45d2	1709	37
45d4	1706	40
45d1	1709	37
46a5	1713	33
46a7	1714	32
46a1	1712	34
46a3	1712	34
46a8	1712	34
46a9	1712	34
46a10	1681	65
46a2	1714	32
46a6	1713	33
45a4	1712	34
46b6	1712	34
46b1	1715	31
46b3	1712	34
46b8	1709	37
46b9	1694	52
46b7	1708	38
46b2	1714	32
46b5	1709	37
46b4	1712	34
47	1442	18
49	1662	84
50	1680	66
51d	1364	96
51a	1286	174
51c	1291	169
51b	1204	256
52a	1553	193
52b	1637	109
53a	1596	150

53b	1658	88
53c	1634	112
55	1707	39
56	1693	53
57	1700	46
58a	1710	36
58b	1707	39
58c	1701	45
58d	1701	45
58e	1690	56
59h	1699	47
59l	1688	58
59g	1703	43
59e	1703	43
59a	1698	48
59f	1698	48
59i	1702	44
59k	1699	47
59j	1696	50
59b	1705	41
59c	1700	46
59d	1699	47
60f	1717	29
60a	1720	26
60g	1720	26
60h	1708	38
60c	1714	32
60e	1715	31
60b	1716	30
60d	1716	30
61	1702	44
62	1703	43
63	1666	80
64	1650	96
65n	1634	112
65k	1635	111
65f	1628	118
65r	1633	113
65d	1633	113
65o	1631	115
65t	1624	122
65j	1634	112
65e	1639	117
65l	1631	115
65g	1626	120
65c	1641	105
65i	1635	111
65b	1641	105
65m	1630	116
65q	1630	116
65a	1636	110
65p	1625	121
65s	1622	124

65h	1612	134
66	1712	34
67d	1684	62
67a	1683	63
67e	1671	75
67c	1683	63
67b	1686	60
67f	1688	58
67h	1688	58
67g	1689	57
68a	1690	56
68d	1683	63
68e	1670	76
68b	1687	59
68c	1682	64
68f	1687	59
68h	1650	96
68g	1686	60
69	1672	74
70b	1698	48
70c	1697	49
70e	1698	48
70d	1698	48
70f	1698	48
70a	1698	48
70h	1695	51
70k	1688	58
70g	1692	54
70i	1694	52
70j	1693	53
71	1715	31
73	808	938
74c	1385	75
74b	1333	127
74a	1351	109
74d	1291	169
75	1442	18
76	1446	14
78	1687	59
79b	1546	200
79a	1421	325
79c	1337	409
83a	1694	52
83b	1677	69
83d	1677	69
83e	1679	67
83c	1673	73
84	1584	162
85	1645	101
86b	1688	58
86e	1680	66
86c	1682	64
86g	1688	58

86a	1678	68
86h	1669	77
86f	1677	69
86d	1677	69
87p	1660	86
87j	1662	84
87o	1659	87
87g	1663	83
87c	1656	90
87k	1661	85
87q	1656	90
87h	1655	91
87m	1660	86
87b	1654	92
87i	1659	87
87l	1655	91
87f	1663	83
87n	1658	88
87a	1649	97
87e	1654	92
87d	1654	92

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Bar Association. (1973). The urban police function. Chicago: American Bar Association.

Blakey, G. R., Goldstock, R., & Rogovin, C. H. (1978). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bloch, P. B., & Bell, J. (1976). Managing investigations: The Rochester system. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Brandl, S., & Horvath, F. (1991). Crime-victim evaluation of police investigative performance. Journal of Criminal Justice, 19, 293-305.

Briggs, J., & Goldberg, L. (2000 November). DNA data shift is due. Baltimore Sun, p. 1.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1999). Law enforcement management and administrative statistics, 1997: Data for individual state and local agencies with 100 or more officers. (Report No. NCJ 175712). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1988). Report to the nation on crime and justice. (Report No. NCJ-105506). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Cavanaugh, D. P., Boyum, D., & Nambiar, J. (1993). Relations between increases in the certainty, severity and celerity of punishment for drug crimes and reductions in the level of crime. Washington, DC: BOTEC Analysis Corporation.

