

## Effectiveness of Hotspot Policing and Drug Court: A Literature Review

**Bassey Kooffreh**

Department of Criminal Justice & Legal Studies  
University of Mississippi, Oxford, United States

### Abstract

*Quantitative research analyses have shown that some programs are effective in reducing recidivism; consequently, the term "what works" regarding effective criminal justice policies were developed as a consequence of the findings of these studies. The goal of this piece is to present a literature review of studies that have shown drug courts to be a compelling choice for treating drug offenders, reducing criminal behaviour, monitoring their progress in the community, and alleviating the strain on the criminal justice system. In addition, the paper provides an in-depth review to see whether or not policies designed to target crime "hotspots" successfully lower crime rates in those areas without increasing criminal activity in other areas.*

Keywords: Hotspot Policing, Drug Court, Offender, Treatment, Community

### Introduction

In his analysis of American prison systems, Martinson asked, "What works?" (Martinson, 1974). His fundamental premise was that, in the context of social scientists offering policymakers options and solutions, no single program could be shown to have made any meaningful improvement over the status quo; his work was widely misunderstood and frequently misquoted as "nothing works." (Palmer, 1975). Scholars who feel the system coddles the criminal rather than concentrating on the victim defended Martinson's "nothing works" comment, even though Martinson subsequently noted that there was some research showing that some treatment programs were beneficial in decreasing recidivism (Palmer, 1975). Researchers' analyses of the same studies covered by Martinson's work found that specific programs effectively decreased recidivism (Palmer, 1975). However, Martinson's study had the influence it did because it was released when social and political upheaval was imminent (Cullen & Gilbert, 2013).

Even though during the get-tough era, punishment became the status quo, many academics still argued against it in favour of rehabilitation (Zedlewski, 1987). Although "get tough" measures like "three strikes and you're out" were premised on the notion that jail alone would stop a criminal career in its tracks, others claimed that these estimations were too high (Zedlewski, 1987). Most of the studies supporting the rehabilitation strategy during the get tough movement were conducted by academics from Canada (Cullen & Jonson, 2012). In particular, rehabilitation advocates like Don Andrews, James Bonta, and Hoge R. dug further into Martinson's results that specific programs effectively decreased recidivism (Andrew et al., 1990). Narrative assessments of research showing that some treatment programs effectively decreased recidivism were first published by Paul Gendreau and colleagues (Gendreau & Ross, 1979, 1987). According to the research, the most successful treatments have a few common characteristics: they are behavioural, they account for individual variability in treatment delivery, and they centre on modifiable variables (Gendreau & Ross, 1979, 1987). More studies using refined meta-analytic methods have found interventions that are more effective in outcomes like reduced offending than others. Most notably, punishment-oriented programs had minor positive outcomes. The best programs were those that took place in the perpetrator's natural surroundings, were sufficiently intensive, included rewards for prosocial behaviour, targeted high-risk and high-criminogenic-need individuals, and were individualized to the offender's learning styles and skills (Andrews et al., 1990). Accordingly, this method may reduce recidivism by as much as 30% (Andrews et al., 1990). These studies' conclusions coined the phrase "what works" concerning decreasing recidivism. However, more importantly, research has shown that punishment is ineffective. Many penalties that gained popularity during the "get tough" era contributed to an increase in recidivism (MacKenzie & Armstrong, 2004). Why such severe punishments do not work as deterrents is explained in three ways, as pointed out by Cullen and Gilbert (2013). To begin, the purpose of those "get tough" era legislations was never to improve the reliability of arrests; instead, they were passed to impose harsher punishments. Second, the obligatory aspect of the punishments was undermined by plea bargaining. Moreover, finally, and most importantly, the risk variables that establish a steady tendency to transgress were not altered by the application of severe punishments (Cullen & Gilbert, 2013).

