

Spring 2015

Methods of Policing: Deviation from the Standard Model of Policing and Measured Effectiveness

Elena Stamm

The University Of Akron, ems109@zips.uakron.edu

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Follow this and additional works at: http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stamm, Elena, "Methods of Policing: Deviation from the Standard Model of Policing and Measured Effectiveness" (2015). *Honors Research Projects*. 186.

http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects/186

This Honors Research Project is brought to you for free and open access by The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors College at IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Research Projects by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.

Methods of Policing: Deviation from
the Standard Model of Policing and
Measured Effectiveness

Elena Stamm

Senior Honors Research Project

In today's climate, there are a lot of misgivings about law enforcement, and the way that it is carried out. There have been tensions between certain elements and the police throughout history, but now an age is being entered of even more public outrage than what has come to be considered "the norm". Some of the issues that have arisen are specific to individuals, some to particular police departments, but others are institutional. In light of these issues, it becomes necessary for people to analyze the various methods of policing that have developed, and how they compare to the standard model of policing. An analysis needs to be done of the alternative methods of policing, and their effectiveness in crime prevention. Starting by describing what is known about the standard model and comparing it to these other methods, information can be gleaned as to what changes need to be made in modern day law enforcement to increase effectiveness.

The standard model of policing is exactly as its name implies, it sets the standard for policing across the country. It is what one tends to envision when one thinks about what policing is. It consists of random patrols through streets, in hopes of creating a feeling that police can be anywhere at any time and an increase in officers to attempt to catch more crimes in process. These officers are trained to quickly respond to service calls so as to attempt to apprehend criminals before they make their escape, among other reactive techniques. When crimes have already been committed and more evidence and information is needed, then officers will follow up with the parties involved to glean further knowledge and heighten the likelihood that a crime will be solved (Santos 2012). This is the method that has been used for years, and crime has certainly not been eradicated, or indeed lessened

to an extent that would leave experts feeling that there may be no better way to conduct criminal justice. As a result, further theories and systems have arisen.

One of these methods, Community Oriented Policing, otherwise known as COP, is relatively well known. COP promotes closer involvement by officers in the community that they serve. To truly embrace COP, change must come to the department, whether as a whole or by adding an additional, COP specific, sub unit. From there changes need to be enacted to increase the involvement of the community in the criminal justice process, and higher emphasis put on a problem solving approach. The Clinton administration took the COP program and heavily promoted it, offering grants for departments to train officers in the methods used. Since it was so highly promoted, the question of exactly how effective it is became paramount. A meta-analysis was conducted over the available literature and previous studies to attempt to answer this question. The study looked to measure how much the COP program affected not only how citizens viewed police in terms of legitimacy, and how satisfied they were by the services that law enforcement was providing them, and how fearful they felt that crimes would be committed against them, but also crime itself (Gill et al, 2014).

One of the main pitfalls that occurred when analyzing the data available was that COP is not particularly specific in its tactics, it is open to a wider interpretation, and thus comparisons become tricky. The way that different agencies choose to implement COP varies greatly. Some believe that it is merely meant to be an addition to the policies already in place and not meant to be the main strategy of an entire department, while others believe that COP cannot come into action mildly, and must

instead be used to completely reconfigure a department. Some were just confused as to what practices even constituted COP, and thus were nervous to go further with the program. This all made the selection of different departments as eligible a more difficult task. It was finally decided that departments had to at least have some sort of program or plan set up that involved the citizen's help with solving issues presented in the community (Gil et al, 2014). Because there is so much discrepancy in actual programs, the analysis must be quantitative, not qualitative.

The analysis of studies showed a few different things. When the odds ratio was not favorable to prove COP effective, the authors would not label it as being harmful to the level of crime, saying instead that it was most likely ineffective. Of the studies that measured citizen's satisfaction with police, levels were statistically higher in association with the COP program in 82.6% of the areas in which COP was implemented (Gil et al, 2014). Likewise, a similar percentage of COP areas showed a decrease in citizen's fear of crime and perception of social disorder. However, the results of crime and disorder reduction proved to be less significant. Because of all the discrepancies between COP programs implemented from department to department, finding an overarching theme between them as to whether or not COP is effective in all situations becomes difficult. The results were instead broken into instances of property crime and violent crime, as well as citizen's perception of crime in their neighborhoods. Results for the latter were not statistically significant, although they tended towards increased confidence in police effectiveness on neighborhood crime. However, the study did show that, although nothing was truly concrete, there was some evidence to show that violent crimes may be significantly

decreased when COP is employed, and that people may have an increased trust in law enforcement officers and confidence in interacting with them. Property crimes were not as positively affected.