Chaiken, J. M. (1975). The criminal investigation process Volume II: Survey of municipal and county police departments (R-1777-DOJ). Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Chaiken, J. M., Greenwood, P. W., & Petersilia, J. (1977). The criminal investigation process: A summary report. Policy Analysis, 3(2), 187-217.

Chaiken, J., Greenwood, P. W., & Petersilia, J. (1976). The criminal investigation process: A summary report. In National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice A dialog on research findings (pp. Part IV 1-48). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Chappell, D., Gordon, R., & Moore, R. (1982). Criminal investigation: A survey of Canadian police departments. Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Cohen, B., & Chaiken, J. (1987). Investigators who perform well. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Cole, G. F. (1995). The American system of criminal justice (7th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Cordner, G. W. (1989). Police agency size and investigative effectiveness. Journal of Criminal Justice, 17(3), 145-155.

Eck, J. E. (1992). Criminal investigation. In G. W. Cordner & D. C. Hale (Eds.), What works in policing? Operations and administration examined (pp. 31-52). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Eck, J. E. (1979). Managing case assignments: The burglary investigation decision model replication. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Eck, J. E. (1999). Problem-solving detectives: Some thoughts on their scarcity [On-line]. When the Heat's On: Leadership Sessions to Support Problem Oriented Policing, May 1999 , Abstract from NCJRS , File NCJ 180512.

Eck, J. E. (1996). Rethinking detective management. In Larry T. Hoover (Ed.), Quantifying Quality in Policing (pp. 167-184). Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Eck, J. E. (1983). Solving crimes: The investigation of burglary and robbery. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Eck, J. E., & Spelman, W. (1987). Who ya gonna call? The police as problem-busters. Crime & Delinquency, 33(1), 31-52.

Edwards, T. D. (1993). State police basic training programs: An assessment of course content and instructional methodology. American Journal of Police, 12(4), 23-45.

Elliott, J. F. (1978). Crime control teams: An alternative to the conventional operational procedure of investigating crimes. Journal of Criminal Justice, 6, 11-23.

Ericson, R. V. (1981). Making crime: A study of detective work. Toronto: Butterworths.

Forst, B. (1995). Prosecution and sentencing. In James Q. Wilson & Joan Petersilia (Eds), Crime (2nd ed.,). San Francisco: ISC Press.

Gaines, L. K., Lewis, B., & Swanagin, R. (1983). Case screening in criminal investigations: A case study of robberies. Police Studies, 6(2), 22-29.

Gates, D. F., & Knowles, L. (1976 July). An evaluation of the Rand corporation's analysis of the criminal investigation process. The Police Chief, pp. 20-24, 74-75.

Gay, W. G., Day, H. T., & Woodward, J. P. (1977). National evaluation program phase I summary report - Neighborhood team policing. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Geller, W. A. (1991). Criminal investigations. In W. A. Geller (Ed.), Local government police management 3rd ed., (pp. 131-158). Washington, DC: International City Management Association.

Glick, B. D., & Riccio, L. J. (1979). Productivity of detectives: A study of the investigative function of police juvenile units. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 7(2), 138-154.

Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving policing: A problem-oriented approach. Crime & Delinquency, 25(2), 237-258.

Greenberg, B., Elliott, C. V., Kraft, L. P., & Proctor, H. S. (1977). Felony investigation decision model: An analysis of investigative elements of information. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Greenberg, B., Yu, O. S., & Lang, K. I. (1973). Enhancement of the investigative function. Volume I: Analysis and conclusions. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute.

Greenberg, I., & Wasserman, R. (1979). Managing criminal investigations. Washington, DC: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Greenwood, P. W., Chaiken, J. M., & Petersilia, J. (1976 December). Response to - An evaluation of the Rand corporation's analysis of the criminal investigation process. The Police Chief, pp. 62-71.

Greenwood, P. W., Chaiken, J. M., & Petersilia, J. (1977). The criminal investigation process. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Greenwood, P. W., Chaiken, J. M., Petersilia, J., & Prusoff, L. (1975). The criminal investigation process Volume III: Observations and analysis (R-1778-DOJ). Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Greenwood, P. W., & Petersilia, J. (1975). The criminal investigation process Volume I: Summary and policy implications . (Report No. R-1776-DOJ). Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Healey, P. P. (1994). Detective training for the state of Michigan law enforcement agencies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Horvath, F., Bucqueroux, B., & Meesig, R. (1997). Community policing and the police criminal investigation process. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Louisville, Kentucky.

