

that indictments and convictions for police corruption were on an upward trend. In 1993, there were 129 convictions of law-enforcement officers for corruption throughout the United States; 59 of the convictions were for drug-related offenses. In 1994, 1995, and 1997 the numbers of convictions exceeded 135 each year, and the proportions of drug-related convictions were similar to the 1993 figures.

The National Police Misconduct Statistics and Reporting Project released its Police Misconduct Statistical Report in 2010, finding that 6,613 sworn law enforcement officers were involved in reported acts of misconduct that year, with 7.2 percent of the officers reported engaging in acts of theft, fraud, and robbery. In 2013, fifty-three drug convictions were dropped by a federal court after it was learned that the cases had been corrupted by a veteran police officer of Philadelphia's narcotics unit. The following year, the city of Tulsa, Oklahoma, was still settling lawsuits filed by individuals wrongfully convicted of drug crimes after an investigation had led to the conviction of four officers in the Tulsa Police Department accused of corruption crimes such as perjury. Also in 2014, two San Francisco police officers were convicted of conspiracy, theft, and wire fraud by a federal court; a surveillance video had been released by a public defender in 2011 that had shown the officers stealing property during raids of single room occupancy apartments.

Punishment

Two major methods of punishment have been used to discipline officers convicted of corruption: administrative and judicial processing. Possible forms of administrative punishments for convicted officers include departmental warnings, suspensions of pay and from duty, relief of command especially for commanders, demotions in rank, referrals for criminal prosecution, and outright dismissals from departments. Typical judicial outcomes are warnings, fines, and incarceration.

Emmanuel C. Onyeozili

Further Reading

Alexander, Michelle. "Why Police Lie Under Oath." *New York Times*. New York Times, 2 Feb. 2013. Web. 5 Feb. 2015.

Corsianos, Marilyn. *The Complexities of Police Corruption: Gender, Identity, and Misconduct*. Lanham: Rowman, 2012. Print.

Gaines, Larry, and Victor Kappeler. *Policing in America*. 4th ed. Cincinnati: Anderson, 2002. Print.

Katz, Charles M. *The Police in America: An Introduction*. 5th ed. New York: McGraw, 2005. Print.

The Knapp Commission Report on Police Corruption. New York: Braziller, 1972. Print.

Langworthy, Robert H., and Lawrence F. Travis III. *Policing in America: A Balance of Forces*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice, 2003. Print.

Lardner, James, and Thomas A. Reppetto. *NYPD: A City and Its Police-The Inside Story of New York's Legendary Police Department*. New York: Holt, 2000. Print.

Palmiotto, Michael J. *Community Policing: A Policing Strategy for the Twenty-first Century*. Gaithersburg: Aspen, 2000. Print.

Sherman, Lawrence W., ed. *Police Corruption: A Sociological Perspective*. Garden City: Anchor, 1974. Print.

Siegel, Larry J., and Joseph J. Senna. *Essentials of Criminal Justice*. 4th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth, 2004. Print.

Walker, Samuel, and Charles M. Katz. *The Police in America: An Introduction*. 5th ed. New York: McGraw, 2005. Print.

See also Bounty hunters; Civilian review boards; Discretion; False convictions; Knapp Commission; Miscarriage of justice; Perjury; Police; Police brutality; Police civil liability; Police ethics; Police powers; Political corruption; September 11, 2001, attacks; Wickersham Commission.

Police detectives

Definition: Police officers who specialize in criminal investigations

Criminal justice issues: Evidence and forensics; Investigation; Police powers

Significance: Trained detectives increase the effectiveness of police efforts to solve crimes. As specialists in the art and science of criminal investigation, they help to ensure professional and thorough responses to serious crimes.

Glorified in fiction and essential in fact, detectives are both common and crucial figures in American law enforcement. Although full-time police detectives are not nearly as numerous as uniformed patrol officers, they can be found in almost all large and medium-sized police departments. Although the popular image of police detectives is of plainclothes officers assigned full time to criminal investigative work, almost all police officers perform at least some detective work in the course of their routine duties.