COP is a program that works on crime control through enhanced citizen/officer relations (Gil et al 2014). Although more research needs to be done, and the COP program may need to be more standardized to provide better material for analysis, the results of this study were more positive than previously imagined. There was some evidence that the program positively influenced not only instances of crimes but also public relations, something that is vital to police effectiveness. With some tweaking and more testing, COP could prove to truly influence criminal justice for the better.

One of the first variations from the standard model of policing is problem oriented policing (POP). POP was created because policing was beginning to be more focused on bureaucratic and organizational specifics than on the issue that they are actually in place for, crime in society (Goldstein 2005). Some elements of POP are similar to what has already been addressed in regards to the COP program, such as working on community relations to help with crime control. Other elements are a little different, such as focusing not only on criminal law but also bringing in civil statutes in the approach to crime fighting. Using these different resources is a necessary measure to not only address the issues from which civil disorder and crime originate, but also in reaching ideas to address these issues when they arise, and thereby better solve the problems that create the opportunity for criminal acts to take place (Weisburg et al, 2010). Other researchers further expanded on the

work done by Goldstein and worked to develop a way in which his approach could be employed by police departments wishing to enact the POP model. The acronym for this process is SARA, otherwise elaborated as scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. To explain, law enforcement officers scan for issues, analyze the problem and what possible solutions are available, respond with what they believe to be the most effective idea, and assess the results to see if the problem has indeed been taken care of (Weisburg et al, 2010).

POP has proven to be one of the more popular methods of policing. Despite this popularity, there has not been a lot of actual research done to assess exactly how effective the method actually is. There is not one universal method when it comes to the implementation of POP, making it somewhat difficult to decide what criteria should be evaluated. Since crimes and departments and environments all differ, it comes down to whether or not the issues were approached from a problem solving perspective or not. Through this criterion, Weisburg et al. (2010) were able to conduct an overview of the information available relating to the effectiveness of POP programs. Situations where the SARA model was utilized were considered for inclusion, providing that they included enough quantitative data to calculate whether the method was actually having an effect on the problematic areas or individuals in question, and if so what it was, and how it compared to the control group on which POP was not employed (Weisburg et al, 2010).

It was difficult to find many studies that fit this description, which may be considered somewhat worrisome for the criminal justice community. If POP is to be properly assessed for its effectiveness when compared with other methods of

policing, it is necessary to produce more studies on the results of its use. There are so many different types of crime, and so many diverse approaches to solving each of these problems that it becomes difficult to compare the results from studies in an equitable manner. If trends in these studies did, despite difficulties, arise, these trends could then allow for the application of certain solutions to a broader type of crime. If they have proven effective through extensive testing, they could assist in solving a problem in a more generalized sense than merely one specific instance (Weisburg et al, 2010).

The meta-analysis supported the conclusion that POP does have a statistically significant impact on crime control. Although statistically significant it was not as drastic a reduction as some researchers believed that it would be. This finding could be because, as previously mentioned, the situations and crimes studied were all different and there is not one overall way in which POP is to be integrated. The difference in commitment levels of the organizations studied could also have had an impact. Some took the experiment more seriously than others and had a much stronger push to use the system from the structure as whole, not just a few officers or a specific department. The authors stated that the government needs to fund more research on POP, trying to investigate what kinds of departments are best impacted by its implementation, and what specific methods of it are the best in regards to applying it to particular problems (Weisburg et al, 2010).