Horvath, F., Lee, Y. H., & Meesig, R. (2001). [A content analysis of criminal justice periodicals in the last ten years: Researchers' attention to the criminal investigation process]. Unpublished raw data.

Horvath, F., & Meesig, R. (1998). A content analysis of textbooks on criminal investigation: An evaluative comparison to empirical research findings on the investigative process and the role of forensic evidence. Journal of Forensic Science, 43(1), 125-132.

Horvath, F., & Meesig, R. (1996). The criminal investigation process and the role of forensic evidence: A review of empirical findings. Journal of Forensic Science, 41(6), 963-969.

Horvath, F., Orns, E., & Siegel, J. (1998). Prosecutorial use of physical and non-physical evidence in felonies. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Jefferis, E. S., Frank, J., Smith, B. W., Novak, K. J., & Travis, L. F. (1999). An examination of the productivity and perceived effectiveness of drug task forces. Police Quarterly, 1(3), 85-107.

Karchmer, C. L., & Eck, J. E. (1998). Proactive investigations evaluation. Larry T. Hoover (Editor), Police Program Evaluation (pp. 127-165). Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Beatty, D., & Smith-Howley, S. (1998). The rights of crime victims--Does legal protection make a difference? (Report No. NCJ 173839). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Kirkpatrick, M. D., & Loudermilk II, J. A. (2000). Solving cold cases with digital fingerprints. Sheriff, 53(4), 14.

Kuykendall, J. (1986). The municipal police detective: An historical analysis. Criminology, 24(1), 175-201.

Lange, T., & Vanatter, P. (1997). Evidence dismissed: The inside story of the police investigation of O.J. Simpson. New York: Pocket Books.

Langworthy, R. H., & Travis III, L. P. (1999). Policing in America: a balance of forces (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Law Enforcement News. (2000 October). Detectives may be an endangered species for one Iowa department. Author, pp. 3, 8.

Maguire, K., & Pastore, A. L. (Eds.). (2001) Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics [Online]. [Web Page]. URL Available: http://www.albany.edu./sourcebook [2001, May].

Manning, P. K. (1992). Economic rhetoric and policing reform. (Report No. Criminal Justice Research Bulletin). Huntsville, TX: Sam Houston State University.

Meadows, R. J. (1987). An assessment of police entry-level training in the United States: Conformity or conflict with the police role? In D. B. Kennedy & R. J. Homant (Eds.), Police and Law Enforcement Volume V ed., (pp. 145-157). New York: AMS Press.

Meesig, R. (1995). Police and detective training: Where we were, where we are, and where we need to go. Unpublished manuscript.

Miller, T. R., Cohen, M. A., & Wiersema, B. (1996). Victim costs and consequences: A new look. (Report No. NCJ 155282). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Miyazawa, S. (1992). Policing in Japan: A study on making crime. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Moore, M. H., Trojanowicz, R. C., & Kelling, G. L. (1988). Crime and policing. (Report No. NCJ 111460, Perspectives on Policing No. 2). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Nagin, D. S. (1998). Criminal deterrence research at the outset of the twenty-first century. Michael Tonry (Ed.), Crime and Justice: A Review of Research (Vol. 23pp. 1-42). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. (1973). Standard 19.3: Investigative Responsibility. In author Report on police. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Northrop, A., Kraemer, K. L., & King, J. L. (1995). Police use of computers. Journal of Criminal Justice, 23(3), 259-275.

Peterson, J. L., Mihajlovic, S., & Gilliland, M. (1984). Forensic evidence and the police: The effects of scientific evidence on criminal investigations. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Peterson, J. L., Ryan, J. P., Houlden, P. J., & Mihajlovic, S. (1987). The uses and effects of forensic science in the adjudication of felony cases. Journal of Forensic Science, 32(6), 1730-1753.

Phillips Jr., R. G. (1984 August). State and local law enforcement training needs. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, pp. 6-15.

Phillips Jr., R. G. (1988 August). Training priorities in state and local law enforcement. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, pp. 10-16.

Pogrebin, M. (1976). Some observations of the detective role. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 4(3), 277-284.

Police-Executive-Research-Forum, & Police-Foundation. (1981). Survey of police operational and administrative practices--1981. Washington, DC: Authors.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1968). The challenge of crime in a free society. New York: Avon Books.

