

Crime Prevention Research Review

No. 7

Police Programs to Prevent Crime in Hot Spot Areas



Anthony A. Braga
Rutgers University and Harvard University

Andrew V. Papachristos
Yale University and Harvard University

David M. Hureau
Harvard University



COPS
COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE



THE CAMPBELL
COLLABORATION

Suggested citation:

Braga, Anthony A., Andrew V. Papachristos, David M. Hureau. 2012. *Police Programs to Prevent Crime in Hot Spot Areas*. No. 7 of Crime Prevention Research Review. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

The opinions contained herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. References to specific agencies, companies, products, or services should not be considered an endorsement by the author(s) or the U.S. Department of Justice. Rather, the references are illustrations to supplement discussion of the issues.

The Internet references cited in this publication were valid as of the date of this publication. Given that URLs and websites are in constant flux, neither the author(s) nor the COPS Office can vouch for their current validity.

The Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group (www.campbellcollaboration.org/ccjg) is an international network of researchers that prepares, updates, and rapidly disseminates systematic reviews of high-quality research conducted worldwide on effective methods to reduce crime and delinquency and improve the quality of justice.

ISBN: 978-1-935676-13-3

September 2012

Contents

Introduction.	3
Identifying Evaluations of Hot Spots Policing Programs	7
Characteristics of Hot Spots Policing Programs	11
Effects of Hot Spots Policing Programs on Crime.	13
Conclusion and Policy Implications	19
References	23
Appendixes.	29

“

Police officers have long recognized the importance of place in crime problems.

”

¹ This publication briefly reviews the research on the crime control effectiveness of hot spots policing programs. Readers interested in a more detailed assessment of the crime prevention value of hot spots policing programs should acquire the full report (Braga et al. 2012) available online at the Campbell Crime and Justice Group website, www.campbellcollaboration.org.

Introduction

Hot spots policing¹ has become a popular way for police departments to prevent crime. The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF 2008) surveyed 192 U.S. police departments and reported that nearly nine out of 10 agencies used hot spots policing strategies to deal with violent crime in their jurisdictions. An earlier Police Foundation report found that seven in 10 departments with more than 100 sworn officers reported using crime mapping to identify crime hot spots (Weisburd et al. 2003). Many police departments reported having the capability to manage and analyze crime data in sophisticated ways and, through management innovations such as Compstat, hold officers accountable for implementing problem-solving strategies to control hot spot locations (Weisburd et al. 2003).

Recent research studies suggest focused police interventions, such as directed patrols, proactive arrests, and problem-oriented policing, can produce significant crime prevention gains at high-crime hot spots (see Braga 2008; Skogan and Frydl 2004; Weisburd and Eck 2004). Given the growing popularity of this approach to crime prevention, ongoing review of existing evaluations of hot spots policing programs can help police executives and policy makers understand “what works” in preventing crime in hot spot areas.

Police officers have long recognized the importance of place in crime problems. They know the locations within their beats that tend to be trouble spots and are often very sensitive to signs of potential crimes. As Bittner (1970) suggests in his classic study of police work, some officers know “the shops, stores, warehouses, restaurants, hotels, schools, playgrounds, and other public places in such a way that they can recognize at a glance whether what is going on within them is within the range of normalcy.” The traditional response to such trouble spots typically included heightened levels of patrol and increased opportunistic arrests and investigations. Until recently, police crime prevention strategies did not focus systematically on crime hot spots and did not seek to address the underlying conditions that give rise to high-activity crime places.

Unlike most innovations in policing, the emergence of hot spots policing can be traced directly to developing computerized mapping and database technologies and emerging academic interest (Weisburd and Braga 2006). A number of research studies documented that crime is not spread evenly across city landscapes (see Pierce et al. 1988). Rather, crime clusters in very small places, or hot spots, generate a disproportionate amount of criminal events. For instance, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, only 3 percent of the city's addresses accounted for 50 percent of calls for service to the police (Sherman, Gartin, and Buerger 1989). Even within the most crime-ridden neighborhoods, crime clusters at a few discrete locations and other areas are relatively crime free (Weisburd and Green 1994). Research has also demonstrated that these high-activity crime places generate very stable concentrations of crime over long periods of time (Weisburd et al. 2004). For instance, in Boston, Massachusetts, only 5 percent of the city's street block faces and street intersections were responsible for 74 percent of the city's total shootings between 1980 and 2008 (Braga et al. 2010). The 60 most active locations experienced more than 1,000 shootings during the study time period.

A number of police policy makers and researchers have argued that many crime problems can be reduced more efficiently if police officers focused their attention to these deviant places (Braga and Weisburd 2010; Sherman and Weisburd 1995). The appeal of focusing limited resources on a small number of high-activity crime places is straightforward. If police can prevent crime at these hot spots, then they might be able to reduce total crime.



Identified studies were further screened to ensure that rigorous evaluation designs...were used.