Another policing structure is known as evidence based policing. This method was conceptualized by August Vollmer, attempting to improve on policing practices by adjusting them in the same way as the scientific method is used to improve upon

modern medicine. When a new technique in medicine is developed, it is tested extensively to assess its effectiveness. In this same way, new principles in policing need to be tested for effectiveness and then either phased into practice or sent back for further work (Sherman 1998). It has been shown that not all medical practitioners are eager to change their actions, much the same as law enforcement officers are inclined to stick to habit and tradition, and both fields need to modify their actions according to what is actually proven to work, as opposed to just what has always been done.

Many current practices in policing and medicine are still employed without much evidence of their actual effectiveness. There is something to be said for tradition and experience, but when methods from the past have failed to prove useful, then the resistance to change becomes an issue. It has been shown that police are not always adverse to research that challenges their traditions and structure, but that not enough research is done to challenge anything in the first place. Another related issue is that many police officers are not told which methods actually have proven effective, and their ability to gauge which tactics are effective and which are not is severely lacking, and at some points even completely incorrect (Lum et al, 2012).

Police departments need to be evaluated individually and in a specified and regulated manner, to ensure accuracy in the evaluation. When presented with a particular problem, ten police officers might have just as many different ways to handle the situation. There are oftentimes an assortment of possible solutions to a problem, but it is doubtful that all of them will prove equally useful. Research needs

to be conducted in regards to which methods are most effective when employed in controlled experiments, and also on a long term basis to assess whether the methods continue to function fully as time goes on and society and departments change (Sherman 1998). The long-term evaluation will begin to shape guidelines about specific areas and the factors that influence policing practices, allowing for a framework to take form of what practices work best under which circumstances. Recidivism will be better tracked, making it easier to see what responses actually prevented further criminal acts, and which served as a temporary fix. This scientific approach to policing is not utilized by other methods (Sherman 1998).

To implement evidence based policing, police departments would have to comply with some universal principles put in place. The system would have to be regulated so that the data would actually be comparable from department to department. To put this into effect, all officers would have to be on board with the program as it requires total participation to produce accurate numbers. Putting a system in place, such as publicly reporting data about individual police departments and officers has been considered a possibility, as it has been shown to lead to more accountability (Sherman 1998). However it could be lead to be implemented, evidence lead policing seeks to enhance the underemphasized scientific side of policing.

Many policing methods are put into action with the use of a small group of officers or the creation of a specialized unit in the department. In general, it can be argued that the more that the whole institution supports a given method, the more

effect that it has on the community. However, when it comes to COMPSTAT, the entire system has to be overhauled to put the program into effect.

COMPSTAT, which stands for computer statistics, is a managerial and technological system for law enforcement agencies. It serves as an accountability strategy and is driven by the analysis of crime statistics. COMPSTAT was created by the New York City Police Department (NYPD) in an attempt to better coordinate their forces to respond to crimes in the city. There are four main principles that comprise COMPSTAT. The first of these principles is ensuring that information is conducted to the entire organization quickly and accurately. Second, making sure that only effective techniques are used to treat specific issues. Third of all, which echoes back to the standard model of policing, is rapid response to calls for service, but with the addition of safeguarding that officers are applied to more specifically focused areas. Finally, fourth, making sure to consistently and persistently follow up on incidents to gather information on what went right and what went wrong with the handling of the matter (Willis et al, 2007).

COMPSTAT attempts to hold officers and their commanders accountable for their actions, and for their success or failure in controlling criminal acts, not merely dictating the response to crimes committed. To better assist this process, there are regular meetings scheduled where supervisors report to the top brass of the department, explaining what problems are occurring in their precincts, what they plan to do to resolve the problems, and what the results are concerning problems addressed previously (Willis et al, 2007). These statistics are compiled and given to crime analysts to assess and organize. If the commanders fail to give satisfactory

results to their bosses, they are held accountable for their failures. Some believe that COMPSTAT enhances the structure of policing, organizing things in a more comprehensive, efficient, and effective manner. Others believe that it draws even deeper lines between the levels of the departments, making them more hierarchical and less cohesive (Willis et al, 2007).