History

The development of professional police detectives is closely linked to crimes that could not be prevented or deterred by uniformed patrol officers. When the first American police departments began forming in the early nineteenth century, they consisted only of uniformed patrol officers. Over time, it became obvious that crimes were continuing to occur despite the work of routine po-

lice patrols and that methods of investigating crimes after they occurred was necessary.

In England and France, criminals known as “thief catchers” were used by police forces to help catch other criminals, as it was believed that only criminals themselves could know enough about the habits of criminals to solve crimes. However, that method of crime detection failed—primarily because of the dishonesty of the thief catchers themselves—so agencies began experiments using sworn police officers as investigators of crimes. The London Metropolitan Police pioneered the use of plainclothes detectives in the mid-nineteenth century. These detectives were stationed in a London building that had been formerly used by Scottish royalty, and their work was closely followed by the press and by the novelist Charles Dickens, who wrote positive articles about the detectives who came to be known as “Scotland Yard,” or “the Yard,” after their headquarters. In addition to writing about the detectives’ heroic work, Dickens coined the term “detective” in his 1853 novel *Bleak House*.

In the United States, detectives began appearing in police departments during the 1840s, most notably in Boston, Chicago, and New York City. By the end of the Civil War, in 1865, nearly all large American cities had detective units. Many of them were kept busy by a post-war crime wave and problems of urban overcrowding brought on by new waves of European immigration. Some detectives became well known as newspapers closely followed their exploits.

New York City’s Inspector Thomas Byrnes promoted the theory of *modus operandi* (MO), which was based on the principle that individual criminals tend to use the same methods of operation in their crimes and that recognizing those distinctive methods can help identify the perpetrators of crimes. In 1886, Byrnes published a book detailing the methods of hundreds of felons then active along the East Coast.

In contrast to those in Europe, American private detectives rivaled public detectives in popularity and effectiveness. Allan Pinkerton emerged as the country’s foremost private detective, setting an example that was copied by many police investigators. In addition to establishing a series of highly profitable private detective branch offices across the country, Pinkerton also served as Chicago’s first public detective and headed the US Secret Service during the Civil War.

During the twentieth century, the development of motor vehicle transportation and the rise of statewide crime rings promoted the creation of state police and highway patrols with detective units of their own. Meanwhile, a

number of specialized federal offices of criminal investigation arose during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In addition to the Secret Service, these included the US Customs Service, the Bureau of Investigation—which later became Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)—and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

Types of Detectives

The largest numbers of full-time, plainclothes detectives are found in local law-enforcement agencies. In 2004, approximately 10 percent of all sworn police officers were detectives, almost 60,000 of whom were working in city and county agencies. An additional 30,000 to 40,000 worked at the state and federal levels. The New York City Police Department had the largest number of detectives of any single agency, with nearly 4,000; the FBI had the most federal investigators, with nearly 12,000. In 2015, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there were 106, 580 detectives and criminal investigators working at state, local, and federal law-enforcement agencies, illustrating the continued need for these professionals in the modern criminal landscape.

Most city, county, and state detectives are selected from among officers already working in regular patrol divisions. Unlike many European police departments that allow college graduates to begin their police careers as investigators, most American agencies regard patrol work to be an invaluable part of the maturing and learning process that officers should have before becoming detectives. Although some federal criminal investigators have prior patrol experience, it is not required for federal special agent positions.

In addition to sworn police officers, thousands of other government investigators and private detectives also do detective work in the United States. Investigators who assist public defenders’ offices and coroners, and other government employees who perform state and federal background applicant checks, are also numerous. The numbers of private detectives vary considerably from state to state, with more than thirty thousand employed throughout the country in 2015, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics..