Identifying Evaluations of
Hot Spots Policing Programs

² These evaluation designs permit the clearest assessments of “cause and effect” in determining whether hot spots policing programs prevent crime. These designs examine pre- and post-program measurements of crime outcomes in targeted locations relative to “control” locations. The control groups in the identified hot spots evaluations received routine levels of traditional police enforcement tactics.

Identifying Evaluations of Hot Spots Policing Programs

The effectiveness of focused police efforts to prevent crime in hot spot areas was examined by reviewing all available academic studies evaluating hot spots policing programs. To be eligible for this review, interventions used to control crime hot spots were limited to police-led crime control efforts. Suitable police crime control efforts included traditional tactics such as directed patrol and heightened levels of traffic enforcement as well as alternative strategies such as problem-oriented policing (Goldstein 1990). Eligible program evaluations were also limited to police programs that targeted small areas such as street corners, homes, apartment buildings, and subway stations. Police programs that focused on large areas, such as an entire neighborhood, were not considered. Identified studies were further screened to ensure that rigorous evaluation designs, such as randomized experiments and quasi-experiments, were used.²

Particular attention was paid to studies that measured crime displacement effects and diffusion of crime control benefit effects. Policing strategies that focused on specific locations have been criticized as resulting in displacement (see Reppetto 1976)—i.e., criminals at targeted locations would simply move around the corner to areas that were not protected by focused police attention. More recently, academics have observed that crime prevention programs sometimes result in the complete opposite of displacement—that crime control benefits can be greater than expected and “spill over” into places beyond the target areas (Clarke and Weisburd 1994).

The review was not restricted to a specific time period, and relevant studies written in languages other than English were obtained and translated wherever possible. Eligible studies include published as well as unpublished works: journal articles, theses/dissertations, reports, books, book chapters, and conference papers. (For further details of the systematic search methodology, see Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau 2012.)

A total of 4,315 article summaries were reviewed for any suggestion of an evaluation of a hot spots policing program. Of the 4,315 summaries, 131 were selected for closer review, and the full-text reports, journal articles, and books for these evaluations were acquired and carefully assessed to determine whether the interventions involved focused police enforcement efforts at crime hot spots and whether the studies used rigorous evaluation designs.

Using these methods, 19 hot spots policing evaluations were identified and included in this review:

1. Minneapolis (MN) Repeat Call Address Policing (RECAP) program (Sherman, Buerger, and Gartin 1989)
2. New York (NY) Tactical Narcotics Teams (TNT) (Sviridoff et al. 1992)
3. St. Louis (MO) problem-oriented policing (POP) in three drug market locations (Hope 1994)
4. Minneapolis (MN) hot spots patrol program (Sherman and Weisburd 1995)
5. Jersey City (NJ) Drug Markets Analysis Program (DMAP) (Weisburd and Green 1995)
6. Kansas City (MO) crack house police raids program (Sherman and Rogan 1995a)
7. Kansas City (MO) gun project (Sherman and Rogan 1995b)
8. Beenleigh (AUS) calls for service project (CJC 1998)
9. Jersey City (NJ) POP at violent places project (Braga et al. 1999)
10. Houston (TX) targeted beat program (Caeti 1999)
11. Oakland (CA) Beat Health program (Mazerolle, Price, and Roehl 2000)
12. Pittsburgh (PA) police raids at nuisance bars program (Cohen, Gorr, and Singh 2003)
13. Buenos Aires (ARG) police presence after terror attack study (DiTella and Schargrotsky 2004)
14. Philadelphia (PA) drug corners crackdowns program (Lawton, Taylor, and Luongo 2005)
15. Jersey City (NJ) displacement and diffusion study (Weisburd et al. 2006)
16. Lowell (MA) policing crime and disorder hot spots project (Braga and Bond 2008)
17. Jacksonville (FL) policing violent crime hot spots project (Taylor, Koper, and Woods 2011)
18. Philadelphia (PA) foot patrol program (Ratcliffe et al. 2011)
19. Boston (MA) Safe Street Teams (SST) program (Braga, Hureau, and Papachristos 2011)

...the 19 identified studies provided 25 distinct tests of hot spots policing on crime.

Characteristics of Hot Spots
Policing Programs

Characteristics of Hot Spots Policing Programs

Seventeen of the 19 identified studies were conducted in the United States (see Appendix A on page 30). The “Beenleigh Calls for Service Project” (CJC 1998) evaluation was conducted in Australia, and an evaluation examining the crime control effects of increased police presence on blocks with Jewish centers after a terrorist attack was conducted in Buenos Aires, Argentina (DiTella and Schargrodsky 2004). Ten studies were completed in medium-sized cities with between 200,000 and 500,000 residents. Seven studies were completed in large cities with more than 500,000 residents, and two studies were completed in smaller cities with less than 200,000 residents. Four cities were the research sites for multiple hot spots policing evaluations: Jersey City was the site for three studies, while Minneapolis, Kansas City, and Philadelphia were the sites for two studies each.