To test whether or not COMPSTAT is truly an effective and viable method for controlling crime, it was analyzed according to how it acted in the departments studied, from two different perspectives. The first perspective, technical/rational, is characterized by being based somewhat on a market economy, the department offers certain services which it trades in exchange for the desired profit, specifically being reduced crime. From this perspective, the desire to speed “production” and receive the resulting profit causes the institution to streamline and organize itself for utmost efficiency (Willis et al, 2007). The second perspective is institutional, which is shaped more by environmental cues than by exchange of goods and services. According to this perspective, institutions take cues from their environment as to what they are expected to look like and function as, and that becomes the foremost concern, as opposed to effectiveness (Willis et al, 2007). To get a sample that was representative of how the COMPSTAT program would work in a wider variety of departments in the United States than just the NYPD, the creators of this study chose three cities that are of somewhat large proportion with slightly differing departmental makeups. Department status meetings were attended and interviews and surveys of officers were conducted to better grasp what effect COMPSTAT was truly having on the organizations (Willis et al, 2007).

One of the issues immediately encountered was that not all departments in the study attempted to adjust the model of COMPSTAT to their specific circumstances, instead electing to keep all of the elements that were used in the NYPD model. Because every police department is different, there were issues that developed with race relations between the public and the police, something that had not been at the forefront of concerns previous to the enactment of COMPSTAT. This failure to adjust to specific circumstances for fear of damaging the perceived integrity of the system led to the impression that appearances were more of concern than actual results. Another issue that arose was the use of conflicting policing strategies. COP was also utilized by the cities studied, and the two approaches would at times clash in their execution, making it unclear whether COMPSTAT was not working or making things worse, or vice versa (Willis et al, 2007).

One element that appeared to serve its purpose was the departmental meetings that COMPSTAT requires. The meetings caused commanders to feel the need to keep up on the statistics and other goings on in their districts, a way to almost force them to be accountable for fear of appearing negligent to their peers and bosses. Not all officers were required to report; only those of a certain rank were counted upon, resulting in the limitation of accountability. On top of this, it seems that officer reports were mainly focused on how much information they could regurgitate on command, not so much on the quality of the information, and the positive or negative effects that their actions were having on crime (Willis et al, 2007). Officers that attended the meetings would fail to bring back information and updates to their underlings with any regularity, stopping the flow of information

and limiting the effects that the meetings could potentially have on performance. Issues between the command division and the reorganization of the structure of the police departments created discordance and confusion in departments, making it appear that an organizational plan should be finely tuned to each individual area before COMPSTAT is instituted (Willis et al, 2007).

Since statistics are such an integral part of the COMPSTAT system, records were more meticulously kept and information about geographical location of crimes and other possibly relevant information was made more readily available than in previous times. This information, although now provided to commanders in broken down form, was utilized or filtered through advanced technology, instead of being looked at through personal knowledge and traditional tactics. This caused the information to not have an impact much different than it would have previous to the implementation of COMPSTAT. Further echoing this was the general lack of follow up, despite its importance in the model of COMPSTAT developed (Willis et al, 2007). Without utilizing the information collected, the impact of the program becomes difficult to measure. There was increased accountability of command and focus on the mission of fighting crime, but the organizational confusion and missing follow through and follow up, the effectiveness of COMPSTAT in departments of more average size than the NYPD is difficult to measure.

COMPSTAT as a method of taking a department and structurally changing it to address a crime problem has been proven to be effective in some situations. Issues arise when departments fail to adopt the original model to their own separate circumstances, and when no feedback is given from the weekly

informational meetings to the departments, causing there to be an information gap. Information and statistics need to be gathered and dispersed to the correct sources, and feedback must be given in a timely manner. Problem solving techniques can then be used to address the issues that have proven relevant, possibly increasing the effectiveness of this method of policing (Willis et al, 2007).