### *Relationship between Theory and Effective Criminal Justice Policies.*

The subject of theory is pertinent to criminal justice policy as every policy is "pregnant with a theory" (Cullen & Chouchy, 2016). In an attempt to underscore a Criminal justice policy, three vital questions are of imminent importance. These consist of what theory inspired the policy, whether it is driven by evidence, and the factor that

causes crime identified by the theory (Cullen & Chouhy, 2016). The word "theory" has come to mean nothing more than an untested notion or thought to many people in today's culture (Cuzzort, 1989).

Theories are "tentative responses to the regularly posed questions regarding events and behaviours," as defined by Akers, Sellers, and Jennings (2016). To rephrase, theories are explanations that allow us to make sense of the world around us. It is crucial that persons who study theories of crime and deviance also know how to analyze the theories before adopting policies that support the principles put forth in the theory since most theories are at odds with one another as to what the causes of crime or what deviance conduct are (Akers et al., 2016). One of the primary purposes of criminal justice theory is to provide a coherent theoretical framework to examine and analyze the criminal justice system. Events are studied theoretically to categorize them, explain their origins, foretell their future courses, and gain insight into their occurrence (Turner, 1997). A theory, as defined by Paternoster and Bachman (2001), is an explanation that helps us make sense of our observations about the world. As a means of gaining insight into and making sense of the world around us, we put hypotheses to the test and develop theories to account for observed occurrences. The goal of criminological theory is to explain why criminal behaviour occurs. They provide light on the motivations of criminals, the variables that put individuals in danger, and the processes and reasons for which specific laws are implemented. According to Sutherland (1934), the goal of any good theory is to be able to foresee the future. The first step in creating successful policies and programs to minimize crime is to get a deeper comprehension of the factors contributing to the problem.

Science requires theory, sound evidence and reliable methods of examination (Bernard & Ritti, 1990). There can be no actual science without theory. Without a solid theoretical foundation, scientific inquiry is nothing more than a scavenger hunt (Bernard & Ritti, 1990). Ultimately, the true significance of such studies' conclusions is left up to unsubstantiated conjecture (Bernard & Ritti, 1990). Traditional criminological theories, including learning and choice-based theories, provide the basis for crime, justice, laws and initiatives (Pratt et al., 2006). Deterrence, routine activity theory, and situational crime prevention are all examples of choice-based theories (Pratt et al., 2006). If lawmakers want to prevent certain behaviours, they may utilize deterrence theory to guide their policymaking (Ben, 2019).

Some criminal justice laws and procedures may appear acceptable depending on the alleged cause of criminal conduct, while others may seem unreasonable and dangerously reckless (Lilly et al., 2007). It is common for new hypotheses to prompt calls for policy adjustments. When this occurs, efforts are made to legitimize the policy by spreading beliefs that support the measures (Lilly et al., 2007). This is a dynamic process where philosophy and policy mutually legitimize one another. Whatever the case, if the underlying idea of criminal justice systems becomes untenable, public support for such policies will inevitably decline (Lilly et al., 2007). According to Wicharya's (1995) research, policymakers accept crime causation theories congruent with their policy choices, and "get tough" sentencing reform tends to reduce complex facts to a basic form. According to Vold and Bernard (1986), people are more likely to support a particular theory of crime if they agree with the measures advocated by that theory to reduce criminal activity. Miller (1973) focused on the tension between ideology and theoretically inspired research-based policy. Lyndon B. Johnson, Binder and Poland (1991) highlight the influence of strain and labelling theories in their study of federal delinquency programs during the administrations of President John F. Kennedy. Miller (1991) provides other examples of critical problems associated with developing and implementing policies and programs, including "political influences, human eccentricities, bureaucratic competition, and variances in commitments to objectives" that influence the successful implementation of theory-based juvenile delinquency programs.