Police Detective Duties

Crime cases come to the attention of police agencies through three channels: victim and witness reporting, patrol observation, and initiatives undertaken by investigators. The majority of cases are reported by the general public. After they are reported, cases are assigned to indi-

vidual detectives either through systems of rotation or because of the detectives' investigative specialties. Although most detectives are able to investigate all types of crime, individual detectives tend to specialize. Some concentrate on violent crimes, others on serial crimes, high-loss property offenses, or cases involving unidentified perpetrators.

Criminal investigations are typically divided into three phases: preliminary investigations; continuing, or follow-up, investigations; and concluding investigations. Preliminary investigations focus on processing crime scenes and the initial interviewing of victims and witnesses. Often completed by regular patrol officers, the preliminary investigations serve as case foundations.

In larger police agencies, continuing and concluding investigations are undertaken exclusively by detectives. Continuing investigations seek to establish the identities of suspects, find new victims and witnesses, and coordinate evidence processing with crime laboratories. During the concluding phase, decisions must be made whether to suspend the cases or prepare them for prosecution.

Success rates of detective work vary with the types of crimes. The FBI reported that in 2014, 47.4 percent of violent crimes and 20.2 percent of property crimes were cleared by arrest.

Traits of the Detective

Certain personality traits appear to be important to successful detective work. For example, an ability to reason logically and objectively is essential. Deductive and inductive reasoning are both commonly employed in detective work. Detectives employing the deductive method form their general conclusions before all facts are explained and then use additional facts to modify or verify those conclusions. Detectives using the inductive method wait for all relevant facts and information to emerge before drawing any conclusions. The inductive method is most commonly used in complex white-collar crimes and drug cases involving many suspects.

Other traits essential to proper detective work include strong organizational ability, heightened observational skills, ability to communicate with a wide variety of people, advanced search and seizure legal knowledge, and a thorough understanding of forensic science capabilities.

James N. Gilbert

Further Reading

Corwin, Miles. *Homicide Special: On the Streets with the LAPD's Elite Detective Unit*. New York: Holt, 2003. Print.

Douglas, John. *The Anatomy of Motive: The FBI's Legendary Mindhunter Explores the Key to Understanding and Catching Violent Criminals*. New York: Pocket, 2000. Print.

Gilbert, James N. *Criminal Investigation*. New York: Prentice, 2004. Print.

Micheels, Peter. *The Detectives: Their Toughest Cases in Their Own Words*. New York: Pocket, 2003. Print.

"Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: Detectives and Criminal Investigators." *Bureau of Labor Statistics*. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 30 Mar. 2016. Web. 27 May 2016.

"Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2015: Private Detectives and Investigators." *Bureau of Labor Statistics*. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 30 Mar. 2016. Web. 27 May 2016.

Sanders, William. *Detective Work*. New York: Free, 1980. Print.

US Dept. of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Crime in the United States, 2014*. Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, FBI, 2015. PDF file.

See also Cold cases; Crime labs; Crime scene investigation.

Police dogs

Definition: Dogs used by law-enforcement professionals to help find missing persons and criminal suspects and to sniff out controlled substances

Criminal justice issues: Investigation; Police powers

Significance: Police dogs are now trained in more varied and diverse missions than ever before.

Dogs' work in law enforcement began in Belgium in 1899, with the deployment of Belgian sheepdogs, and quickly spread through the law-enforcement agencies around the world. Police dogs were first used in the United States by the New York City Police Department in 1907. The growth in the police dog service has been explosive; Jim Watson, director of the North American Police Work Dog Association, estimated that there were more than fifty thousand police dogs serving law-enforcement agencies in the United States in 2010. These dogs are referred to as K-9 (shorthand for canine) officers.

