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Outline for the lecture

- Identify major research studies on the effectiveness of patrol
- Explain how current philosophies of patrol differ traditional approaches
- Introduce some of alternative ways to improve the traditional patrol

The Call Service Workload

- The Volume of Calls
  - Workload produced by 911 systems varies widely
- Types of Calls: Handling "anything & everything"
- 29.1% crime-related calls (just 3% for violent crimes): not crimefighters, but peacekeepers or problem solvers
- Most CFS: order maintenance, conflict management, service (especially, family problems)
- Many situations require the exercise of discretion
- "Hotspots": Minneapolis Study (5% people → 64% CFS)

Aspects of Patrol Work

- Response Time (RT)
  - Quick RT will increase the probability of an arrest and public satisfaction, but little effect on clearance rate

Aspects of Patrol Work (cont.)

- Officer Use of Patrol Time
  - Traditional negative stereotypes: "Donut shop"
  - Committed time: officer occupied with handling calls
  - Uncommitted time: patrol, non-police related activity, stationary police-related activities, residual time
  - POPN study
    - P.O.s (beat) spend: encounters with citizens (20%), patrol (20%), traveling (15%)
    - CPO spend: encounters with citizens (14%), patrol (9%)
  - Arrest: Major impact on use of time (1-2 hours processing)
### Aspects of Patrol Work (cont.)

- **Evasion of Duty**
  - Officers can create free time by delaying a call

- **High-Speed Pursuit (HSP)**
  - HSP is a situation where a P.O. attempt to stop a vehicle and a suspect knowingly flees at a high rate of speed
  - Poses serious risk to P.O., suspects, other drivers, bystanders (e.g., 33% resulted in accidents, 17% for injuries)
  - "Dark figures": short duration, don't report when violated dept's policy

### The Effectiveness of Patrol

- **Does Visible Police Presence deter crime?**
  - Since LPD, the basic assumption is adding more P.O.s on patrols will increase the deterrent effect
  - Research in 1950s and 1960s did not meet contemporary standards of research
    - Operation 25 (NY) - did not control for displacement
    - NYC experiment

- **The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (1972-73)**
  - The first experiment testing the effectiveness of patrol that met minimum standards of scientific research
  - Research design
    - a. 15 beats in S. patrol division (out of 24, 9 eliminated)
    - b. 15 beats matched crime data, # of CFS, ethnic composition, median income, etc.
  - c. Three level of patrol: reactive, proactive, and control
    - R = No preventive patrol
    - C = Normal patrol
    - P = 2-3 times more patrol
  - **Findings**:
    - "No impact on crime, citizen feelings of safety, change in behavior or lifestyle, and attitudes toward the police"

- **The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (cont.)**
  - Findings (cont.)
    - a. Challenged traditional assumptions about patrol
    - b. Crime and FOC did not increase in reactive beat
  - Reasons for the findings and limitations
    - a. Did not control traveling among beats, people did not seem to notice the different level of patrol (i.e., residual deterrence or phantom effect)
The Effectiveness of Patrol (cont.)

- The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (cont.)
  - Reasons for the findings and limitations (cont.)
    b. Patrol is spread so thin: doubling is not have any additional impact
    c. Crimes not to be deterred by patrol
    d. Tested only the level of police patrol rather than actual police activity
  - Since then there have been many critics of KC study, but it remains a foremost study to police patrol

The Effectiveness of Patrol (cont.)

- The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment (1978-79)
  - Tested the effect of foot patrol on crime and public perceptions
  - Research Design: similar to KC study
  - Measurement: the effect of different levels of FP on crime, arrest rate, and community attitude (using survey)
  - Findings
    "Additional FP had no effect on the crime rate, but FP reduce citizens' fear of crime, more positive attitudes toward the police"

The Effectiveness of Patrol (cont.)

- Conclusions
  Q: Does Visible Police Presence (adding more P.O.s on patrol) deter crime?
  A: Based on two empirical researches, it can be concluded that simply adding more police officers on patrol will not deter crime.

Improving Traditional Patrol

- Traditional Approaches
  - Patrol deterred crime, quick response is important, maximize patrol coverage (e.g., FP -> VP, one officer unit)
- Different Response to Calls
  - Calls classified according to seriousness of the call
    a. Immediate response by S.O.
    b. Delayed
    c. No police response
  - Increased both citizen and officers' satisfaction, and overall quality of CFS system

Improving Traditional Patrol (cont.)

- Telephone Reporting Units (TRUs)
  - Handle calls when citizen reports crime but no immediate police response is necessary
- 311 Non-Emergency Numbers (3% PD)
  - Baltimore PD introduced in 1996
  - The average time it took to answer 911 calls reduced by 50%
  - Calls from 911 that are non-emergency transferred to 311 or vice versa
Improving Traditional Patrol (cont.)

- **Non-English 911 Call Service**
  - Creates a major problem for the police (e.g., Hispanics less likely to call the police due to language barriers)
  - PD may subscribe to translation services
- **Reverse 911**: PD call citizens to provide info.
- **Computer and Video Cameras in Patrol Cars**: Enhance police operations, and police accountability
- **Police Aides and Cadets**: handle low-priority calls
- **Directed Patrol and Hot Spots**: focus on specific duties