In sum, the 19 identified studies provided 25 distinct tests of hot spots policing on crime. Six studies tested multiple hot spots policing interventions: The Minneapolis RECAP study separately evaluated problem-oriented policing interventions at residential and commercial addresses. The Vera Institute of Justice separately evaluated the Tactical Narcotics Team intervention at hot spots areas via analyses in two separate New York Police Department precincts. The Houston targeted beat program evaluation separately tested the effects of problem-oriented policing, high-visibility patrol, and zero-tolerance policing on hot spots in targeted high-crime beats. The Jersey City displacement and diffusion study examined the impact of problem-oriented policing interventions on a prostitution hot spot and a drug crime hot spot in separate quasi-experiments. Finally, the Jacksonville policing violent crime hot spots experiment separately tested the effects of direct-saturation patrol and problem-oriented policing on violent street crime.

Across the 25 tests in the 19 eligible hot spots policing studies, problem-oriented policing was evaluated in 13 of the tests, and increased traditional policing strategies were evaluated in 12. Increased traditional policing strategies included heightened levels of patrol (foot or car), drug enforcement operations, zero-tolerance policing, and increased gun searches and seizures in crime hot spots areas.

...hot spots policing generated positive crime control gains for a variety of crime types...

Effects of Hot Spots Policing Programs on Crime

³ Meta-analysis is a technique used to investigate overall program effects associated with a selected set of studies (see Lipsey and Wilson 2001).

Effects of Hot Spots Policing Programs on Crime

Twenty of the hot spots policing evaluations concluded that hot spots policing programs generated significant crime control benefits in the treatment areas relative to the control areas (see Appendix B on page 32). Only five of the 25 tests of hot spots policing interventions did not report noteworthy crime control gains associated with the approach. These five were the Minneapolis RECAP at commercial addresses, the New York Tactical Narcotics Team in the 70th Precinct, the Beenleigh calls for service project, the Houston targeted beat program's problem-oriented policing intervention, and the Jacksonville direct-saturation patrol intervention. A meta-analysis of eligible hot spots policing evaluations revealed that these programs generated an overall statistically significant reduction in crime outcome measures (see Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau 2012).³ The analysis further revealed that hot spots policing generated positive crime control gains for a variety of crime types, including violent crime, property crime, drug offenses, and disorder offense outcomes.

The strongest crime control gains were reported in the Buenos Aires police presence study, the Jersey City displacement and diffusion study, and the Kansas City gun project. The Buenos Aires police presence after a terror attack study revealed a 75 percent reduction in motor vehicle theft at protected blocks (DiTella and Schargrodsky 2004). The Jersey City displacement and diffusion study reported a 58 percent reduction in drug crime events at the targeted drug hot spot and 45 percent reduction in prostitution events at the targeted prostitution hot spot (Weisburd et al. 2006). Proactive patrols that focused on firearm recoveries in the Kansas City gun project resulted in a 65 percent increase in gun seizures and a 49 percent decrease in gun crimes in the target beat area; gun seizures and gun crimes in the comparison beat area did not significantly change (Sherman and Rogan 1995b). The Kansas City crack house raids study reported the smallest crime control effect; treatment blocks experienced a modest reduction in total calls for service that rapidly decayed over a two week period when compared to control blocks (Sherman and Rogan 1995a).

While it is not possible to review the findings of all 25 tests here, a few evaluations deserve further mention to illustrate the positive benefits generated by hot spots policing programs. The Jersey City POP strategy resulted in significant reductions in total calls for service and total crime incidents, as well as varying reductions in all subcategories of crime types (Braga et al. 1999). Additional analyses of observation data collected over the course of the Jersey City POP evaluation revealed that social disorder (such as loiterers and public drinkers) and physical disorder (such as trash, graffiti, and vacant lots) was also significantly reduced.

The Minneapolis hot spots patrol program revealed that roughly doubling the level of patrol in crime hot spots resulted in modest, but significant, reductions in total calls for service, ranging from 6 to 13 percent (Sherman and Weisburd 1995). Moreover, systematic observations of the hot spots documented that disorderly behavior in the targeted areas was also reduced (Sherman and Weisburd 1995). The Jersey City DMAP program found that problem-oriented police crackdowns followed by patrol maintenance resulted in significant reductions in disorder calls for service (Weisburd and Green 1995). Similarly, the St. Louis quasi-experiment found that the enforcement problem-oriented policing strategy was associated with varying degrees of reductions in total calls for service at all three high-activity drug locations; these reductions were greater than any reductions observed in other blocks and intersections in the surrounding areas (Hope 1994).

As described earlier, hot spots policing programs included in this review were characterized as two fundamentally different types of approaches to control problem places. Problem-oriented policing programs represent police-led efforts to change the underlying conditions that cause hot spots to generate recurring crime problems (Goldstein 1990). The other hot spots policing interventions represent increased traditional policing activities concentrated at specific places to prevent crime through general deterrence and increased risk of apprehension. Meta-analysis was used to examine whether these different approaches generated similar effects on crime hot spots. The analysis revealed that problem-oriented policing interventions generated larger effects relative to increased policing interventions for all crime outcome categories.