Different breeds of dogs have been trained for police work. Trainers find that a dog needs to have a distinct set of characteristics for police work. These traits include intelligence, loyalty, an excellent sense of smell, and natural aggression. The breeds most often chosen are Belgian sheepdogs, German shepherds, Doberman pinschers, and a variety of hounds and beagles. The last two groups are used primarily for tracking and smell detection. Non-neutered male dogs are used for their natural aggression.

During the early twenty-first century with heightened awareness of terrorism, the role of police dogs and their



Police dog. (Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons)

companion officers expanded dramatically. A dog's sense of smell is fifty times more acute than that of its human companion. Dogs can smell substances present in trace amounts of less than 1 gram, and some are 70 percent more effective than odor detection machines. These olfactory skills are put to use searching for explosives, drugs, and people.

The use of police dogs has seen challenges to its legality. When a large, well-trained dog attacks and bites a suspect, the question of reasonable force can arise. The US Supreme Court has heard two cases that address this issue of deadly force. In 1985, *Tennessee v. Garner* reviewed the Fourth Amendment and the use of deadly force. In 1989, *Graham v. Connor* discussed the "reasonableness" of the use of force by a police dog. In 2013, the Supreme Court held in its ruling in *Florida v. Harris* that a drug-detection dog's alert to an officer provides probable cause for officers to conduct a warrantless search of a vehicle, without requiring any other evidence of the dog's reliability so long as it has been certified. At the appellate court level, almost all circuits have heard cases discussing the

deployment of police dogs, their training, and what constitutes reasonable force.

Robert Stewart

Further Reading

- Albrecht, Kathy. *Lost Pet Chronicles: Adventures of a K-9 Cop-Turned-Pet Detective*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2004. Print.
- Balko, Radley. "Federal Appeals Court: Drug Dog That's Barely More Accurate than a Coin Flip Is Good Enough." *Washington Post*. Washington Post, 4 Aug. 2015. Web. 27 May 2016.
- Condon, Stephanie. "Supreme Court Rejects Distinct Limits on Drug Dog Searches." *CBS News*. CBS Interactive, 19 Feb. 2013. Web. 27 May 2016.
- Ingraham, Christopher. "The Surprising Reason More Police Dogs Are Dying in the Line of Duty." *Washington Post*. Washington Post, 20 Nov. 2015. Web. 27 May 2016.
- Johnson, Glen R. *Tracking Dog: Theory and Methods*. 4th ed. Mechanicsville: Barkleigh, 1999. Print.
- Schillenber, Dietmar. *Top Working Dogs: A Training Manual—Tracking, Obedience, Protection*. Rev. ed. Oslo: I.D.I., 1994. Print.

See also Deadly force; Police civil liability; Reasonable force; Trespass.

Police ethics

Definition: Written and unwritten rules of acceptable conduct by law-enforcement personnel within their agencies, in their dealings with other agencies, and in their dealings with the public

Criminal justice issues: Civil rights and liberties; Confessions; Interrogation; Professional standards

Significance: The conceptualization of what constitutes "proper" behavior in a wide variety of law-enforcement situations has heavily influenced both public attitudes toward police and the legal system's response to allegations of unethical police conduct.

The parameters defining acceptable and unacceptable police behavior are as old as law enforcement itself and have evolved continuously. Police ethics touch on many issues, such as intentional deception in investigations and court proceedings, the use of deadly force, corruption, and selective law enforcement.

The development of formalized codes of police ethics in the United States can be traced back to O. W. Wilson's work with the Wichita, Kansas, police during the late 1920s. However, the first statewide ethics code was developed in California in 1955. Two years later, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) adopted it as the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics. With minor re-

visions drafted in 1989 and unanimously adopted in 1991, along with a newly prepared Law Enforcement Code of Conduct, the IACP's ethics code has served as the model for many police departments. Central elements of the code include a statement of the officer's basic service mission, the obligation to "respect the constitutional rights of all to liberty, equality, and justice," and a charge that one's private life and public actions exemplify honesty and integrity. The code also enjoins officers to enforce the law without any biases arising from "personal feelings, prejudices, political beliefs, aspirations, animosities, or friendships"; to avoid unnecessary force; and to reject bribes and other forms of corruption.