Another method, called Hot Spot Policing, focuses more on the principle that crime is not evenly distributed in all areas, but “clustered in small areas, or hot spots, that account for a disproportionate amount of crime and disorder (NIJ 2014)”. To combat these so called “hot spots”, researchers look to develop ways to target the specific high crime areas to effectively reduce the crime taking place within them, and not merely push the offenders into other areas. It is a difficult balance to strike. There has to be proof that a positive effect is made in the hot spot itself. Multiple experiments were conducted, including one by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ 2014), on hot spot areas in cities. Results from increased patrol and police presence in some of the hot spots were compared with results from controlled spots in which police presence was not altered, and there were definite effects of reduced criminal activity in the areas in which police presence was increased (Weisburd 2005). In regards to the concern that criminals would instead be diffused to the surrounding areas and wreak havoc there, results suggested that the increased police attention in the hot spot locations served to decrease calls for criminal acts in the areas directly surrounding them, having a deterrent effect (Weisburd 2005).

One problem that was not originally foreseen in the implementation of hot spot policing was how the public would react to police presence being increased in

certain areas, which may lead to decreases in other areas. The public requested that patrols be increased all over, something that is not necessarily feasible for all, if any, departments. Before a department implements hot spot policing, a plan must be enacted to educate the public and the police to explain the theory behind the method. If not made aware of the reasoning, then the public and the public servants may feel that they are being unjust in their attentions and leaving other areas vulnerable, instead of strategically addressing an issue (Weisburd 2005). As with other methods, one of the elements that could increase the effectiveness of hot spot policing would be a heavier push from the higher ups in the policing organizations. If the officers are not inspired and encouraged to enact the policies then they may not put in much personal effort, causing the results of the study to also be inaccurate. Also, the development of a stronger framework of the exact actions that officers should be taking as part of increased patrols should be developed. Questions arise such as whether or not increased officer/citizen interaction should be made, or if officers should merely be present in the areas instead of actively participating (Weisburd 2005). Consistency is also an issue that rears its head. If officers are constantly taking breaks and vacations, causing there to be a thinning of the ranks, then effects of changes in policing practices may be more difficult to accurately emphasize, and results become more difficult to interpret and vague (Braga 2001, Weisburg 2005).

Police misconduct is another concern that is voiced when police action is centered in very concentrated areas. This issue has been highly incendiary in the media of late, which increases the relevancy of this study. There may be statistical

evidence that prove certain areas have increased criminal activity, but much caution must be taken when it comes to the reciprocated increase in police action. If the action is not carefully restricted, then there can also be an increase in complaints of police brutality. Special attention to certain areas makes it appear that police are intentionally targeting not only certain areas, but also certain demographics. Cities sometimes have different regions that house people of similar racial or economic characteristics, whether this is in direct correlation to the amount of crime in the area or not. If these regions do have heightened crime, extra police attention can cause the citizens who reside in the surrounding area to feel targeted, not understanding the exact philosophy behind hot spot policing (Braga 2001). If police misconduct is an issue in a department, then it would need to be addressed in its own right. If misconduct is not an issue, then the actual purpose of increased patrols would need to be explained and illustrated with real statistics to the public.

Through careful explanation and presentation of statistics, departments and communities can be taught the principles of hot spot policing, creating better understanding of the methodology. Once the department and citizens are behind the strategy, hot spot policing can be put into effect. Seven out of nine evaluations of departments that employed hot spot policing showed significant reduction of crime in the areas addressed, without an increase of crime in the surrounding areas connected with overflow from the hot spots being treated. Although no clear method proves most effective in these hot spots, knowing that addressing these problem areas can cause a difference is a jumping off point to research the subject further and with more specifics (Braga 2001)

Intelligence-Led Policing (ILP) is not purely a carefully strategized plan, it is also an emphasis on communication and environmental factors influencing criminal activity (Ferguson 2012, Licate 2014). ILP requires the sharing of information between agencies. Many pitfalls in criminal justice result from vital information falling through the cracks due to too little communication between departments and agencies. It might not seem like an issue that would arise, but many departments do not have the foresight to share information on current cases and problem areas with other departments and agencies that might find it useful. ILP is trying to break this cycle by figuring out in what new ways technology and other resources can be used to increase and facilitate this information sharing (NIJ 2007). Information is gathered on the crimes committed in certain areas and the specifics surrounding them, mapping statistics and data and using them to attempt to address the issues faced in those areas (Ferguson 2012).