Only three hot spots policing studies considered whether the concentration of police enforcement efforts at particular places undermined police-community relations. The Kansas City gun quasi-experiment suggested that residents of areas subjected to hot spots policing welcome the concentration of police efforts in problem places (Shaw 1995). The Lowell policing crime and disorder hot spots experiment reported that community members in treated hot spot areas recognized the increased police presence and its desirable impacts on local disorder problems (Braga and Bond 2009). The Jersey City POP in violent places experiment also found that community members often perceived that the focused police attention improved disorder problems in the treatment hot spots without any negative impacts on their perceptions of the police (Braga 1997).

⁴ The Weisburd et al. (2011) study did not evaluate the impact of these hot spots policing programs on official crime outcomes. Therefore, it was not included in our systematic review of the effects of hot spots policing programs on crime.

Moreover, in a recent randomized controlled trial explicitly designed to test the impacts of hot spots enforcement on community perceptions in three mid-sized California cities,⁴ Weisburd et al. (2011) did not find any evidence of “backfire effects” associated with a policing disorder intervention: the hot spots policing program delivered in this study had no significant impacts on fear of crime, police legitimacy, collective efficacy, or perceptions of crime or social disorder.

Displacement and Diffusion Effects

Seventeen of the 25 hot spots policing tests also included analyses to determine whether the hot spots policing intervention generated any immediate spatial crime displacement or diffusion of crime control benefits effects (see Appendix B on page 32). Prior to discussing the research findings, it must be noted that detecting displacement effects is very difficult, because the potential manifestations of displacement are quite diverse. As Barr and Pease (1990) suggest, “if, in truth, displacement is complete, some displaced crime will fall outside the areas and types of crime being studied or be so dispersed as to be masked by background variation.... No research study, however massive, is likely to resolve the issue.” Diffusion effects are likely to be as difficult to assess. All 17 studies were limited to examining immediate spatial displacement and diffusion effects—i.e., whether focused police efforts in targeted areas resulted in crime “moving around the corner” or whether these surrounding areas experienced unintended crime control benefits.

This review found that diffusion of crime control benefits effects were more likely to be observed than crime displacement. Eight tests reported significant diffusion effects, and six reported no crime displacement or diffusion effects. The eight tests that reported significant diffusion of crime control benefits effects were the Jersey City DMAP (Weisburd and Green 1995), Kansas City gun project (Sherman and Rogan 1995a), Houston targeted beat program (two tests: areas surrounding the zero-tolerance beats and problem-oriented policing beats; Caeti 1999), Oakland beat health study (Mazerolle, Price, and Roehl 2000), Philadelphia drug corners crackdowns project (Lawton, Taylor, and Luongo 2005), and the Jersey City displacement and diffusion study (two tests: buffer zones surrounding the targeted prostitution hot spot and the targeted drug hot spots; Weisburd et al. 2006).

Only three of the 17 studies reported substantial immediate spatial displacement of crime into areas surrounding the targeted locations. The tests that reported statistically significant crime displacement effects were in the St. Louis POP in three drug market locations study (Hope 1994), Jacksonville problem-oriented policing at violent crime hot spots evaluation (Taylor et al. 2011), and Philadelphia foot patrol evaluation (Ratcliffe et al. 2011). While the Philadelphia foot patrol study revealed displacement of violent crime, Ratcliffe et al. (2011) concluded that violent crime control gains in the treatment areas exceeded violent crime displacement into the surrounding areas.

Offenders interviewed in the Jersey City displacement and diffusion study described factors that inhibited spatial displacement, including the importance of familiar territory to offenders and the social organization of illicit activities at hot spots, which often precluded easy movement to other areas that offer crime opportunities. Prostitutes, for example, were found to work near their homes and described being uncomfortable in moving to other areas where different types of people worked and different types of clients were found. Prostitutes and drug dealers in the study described the importance of the familiarity of a place to their clients, and some offenders talked of the dangers of encroaching on the territories of offenders in other hot spots.

Overall, a number of factors seemed to discourage spatial displacement in the study. Nonetheless, Weisburd et al. (2006) find that offenders will often try other modes of adaptation to police interventions, the most common being a change in methods of committing illegal acts. For example, prostitutes and drug dealers may begin to make appointments with their customers or move their activities indoors to avoid heightened police activities on the street. While the net gain in crime prevention may still be large for hot spots efforts, these findings suggest the importance of the continued investigation of possible non-spatial displacement (e.g., method displacement) outcomes in hot spots policing.

Further research on community reactions to hot spots policing programs is still sorely needed.

Conclusion and Policy
Implications

⁵ This study was not included in this systematic review because it did not evaluate the efficacy of the hot spots policing program on an official crime outcome.