Police ethics codes serve multiple purposes. They assure the public that officers who are granted unique powers to further their investigative work are nonetheless required to behave in ways that meet at least minimal acceptable standards. They may be seen as providing a "moral compass" that guides officers' decision making in uncertain situations, while contributing to the development of a police culture and a cohesive work environment. Having such codes can improve the public image of police and serve as an alternative to external review and regulation, although this is true only to the extent that such codes are publicly seen to be rigorously and consistently enforced.

Interrogations

While ethics codes provide laudable blueprints for police behavior, the actual everyday work experiences of officers present many stressful ethical challenges. One broad category that invites unethical behavior is the use of deception during interrogations of suspects. The courts have clearly outlawed physical abuse of suspects, and the Supreme Court has ruled that police officers must read suspects their Miranda rights before any interrogation; however, deceptive behaviors are handled on a case-by-case basis.

Police may employ a variety of deceptive tactics during interrogations. For example, some officers try to convince suspects that they are not really being held in custody and that their interrogations are merely "interviews." Adoption of this tactic may officially relieve the officers from having to issue Miranda warnings to the suspects, even though the officers' actual agendas may be to elicit confessions so that they can commence arrest procedures.

Sometimes police read the Miranda warnings to suspects in such a perfunctory manner that the suspects mistakenly conclude that they can waive their rights without serious consequences. Another tactic is for police to at-

tempt to lessen the actual severity of offenses in murder suspects' eyes by leading them to believe that one or more murder victims are still alive and able to testify. At other times, police may try to increase the perceived severity of offenses so that suspects will admit to lesser offenses. Yet another tactic is for officers to pretend to be investigating one crime while actually gathering information about another. Officers also sometimes express sympathy toward suspects, while trying to convince them that confessing is the best way for them to resolve matters. Promises of more lenient judicial treatment after confessions cannot be guaranteed, but they often produce confessions.

Confronting suspects with falsified evidence pointing toward their guilt is another frequently used tactic for eliciting confessions during interrogations. Confessions resulting from deceptive interrogation techniques are a major ethical concern and must be balanced against their usefulness in finding and convicting guilty suspects. Deceptive tactics may also undermine police credibility.

Prospects for the Future

During the early years of the twenty-first century, it was expected that the movement toward community-oriented policing and the escalating fight against terrorism were likely to influence the development of police ethics. For example, a central tenet of community policing is the empowerment of foot-patrol officers by assigning them to "quality of life" community projects. However, their increased power may cause them to lose some of their sensitivity to civil liberties in police-citizen interactions. Similarly, a national concern with preventing future terrorist acts in the United States has already led to a reduction in civil liberties, exemplified most prominently by the USA PATRIOT Act that was enacted shortly after the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001.

While the ends in both cases may be noble, they cannot be used to justify the reduction of individual liberties. Community policing poses new moral challenges that will need attention. For example, closer interactions with members of the community may lead police to discover law violations committed by their new "citizen partners." The police will then have to decide whether such violations should be vigorously prosecuted and thus imperil police-citizen collaboration. On the other hand, as citizens become more involved in law-enforcement practices, should they have a greater voice regarding police responses to violators? Will citizens want to take justice more in their own hands, through vigilante-type actions? Finally, what is the proper police reaction if their associated citizen groups adapt racist or otherwise unaccept-

able agendas? Twenty-first-century law-enforcement personnel must take specialized intensive training programs to best confront all types of traditional and new ethical dilemmas.