To help install ILP as an accepted policy in departments, the hiring of crime analysts is one move that can be made. Crime analysts were not always considered necessary or even useful in smaller departments, their use was much more common and accepted in larger departments and intelligence agencies, such as federal law enforcement agencies, because of the import of their cases and the large area over which they have to oversee. While analysts are indeed more useful at lower levels than previously believed, not all departments have the money or resources to hire them (Carter 2009). However, there can be other changes made to organizations to set them up to better demonstrate ILP practices. A restructuring of the department to allow information to better flow through it and reach all the officers that it could

possibly affect and assist is necessary. Also, an emphasis on information collection needs to be made. Not all occurrences are proof that a crime is imminent, but details should still be recorded and communicated so that the entire department is aware of the goings on in the district and can possibly piece together information that could help them to solve crimes or other issues in the communities. This information should also be freely shared among other law enforcement agencies, creating cooperation and assistance between agencies that could serve to prevent more major crimes from taking place (Carter 2009).

Crime analysts should be used to analyze the combination of certain factors, specifically what happens when an offender finds a vulnerable target, and there is no safeguard to prevent this offender from taking advantage of the target (Licate 2014). If these vulnerable areas can be identified and then communicated to other departments and agencies, then the process of problem solving can begin. Targets can be hardened or guardians can be put into place, decreasing vulnerability and the likelihood of a successful attack by an offender (Licate 2014).

Intelligence is an integral part of the police departments in which ILP is adopted. It is not to act as a separate project, it is necessary to recognize that intelligence and information is now to be one of the main focuses of the department. The idea of this is to not take away focus from crime fighting and solving public issues, but to instead better both of these practices through the involvement of better intelligence and communication (Carter 2009). Concentration on intelligence will help agencies to better identify possible threats and undefended targets, conduct them to analysts and the proper channels, and then address how they

should be dealt with from there, all the while keeping the rest of the agency fully informed of what is transpiring. The intelligence gathered should also be conducted to the correct departments. Not all members of police departments are involved in the exact same concentrations, so not all information collected will be useful to everyone in the department. It is necessary to identify threats or intelligence and provide it to analysts and strategists, but also to ensure that it is carried to the department that can take action and begin to solve the problem (Carter 2009).

Some departments may already be employing other methods of policing and may not be sure of whether or not it is advisable to add yet another method. In some cases, ILP may actually be enhanced by the addition of other policing strategies. COP can add additional sources of intelligence, creating a direct link between the department and the public, making that flow of information even stronger. However, unlike various other methods of policing, ILP focuses more on what may come to pass based on real or perceived threats, and not so much on where crimes have happened in the past (Carter 2009). However, past criminal statistics are still information that can be shared within the agency to help assist in assessing current threats, so ILP can interact on several different levels with most policing strategies, making it a smoother adoption than may have been previously believed (Carter 2009).

ILP is a policing strategy that uses intelligence and analysis to find motivated offenders and soft targets that are absent of a guardian (Licate 2014). Police departments can employ this strategy by hiring analysts and drawing from other methods of policing such as hot spot policing and POP to defend targets from

criminals. ILP has been employed in the United Kingdom and also in America, where it has been integrated into the nation's homeland security strategies, and other countries. ILP's use of data analysis makes it a strategy where its effectiveness is easily tracked (Licate 2014).

Predictive Policing is a method of policing that draws from several sources, utilizing technology to help predict approximately where and when a particular crime will occur. Using the data compiled from various other crimes in the area, trends over various amounts of time, factors that have been proven to influence the occurrence of certain crimes, and other factors, it can be attempted to predict where and when another crime will be committed. If the data tracking and prediction process proves effective, than it may be feasible that some measures can take place to deter the crime from happening in the first place. This sort of crime fighting cannot prevent the commission of all crime, and it will certainly need more streamlining to make it likely that all future crimes in the area are already solved in advance. However, it is a goal to stretch for to decrease crime in a region that is particularly prone to it (Ferguson 2012). The statistics needed for predictive analysis can be transformed into a computer program that eliminates the middlemen of crime analysts. This is not to say that crime analysts should not be utilized at all still, but this program makes the availability of statistical probabilities more immediately available than if they were ran through a person, as opposed to a computer.