Conclusion and Policy Implications

More than a decade has passed since the first iteration of a Campbell Collaboration systematic review on the effects of hot spots policing on crime was published (Braga 2001). The results of this more recent systematic review provide strong support for the basic conclusions of the original Campbell review: hot spots policing programs generate modest crime control gains and are likely to produce a diffusion of crime control benefits into areas immediately surrounding targeted high-activity crime places.

This recent review also makes a new and important substantive contribution to crime control theory and practice by identifying problem-oriented policing as a preferable strategy for reducing crime in hot spot locations. Relative to simply increasing police visibility and making additional arrests in crime hot spots, problem-oriented interventions that attempted to alter place characteristics and dynamics seem to produce larger crime prevention benefits.

The original Campbell review called for further research on community reactions to hot spots policing initiatives (Braga 2001). Unfortunately, this updated systematic review revealed that only four (Braga 1997; Braga and Bond 2009; Shaw 1995; Weisburd et al. 2011) evaluations considered the impacts of these police programs on community members as well as crime outcomes. In contrast to concerns that hot spots policing can easily become zero-tolerance and indiscriminate aggressive tactics can drive a wedge between the police and communities (Rosenbaum 2006; Tonry 2011), these three evaluations revealed that the community members had positive opinions and experiences when subjected to hot spots policing initiatives. Moreover, in a recent randomized controlled trial explicitly designed to test the impacts of hot spots enforcement on community perceptions in three mid-sized California cities,⁵ Weisburd et al. (2011) did not find any evidence of “backfire effects” associated with a policing disorder intervention: the hot spots policing program delivered in this study had no significant impacts on fear of crime, police legitimacy, collective efficacy, or perceptions of crime or social disorder.

Further research on community reactions to hot spots policing programs is still sorely needed. Only two of the four evaluations described above (Braga and Bond 2009; Weisburd et al. 2011) represent new evaluations that were not included in the original Campbell review. It is important to note that these four evaluations interviewed or surveyed residents and business owners in hot spot areas and did not interview individuals arrested, detained, and/or interrogated as a result of these focused police actions. These individuals may have very different opinions and experiences when compared to community members who do not experience direct law enforcement actions.

A recent evaluation of the adverse system side effects of Operation Sunrise, described here as the Philadelphia drug corners crackdown, found that the initiative strained the local judicial system by generating a high volume of arrests that resulted in a significant increase in fugitive defendants (Goldkamp and Vilcica 2008). Short-term crime gains produced by particular types of hot spots policing initiatives could undermine the long-term stability of specific neighborhoods through the increased involvement of mostly low-income minority men in the criminal justice system.

The potential impacts of hot spots policing on police-community relations may depend in good part on the context of the hot spots affected and types of strategies used. An increased enforcement program to control a repeat shoplifting problem in a shopping mall, for instance, may be welcomed by store owners and legitimate customers alike. However, police actions that seek to prevent crime by changing places, such as problem-oriented policing interventions, seem better positioned to generate both crime control gains and positive community perceptions of the police relative to simply increasing police presence and arresting large numbers of offenders. Whatever the impacts, more needs to be known about the effects of hot spots policing approaches on the communities the police serve. Future evaluations of hot spots policing programs must make understanding these complex police-community dynamics a high priority.

In closing, none, surprisingly, of the 19 hot spots policing evaluations reviewed here conducted formal cost-benefit assessments. It is unfortunately rare for crime and justice program evaluations to include analyses of monetary costs of running a program relative to the benefits accrued by preventing crimes (Welsh and Farrington 2000). In fact, the only time monetary costs were explicitly mentioned was to acknowledge that additional patrols in hot spot areas were supported by the police department's own overtime budget (see Taylor, Koper, and Woods 2011) or through external grant funds (see Sherman and Rogan 1995b). Many of the evaluations implied that the hot spots interventions were supported via reallocating existing resources into the treatment areas without incurring any additional costs. Nevertheless, this policy impact of this body of research would be considerably strengthened if evaluations demonstrated that hot spots policing programs generated both crime control gains and monetary savings relative to traditional policing methods.