Eric W. Metchik

Further Reading

- Albanese, Jay S. *Professional Ethics in Criminal Justice: Being Ethical When No One Is Looking*. 4th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2016. Print.
- Braswell, Michael C., Belinda R. McCarthy, and Bernard J. McCarthy, eds. *Justice, Crime, and Ethics*. 8th ed. New York: Routledge, 2015. Print.
- Close, Daryl, and Nicholas Meier. *Morality in Criminal Justice: An Introduction to Ethics*. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1995. Print.
- Goodman, Debbie J. *Enforcing Ethics: A Scenario-Based Workbook for Police and Corrections Recruits and Officers*. 4th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2013. Print.
- Pollock, Joycelyn M. *Ethical Dilemmas and Decisions in Criminal Justice*. 8th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth, 2014. Print.
- Souryal, Sam S. *Ethics in Criminal Justice: In Search of the Truth*. 6th ed. New York: Routledge, 2015. Print.
- United States. Dept. of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Bureau of Justice Assistance. *Police Chiefs Desk Reference: A Guide for Newly Appointed Police Leaders*. 2nd ed. Boston: McGraw, 2008.
- International Association of Chiefs of Police. Web. 3 June 2016.

See also Civilian review boards; Community-oriented policing; Internal affairs; Miranda rights; Peace Officer Standards and Training; Perjury; Police; Police brutality; Police civil liability; Police corruption; Police powers; Racial profiling.

Police lineups

Definition: An investigative tool used by police to identify possible suspects of a crime

Criminal justice issues: Evidence and forensics; investigation; witnesses

Significance: Police may be useful tools in police investigations, but they have serious drawbacks and are often performed improperly they often violate suspects' rights and lead to false identifications by witnesses.

Police investigators use lineups as an analytical tool based on the premise that eyewitness testimony is the strongest evidence to use in the investigation of crime, a premise that is highly debatable. The purpose of police lineups is to check the veracity of eyewitness statements for the purpose of identifying a suspect.

Unlike what most people think from the movies or TV, there are essentially three forms of police lineups. The photographic lineup can be done exclusively with the use of photographs (or "mug shots") in which a photograph of the suspect can be placed within an array of other photo-

graphs. A more common form of lineup is to have a suspect stand in a room with other people, known as foils, who look similar. Sometimes a lineup consists only of foils. Police may also make use of showups, in which one suspect appears before a victim or witness. Showups have been questioned and many legal experts see them as highly unreliable. They are restricted by many legal restraints. Some investigators prefer to use a combination of these techniques, such as first requesting a photographic lineup and then later a regular police lineup or showup.

Investigators are bound by constitutional requirements concerning the use of lineups. As in all other investigative procedures, police cannot violate the suspect's due process rights; thus, in some cases the accused must be provided with counsel during the lineup procedure. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Kirby v. Illinois* (1972) that a person at a lineup or showup is entitled to counsel if the investigative procedure is held at or after the time that criminal proceedings have begun. However, if the lineup is conducted before the beginning of criminal proceedings, a suspect is not entitled to counsel. Counsel is also not required for photographic lineups. A defendant may request a waiver of rights to have counsel at a lineup or showup provided that the defendant is made aware of the procedure and the fact that the purpose of the procedure is for the identification of a criminal suspect.

The Problem of Misidentification

The issue of the possibility of misidentifications in police lineup procedures has been debated both by the Court and by scholars. In *Neil v. Biggers* (1972), the Court opined that five factors should be used to detect misidentification. The factors include the opportunity of the witness to view the criminal at the time of the crime, the witness's degree of attention, the accuracy of the witness's prior description of the criminal, the level of certainty demonstrated by the witness at the confrontation, and the length of time between the crime and the confrontation.

Further, scholars suggest that misidentification could be reduced by using either double-blind police lineups or sequential lineups. The double-blind procedure is based on a premise posited by several scholars that police officers who know the identity of the suspect may influence the decision of the eyewitness. The double-blind procedure thus prevents this by having the supervising police officer of a lineup unaware of who the possible suspect is. Sequential lineups require that eyewitnesses view potential suspects one at a time, rather than all at once. The se-