Public Systems Evaluation. (1977). An evaluation report of an alternative approach in police patrol: The Wilmington split-force experiment. Cambridge, MA: Public Systems Evaluation.

Reaves, B. A., & Goldberg, A. L. (1998). Census of state and local law enforcement agencies, 1996. (Report No. NCJ 164618, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Reaves, B. A., & Hart, T. C. (2000). Federal law enforcement officers, 1998. (Report No. NCJ 177607, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Redlinger, L. J. (1994). Community policing and changes in the organizational structure. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 10(1), 36-58.

Regan, K. J., Nalley, P. G., & White, T. (1979). Managing criminal investigations: A summary report. Unpublished report: Urban Institute.

Reppetto, T. A. (1978). The detective task. State of the art, science, craft? Police Studies, 1(3), 5-10.

Roberg, R., & Kuykendall, J. (1990). Police operations: Patrol and investigations. In R. R. Roberg & J. Kuykendall (Eds), Police organization and management: Behavior, theory, and processes (pp. 272-307). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Sanders, W. B. (1977). Detective work: A study of criminal investigations. New York: Free Press.

Schwartz, A. I., & Clarren, S. N. (1977). The Cincinnati team policing experiment: A summary report. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Sherman, L. W., Milton, K. H., & Kelly, T. V. (1973). Team policing: Seven case studies. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Skogan, W. G., & Antunes, G. E. (1979). Information, apprehension, and deterrence: Exploring the limits of police productivity. Journal of Criminal Justice, 7, 217-241.

Sparrow, M. K. (1988). Implementing community policing: Perspectives on Policing No. 9. (Report No. NCJ 114217). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Steadman, G. W. (2000). Survey of DNA crime laboratories, 1998. (Report No. NCJ 179104, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Technology Update. (1999). NCIC 2000 and IAFIS Operational. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 68(10), 5.

Traut, C., Feimer, S., Emmert, C., & Thom, K. (2000). Law enforcement recruit training at the state level: An evaluation. Police Quarterly, 3(3), 294-314.

Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). Community policing: A contemporary perspective. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

U.S. Dept. of Justice, B. o. J. S. (1998). Directory of law enforcement agencies, 1996. [United States] [Computer file ICPSR 2260]. Conducted by U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor].

U.S. Dept. of Justice, B. o. J. S. (1999a). Law enforcement management and administrative statistics (LEMAS): 1997 sample survey of law enforcement agencies [Computer file ICPSR 2700]. ICPSR version. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census [producer], 1998. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].

U.S. Dept. of Justice, F. B. o. I. (1999b). Uniform crime reporting program data: [United States] Offenses known and clearances by arrest, 1997 [Computer file ICPSR 9028]. Compiled by the U.S. Dept. of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor, MI : Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor].

Voelker, M. K., & Horvath, F. (1997). The frequency of use of physical evidence in the prosecution of felonies in Michigan, 1992. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, New York, New York.

Walker, S. (1993). Does anyone remember team policing? Lessons of the team policing experience for community policing. American Journal of Police, 12(1), 33-55.

Ward, R. H. (1971). The investigative function: Criminal investigation in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.

Weisheit, R., Falcone, D. N., & Wells, L. E. (1999). Crime and policing in rural and small-town America. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Wellford, C., & Cronin, J. (2000). Clearing up homicide rates. National Institute of Justice Journal, 2-7.

Willman, M. T., & Snortum, J. R. (1984). Detective work: The criminal investigation process in a medium-size police department. Criminal Justice Review, 9(1), 33-39.

Wilson, J. Q. (1978). The investigators: Managing the FBI and narcotics agents. New York: Basic Books.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982 March). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. The Atlantic Monthly, pp. 29-36, 38.

Wycoff, M. A. (1982). Evaluating the crime-effectiveness of municipal police. In J.R. Greene (Ed.), Managing police work: Issues and analysis (pp. 15-36). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Wycoff, M. A. (1998). Investigations in the community policing context. Manuscript in preparation.

Zawitz, M. W., Klaus, P. A., Bachman, R., Bastian, L. D., DeBerry, Jr. M. M., Rand, M. R., & Taylor, B. M. (1993). Highlights from 20 years of surveying crime victims: The National Crime Victimization Survey, 1973-92. (Report No. NCJ-144525). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.