References

References

- Barr, Robert, and Ken Pease. 1990. "Crime Placement, Displacement, and Deflection." In *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Vol. 12, ed. Michael Tonry and Norval Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bittner, Egon. 1970. *The Functions of the Police in Modern Society*. New York: Aronson.
- Braga, Anthony A. 1997. *Solving Violent Crime Problems: An Evaluation of the Jersey City Police Department's Pilot Program to Control Violent Places*. Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- . 2001. "The Effects of Hot Spots Policing on Crime." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 578:104–25.
- . 2008. *Problem-Oriented Policing and Crime Prevention*. Second edition. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Braga, Anthony A., and Brenda Bond. 2008. "Policing Crime and Disorder Hot Spots: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Criminology* 46:577–608.
- . 2009. "Community Perceptions of Police Crime Prevention Efforts: Using Interviews in Small Areas to Evaluate Crime Reduction Strategies." In *Evaluating Crime Reduction*, eds. Johannes Knutsson and Nick Tilley. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Braga, Anthony A., David M. Hureau, and Andrew V. Papachristos. 2011. "An Ex-Post-Facto Evaluation Framework for Place-Based Police Interventions." *Evaluation Review* 35:592–626.
- Braga, Anthony A., Andrew V. Papachristos, and David M. Hureau. 2010. "The Concentration and Stability of Gun Violence at Micro Places in Boston, 1980–2008." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 26: 33–53.
- . 2012. *The Effects of Hot Spots Policing in Crime*. Campbell Systematic Reviews.
- Braga, Anthony A., and David L. Weisburd. 2010. *Policing Problem Places: Crime Hot Spots and Effective Prevention*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Braga, Anthony A., David Weisburd, Elin Waring, Lorraine Green Mazerolle, William Spelman, and Francis Gajewski. 1999. "Problem-Oriented Policing in Violent Crime Places: A Randomized Controlled Experiment." *Criminology* 37: 541–80.
- Caeti, Tory. 1999. *Houston's Targeted Beat Program: A Quasi-Experimental Test of Police Patrol Strategies*. Ph.D. diss., Sam Houston State University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- CJC (Criminal Justice Commission). 1998. "Beenleigh Calls for Service Project: Evaluation Report." Brisbane, Queensland, AUS: Criminal Justice Commission.
- Clarke, Ronald V., and David Weisburd. 1994. "Diffusion of Crime Control Benefits: Observations on the Reverse of Displacement." *Crime Prevention Studies* 2:165–84.
- Cohen, Jacqueline, Wilpen Gorr, and Piyusha Singh. 2003. "Estimating Intervention Effects in Varying Risk Settings: Do Police Raids Reduce Illegal Drug Dealing at Nuisance Bars?" *Criminology* 41:257–292.
- DiTella, Rafael, and Ernesto Schargrodsky. 2004. "Do Police Reduce Crime? Estimates Using the Allocation of Police Forces after a Terrorist Attack." *American Economic Review* 94:115–133.
- Goldkamp, John, and E. Rely Vilcica. 2008. "Targeted Enforcement and Adverse System Side Effects: The Generation of Fugitives in Philadelphia." *Criminology* 46:371–410.
- Goldstein, Herman. 1990. *Problem-Oriented Policing*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hope, Timothy. 1994. "Problem-Oriented Policing and Drug Market Locations: Three Case Studies." *Crime Prevention Studies* 2:5–32.
- Lawton, Brian, Ralph Taylor, and Anthony Luongo. 2005. "Police Officers on Drug Corners in Philadelphia, Drug Crime, and Violent Crime: Intended, Diffusion, and Displacement Impacts." *Justice Quarterly* 22:427–451.
- Lipsey, Mark W., and David B. Wilson. 2001. *Practical Meta-Analysis*. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 40. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Mazerolle, Lorraine, James Price, and Jan Roehl. 2000. "Civil Remedies and Drug Control: A Randomized Field Trial in Oakland, California." *Evaluation Review* 24:212–241.
- PERF (Police Executive Research Forum). 2008. *Violent Crime in America: What We Know About Hot Spots Enforcement*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Pierce, Glenn, Susan Spaar, and LeBaron Briggs. 1988. *The Character of Police Work: Strategic and Tactical Implications*. Boston, MA: Center for Applied Social Research, Northeastern University.
- Ratcliffe, Jerry, Travis Taniguchi, Elizabeth Groff, and Jennifer Wood. 2011. "The Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Police Patrol Effectiveness in Violent Crime Hot Spots." *Criminology* 49:795–831.
- Repetto, Thomas. 1976. "Crime Prevention and the Displacement Phenomenon." *Crime & Delinquency* 22:166–77.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis. 2006. "The Limits of Hot Spots Policing." In *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*, eds. David Weisburd and Anthony A. Braga. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, James. 1995. "Community Policing Against Guns: Public Opinion of the Kansas City Gun Experiment." *Justice Quarterly* 12:695–710.
- Sherman, Lawrence, Michael Buerger, and Patrick Gartin. 1989. *Repeat Call Address Policing: The Minneapolis RECAP Experiment* (Final Report to the National Institute of Justice). Washington, D.C.: Crime Control Institute.
- Sherman, Lawrence, Patrick Gartin, and Michael Buerger. 1989. "Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place." *Criminology* 27:27–56.
- Sherman, Lawrence, and Dennis Rogan. 1995a. "Deterrent Effects of Police Raids on Crack Houses: A Randomized Controlled Experiment." *Justice Quarterly* 12:755–82.
- . 1995b. "Effects of Gun Seizures on Gun Violence: 'Hot Spots' Patrol in Kansas City." *Justice Quarterly* 12:673–694.