Predictive policing does not attempt to "tell the future" in the magical sense of the phrase. Predictive policing merely attempts to expand upon concepts in

criminal justice that have been in practice for years. Officers obtain warrants and permission to search individuals based on “reasonable suspicion”, “probable cause”, and other such doctrines. The Fourth Amendment and various court cases support these tactics, and predictive policing builds off of them. Because of this relationship to something as powerful as an Amendment, it becomes even more vital that this method of policing be repeatedly and thoroughly analyzed, if there is to be a computer program calculating when and where something like reasonable suspicion is to be applied, the science must be airtight to avoid infringing upon human rights. After all, even technology is not immune to bias or mistakes, and these issues must be addressed before they are applied to the criminal justice system (Ferguson 2012). It is also necessary to remember that predictive policing utilizes many elements that are purely human; data collection, analysis of statistics to exclude false data and irrelevant findings, and recommendations of follow up actions are all functions of people, not computers (Perry et al, 2013)

The algorithms to predict criminal activity have many factors. The most essential is the amount and variety of criminal activity that has taken place in the area over a prolonged period of time. Then other things can be added. The type of crime to be analyzed can be specified; hot spots and the locations of houses of known drug dealers and gang members can even be added to narrow down the area (Ferguson 2012). Several police departments have employed these techniques and added them into their policing practices in regards to property crimes. There have been decreases in crimes in the areas that have received more concentrated patrol. Whether or not these decreases are as a result of the accuracy of the program or

merely a benefit of more attentive patrol is yet to be determined (Ferguson 2012). Predictive policing pulls upon concepts from various other methods of policing, specifically using elements from ILP and hot spots policing. Some of the areas in question may have environmental factors that make the commission of a crime more plausible, such as poor lighting or low security. If these environmental factors exist, they too can influence the predictions of whether a crime is likely to take place in a certain area (Ferguson 2012).

Predictive policing can also draw upon specifics related to certain crimes, such as a phenomenon that has proven true with many instances of burglary. If a house is burglarized, then the statistical odds that other houses in the immediately surrounding area will be burglarized within a short period of time goes up. This may be caused by the houses having similar environmental factors that heighten their vulnerability, or by the same group of offenders striking the same area after a previous successful endeavor, or a number of other ideas. Regardless, this statistic is significant and can be used somewhat predictively (Ferguson 2012). Another method by which areas can be analyzed is risk terrain modeling. This technique involves layering all of the factors in a certain area, environmental, human, criminal, and connects them into a sort of descriptive mapping that figures out the likelihood that certain crimes will transpire in certain areas, based on the risk factors addressed (Ferguson 2012). This method has even been used in some areas to assess the likelihood of violent crimes taking place, adjusting the human factor descriptors such as age and sex and adding proximity to bars and other such areas

of increased disorder helped determine the risk of some crimes of violence, including the likelihood of shootings in one area that was studied (Ferguson 2012).

To ensure that predictive policing does not violate Fourth Amendment rights, there must be ground rules in place. There are already rules when it comes to reasonable suspicion and probable cause. There are court cases that have found it necessary that there be certain caveats fulfilled before a person can be pulled over or searched; there must be logical reasons why the prediction should be heeded. Past history, accurate descriptions of events and situations that only someone close to the situation would know, and the police or judge's own judgment agreeing that the tip or circumstances imply a need for search/seizure etc. (Ferguson 2012). Predictive policing should be further investigated and researched, but researchers should proceed with caution in regards to certain elements of the strategy. It should be kept in mind that, no matter how meticulously reported statistics are kept, there is always a dark factor of unreported crime that could sway the statistics a significant amount. Another consideration is to make sure that the public and the courts are kept in the know about the predictive process. There should be no parts of this method that cannot be explained to the public. Predictive policing is built upon statistics and information, if there is hesitation to inform citizens of elements of its implementation then that may imply a bias that needs to be eradicated (Ferguson 2012).