- Sherman, Lawrence, and David Weisburd. 1995. "General Deterrent Effects of Police Patrol in Crime Hot Spots: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Justice Quarterly* 12:625–48.
- Skogan, Wesley, and Kathleen Frydl, eds. 2004. *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- Sviridoff, Michele, Susan Sadd, Richard Curtis, and Randolph Grinc. 1992. *The Neighborhood Effects of Street-Level Drug Enforcement: Tactical Narcotics Teams in New York*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Taylor, Bruce, Christopher Koper, and Daniel Woods. 2011. "A Randomized Controlled Trial of Different Policing Strategies at Hot Spots of Violent Crime." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 7:149–181.
- Tonry, Michael. 2011. "Less Imprisonment is No Doubt a Good Thing: More Policing is Not." *Criminology & Public Policy* 10:137–152.
- Weisburd, David L., and Anthony A. Braga. 2006. "Hot Spots Policing as a Model for Police Innovation." In *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*, eds. David L. Weisburd and Anthony A. Braga. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Weisburd, David L., Shawn Bushway, Cynthia Lum, and Sue-Ming Yang. 2004. "Trajectories of Crime at Places: A Longitudinal Study of Street Segments in the City of Seattle." *Criminology* 42:283–321.
- Weisburd, David, and John Eck. 2004. "What Can Police Do to Reduce Crime, Disorder, and Fear?" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 593:42–65.
- Weisburd, David, and Lorraine Green. 1994. "Defining the Street Level Drug Market." In *Drugs and Crime: Evaluating Public Policy Initiatives*, eds. Doris L. MacKenzie and Craig Uchida. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- . 1995. "Policing Drug Hot Spots: The Jersey City DMA Experiment." *Justice Quarterly* 12:711–36.

- Weisburd, David, Joshua Hinkle, Christine Famega, and Justin Ready. 2011. "The Possible 'Backfire' Effects of Broken Windows Policing at Crime Hot Spots: An Experimental Assessment of Impacts on Legitimacy, Fear and Collective Efficacy." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 7:297–320.
- Weisburd, David, Stephen Mastrofski, Anne Marie McNally, Rosann Greenspan, and James Willis. 2003. "Reforming to Preserve: Compstat and Strategic Problem Solving in American Policing." *Criminology & Public Policy* 2:421–456.
- Weisburd, David, Laura Wyckoff, Justin Ready, John Eck, Joshua Hinkle, and Francis Gajewski. 2006. "Does Crime Just Move Around the Corner? A Controlled Study of Spatial Displacement and Diffusion of Crime Control Benefits." *Criminology* 44:549–592.
- Welsh, Brandon and David P. Farrington. 2000. "The Monetary Costs and Benefits of Crime Prevention Programs." In *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Vol. 27, ed. Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Appendixes

Appendix A: Hot Spots Policing Programs

Study	Program Elements
Minneapolis (MN) Repeat Call Policing Sherman, Buerger, and Gartin (1989)	Problem-oriented policing interventions comprised of mostly traditional enforcement tactics with some situational responses
New York (NY) Tactical Narcotics Teams Sviridoff et al. (1992)	Undercover and plainclothes police crackdown on street drug markets primarily using “buy and bust” operations
St. Louis (MO) POP in Three Drug Areas Hope (1994)	Problem-oriented policing interventions comprised of mostly traditional enforcement tactics with some situational responses
Minneapolis (MN) Hot Spots Sherman and Weisburd (1995)	Uniformed police patrol; experimental group, on average, experienced twice as much patrol presence
Jersey City (NJ) DMAP Weisburd and Green (1995)	Well-planned crackdowns followed by preventive patrol to maintain crime control gains
Kansas City (MO) Crack House Raids Sherman and Rogan (1995a)	Court-authorized raids on crack houses conducted by uniformed police officers
Kansas City (MO) Gun Project Sherman and Rogan (1995b)	Intensive enforcement of laws against illegally carrying concealed firearms via safety frisks during traffic stops, plain view, and searches incident to arrest on other charges
Beenleigh (AUS) Calls for Service Project Criminal Justice Commission (1998)	Problem-oriented policing interventions comprised of mostly traditional enforcement tactics with some situational responses
Houston (TX) Targeted Beat Program Caeti (1999)	Patrol initiative designed to reduce index crimes in 7 beats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 beats used high-visibility patrol at hot spots • 3 beats used zero-tolerance policing at hot spots • 1 beat used a problem-oriented policing approach comprised of mostly traditional tactics to control hot spots
Jersey City (NJ) POP at Violent Places Braga et al. (1999)	Problem-oriented policing interventions comprised of mostly aggressive disorder enforcement tactics with some situational responses

Study	Program Elements
Oakland (CA) Beat Health Program Mazerolle et al. (2000)	Problem-oriented policing intervention that used civil remedies to alleviate drug and disorder problems at targeted properties
Pittsburgh (PA) Police Raids at Nuisance Bars Cohen et al. (2003)	Raids by narcotics squad on nuisance bars to reduce drug selling in and around targeted bar
Buenos Aires (ARG) Police Presence after Terrorist Attack DiTella and Schargrodsky (2004)	Increased police presence at Jewish centers in three neighborhoods
Philadelphia (PA) Drug Corners Crackdowns Lawton et al. (2005)	Police crackdown that stationed officers at high-activity drug locations
Jersey City (NJ) Displacement and Diffusion Study Weisburd et al. (2006)	Problem-oriented policing interventions comprised of mostly traditional enforcement tactics with some situational responses
Lowell (MA) Policing Crime and Disorder Hot Spots Project Braga and Bond (2008)	Problem-oriented policing interventions comprised of mostly disorder reduction tactics with some situational responses
Jacksonville (FL) Policing Violent Crime Hot Spots Program Taylor et al. (2011)	Two interventions tested: problem-oriented policing and direct-saturation patrol
Philadelphia (PA) Foot Patrol Program Ratcliffe et al. (2011)	Foot patrol in violent crime hot spots
Boston (MA) Safe Street Teams Braga et al. (2011)	Problem-oriented policing interventions comprised of disorder reduction initiatives and limited situational responses

Source: Adapted from Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau 2012

Appendix B: Results of Hot Spots Policing Evaluations

Study	Crime Outcomes	Displacement / Diffusion
Minneapolis (MN) RECAP Sherman, Buerger, and Gartin (1989)	For commercial addresses, no effect For residential addresses, reductions in calls for service	Not measured
New York (NY) Tactical Narcotics Teams Sviridoff et al. (1992)	In the 70th precinct, no effect In the 67th precinct, reductions in assault incidents	Not measured
St. Louis (MO) POP in Three Drug Areas Hope (1994)	Varying reductions in total calls in all three drug locations	Significant displacement in one location
Minneapolis (MN) Hot Spots Sherman and Weisburd (1995)	Reductions in total citizen calls for service	Not measured
Jersey City (NJ) DMAP Weisburd and Green (1995)	Reductions in citizen calls for disorder offenses	Little evidence of displacement; analyses suggest modest diffusion of crime control benefits
Kansas City (MO) Crack House Raids Sherman and Rogan (1995a)	Modest decreases in citizen calls and offense reports that decayed in two weeks	Not measured
Kansas City (MO) Gun Project Sherman and Rogan (1995b)	Increase in guns seized by the police followed by decrease in gun crimes	No significant crime displacement; diffusion effects reported
Beenleigh (AUS) Calls for Service Project Criminal Justice Commission (1998)	No noteworthy differences in total number of calls between Beenleigh and Brown Plains areas Noteworthy reductions in calls reported in majority of case studies	Not measured
Houston (TX) Targeted Beat Program Caeti (1999)	Significant crime reductions for aggregated targeted beats Mixed results for specific beats	No evidence of displacement Diffusion effects reported
Jersey City (NJ) POP at Violent Places Braga et al. (1999)	Reductions in total calls for service and total crime incidents Varying reductions for all subcategories of crime	Little evidence of immediate spatial displacement Possible diffusion of crime control benefits
Oakland (CA) Beat Health Program Mazerolle et al. (2000)	Reductions in drug calls for service	Diffusion of crime control benefits reported

Study	Crime Outcomes	Displacement / Diffusion
Pittsburgh (PA) Police Raids at Nuisance Bars Cohen et al. (2003)	Reductions in drug calls in bars that disappeared when program ceased	Not measured
Buenos Aires (ARG) Police Presence after Terrorist Attack DiTella and Schargrodsky (2004)	Large reduction in motor vehicle theft incidents	No crime displacement or diffusion of crime control benefits reported
Philadelphia (PA) Drug Corners Crackdowns Lawton et al. (2005)	Reductions in drug crime and violent crime incidents	Diffusion of benefits for violent crime incidents; mixed results for drug crime incidents
Jersey City (NJ) Displacement and Diffusion Study Weisburd et al. (2006)	Reductions in prostitution and drug events	Diffusion of crime control benefits reported
Lowell (MA) Policing Crime and Disorder Hot Spots Project Braga and Bond (2008)	Reductions in total calls for service	Mild diffusion of crime control benefits reported
Jacksonville (FL) Policing Violent Crime Hot Spots Program Taylor et al. (2011)	Reduction in street violence incidents due to problem-oriented policing strategy No crime control gains from direct-saturation patrol	Some evidence of crime displacement
Philadelphia (PA) Foot Patrol Program Ratcliffe et al. (2011)	Reduction in street violent crime incidents	Some crime displacement noted, but these effects were not larger than the benefits reported in hot spots
Boston (MA) Safe Street Teams Braga et al. (2011)	Reductions in violent crime incidents	No crime displacement or diffusion of crime control benefits reported

Source: Adapted from Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau 2012



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
145 N Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20530

To obtain details on COPS programs,
call the COPS Office Response Center at 800.421.6770.

Visit COPS Online at www.cops.usdoj.gov.

September 2012
e041218459
ISBN: 978-1-935676-13-3