As long as the human and technological elements used in predictive policing are kept at a balance, much can be learned from the use of this method. There are safeguards that must be in place to make sure that no rights are violated and that

too much trust is not placed in computer systems to spit out accurate findings without analysis being conducted of the information going into the algorithm and the results coming out. Also, there should be definite focus placed on the response to the results found, making sure to incorporate elements of POP and other strategies to come up with the best possible reaction (Ferguson 2012, Perry et al, 2013)

These various policing methods may fail to cover all methods that have been used in the past, and the methods that are being developed for the future. Despite the absence of some methods, those highlighted above are representative of the very human desire to create order out of chaos, reducing the criminal element in the world. Whatever the theory behind the method, it was created with the intent of making the world a safer place by reducing instances of criminal activity. Even before the standard model of policing was developed there was a drive behind police forces, despite the corruption and disorder that was at times rampant in their ranks, to make the world safer for citizens that are incapable of protecting themselves. In today's world, this desire still exists, despite the underlying mistrust that can be found among some members of the public in relation to highly publicized episodes of police misconduct and abuse of power. All of the discussed policing methods have some amount of redeeming value, but which is more effective than the others becomes questionable at best.

There has not been nearly enough research done of any of these methods to prove definitively which ones are the most useful, and even the ones that have shown initially positive results have not been standardized enough to apply to all departments. There are a lot of questions in each study as to whether the

employment of other policies in conjunction with the researched method would be beneficial, or whether their interaction would be harmful to the experiment as a whole. Few departments looked to standardize their methods used, or they attempted too hard to do so, thereby ignoring the needs of their specific region. They tended to either only adapt the parts of the methods that did not require them to put forth much effort to fit in with practices already in place, or they attempted to completely revamp their departments, causing chaos. Too many times the results were made murky by lack of commitment to the programs by officers or indeed entire departments, causing data to be questionable at best. Effective policing is too important a topic to be minimized and relocated to the back burner. Finding scientifically proven ways to control crime and protect citizens and their property is not merely a lofty goal that politicians use as a buzzword to get themselves elected; it is the government's duty to its people.

Bibliography

- 2014 "Policing Strategies." *National Institute of Justice*. Retrieved from <http://www.nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/strategies/Pages/welcome.aspx> on Sep 20, 2014
- Braga, Anthony A. 2001 "The Effects of Hot Spots Policing on Crime." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 578():104-125. Retrieved from on Apr 19, 2015
- Carter, David L. 20. "Intelligence Led Policing: Conceptual and Functional Considerations for Public Policy." *Criminal justice policy review*, 20(2009): 310-325.
- Ferguson, Andrew G. 2012 "Predictive policing and reasonable suspicion." *Emory law journal*62(259):259-325. Retrieved from on Apr 19, 2015
- Gill, Charlotte E. 2014 "Community-Oriented Policing to Reduce Crime, Disorder and Fear and Increase Satisfaction and Legitimacy Among Citizens: A Systematic Review." *Journal of experimental criminology* ():-. Retrieved from on Apr 19, 2015
- Goldstein, Herman . . "Shifting and Sharing Responsibility for Public Safety Problems." *Center for problem oriented policing*, Response guide no. 3 (2005): -.
- Licate, David A. . "Intelligence-led policing." *Encyclopedia of U.S. intelligence*, (2014):
- Lum, Cynthia . 14. "Receptivity to research in policing." *Justice research and policy*, 14(2012): 61-95.
- Perry, Walter L. 2013. *Predictive policing: the role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations.* , Rand corporation.
- Santos, Rachel B. 2012. *Crime analysis with crime mapping.* , Sage publications, inc..
- Sherman, Lawrence W. 1998 "Evidence-based policing." *Ideas in american policing* ():1-15. Retrieved from on Apr 19, 2015
- Weisburd, David . 2005 "Hot spots policing experiments and criminal justice research: lessons from the field." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 599():220-245. Retrieved from on Apr 19, 2015
- Weisburd, David . 2010 "Is problem-oriented policing effective in reducing crime and disorder? Findings from a Campbell systematic review." *American society of criminology* 9(1):139-172. Retrieved from on Apr 19, 2015

Willis, James J. 2007 "Making Sense of COMPSTAT: A Theory-Based Analysis of Organizational Change in Three Police Departments ." *Law and society review* 41(1):147-188. Retrieved from on Apr 19, 2015