Maguire and Schulte-Murray (2001) observed, for instance, that several of the countries reporting police personnel numbers to the United Nations employed inconsistent definitions of "police officer" between periods. Despite the reality that police employment varied gradually over time. Using such information to test historical theories of police employment would provide completely misleading results. Research on a wide variety of criminal justice topics, not simply policing, is hampered by problems with the quality and stability of longitudinal data. As such, Grand ideas are discouraged, according to Howard and Freilich (2007). Looking for a single theory that "explains all criminal justice reactions at all times" may be an unwarranted diversion from more pressing and essential questions (Howard and Freilich (2007). Police departments use new data-driven technologies worldwide for intelligence and surveillance-led policing (Bennett Moses & Chan, 2018). There is a ripple effect across the criminal justice system from using these technologies, which are sometimes the result of partnerships between the academic community, the government, and non-governmental organizations (Ministry of Justice, 2019). These factors might influence sentencing hearings and correctional system interventions, such as parole and prison security levels (Ministry of Justice, 2019).

Substance misuse is one of recidivism's most fluid risk factors (Carson & Sabol, 2012). This should be no surprise, looking at the correlation between drug usage and criminal behaviour. Current statistical data indicates that 46% of federal prisoners are there for drug-related offences (U.S. Dept of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2020). In 2018, of the 3,539,950 adults on probation in the United States, 26% of probationers had a drug charge as their

most serious offence (U.S. Dept of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2020). Drug courts have become a viable option for drug offenders' treatment and community monitoring (Maruschak & Parks, 2012). Drug courts, which aim to decrease drug use and related criminal behaviour, have gained widespread support (Mumola, 1998).

Drug court programs have consistently received consistent funding from the U.S. federal government. Over the years 1995–2022, Congress has provided hundreds of millions of dollars to assist drug courts (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2022). The first drug court in the U.S. was established in 1989 in Miami under the leadership of Judge Herbert Klein. The effects of the war on drugs were felt acutely in Miami. The prison population ballooned due to the increased number of criminals charged with drug offences at the height of the war on drugs (Office of National Drug Control Policy, 2012). Inmates were often incarcerated for inadequately long terms without access to therapy, increasing the likelihood that they would re-offend soon after their release.

For this reason, and in consultation with other interested parties, such as former State Attorney Janet Reno, Judge Klein advocated a new strategy for dealing with repeat drug offenders (Drug Courts Program Office, 1998). They proposed that they may be monitored and treated in the community rather than incarcerating those who had committed drug crimes. They also advocated, in contrast to standard probation, that probationers continue to be subject to judicial oversight through status hearings (Drug Courts Program Office, 1998). Drug courts were established with the hope that they would reduce substance abuse and criminal behaviour while also lessening the burden on the justice system. The first drug court was so successful that it inspired similar programs in other areas. The popularity of drug courts skyrocketed when anecdotal evidence of effectiveness was corroborated by little scientific research. Drug courts reportedly handled over half a million people during their first two years of operation (Drug Courts Program Office, 1998).

There was considerable inconsistency in the results of early studies on drug court outcomes, but subsequent studies have consistently demonstrated that drug courts may significantly decrease recidivism (Mitchell et al., 2012). While the exact percentage varies from study to study, drug courts have been shown to decrease recidivism by anywhere from 8 to 13% in meta-analyses. Mitchell et al. (2012) conducted the most current comprehensive review of Drug Courts with evaluations of 92 adult drug courts. The drug courts were shown to be beneficial in reducing recidivism, drug crimes, and drug usage in the meta-analysis, with 88% of the cases finding some success. Shaffer (2011) noted factors that would lead to recidivism amongst drug court participants, including evaluation, treatment, intensity, target population, leverage, and personnel. Twenty-three drug courts and six comparator sites were chosen from eight states for the Multi-Site Adult Drug Court Evaluation (MADCE, 2012) project. The study's goals were to (1) determine whether drug courts are effective in reducing drug use, crime, and other problems related to drug abuse when compared to similar offenders who were not exposed to drug courts; (2) explain how and for whom drug courts are effective by isolating key individual, and program factors that make drug courts more or less effective; and (3) shed light on how offenders' attitudes and behaviours change after being exposed to drug court. In all, 29 locations assessed offenders three times: once at the beginning of the study, once six months later, and once again after 18 months of participation (MADCE, 2012). This study has three main parts: a cost-benefit analysis, an assessment of the effect, and a review of the process. The process review details the variations in drug court sites' main rules and procedures, such as eligibility requirements, program monitoring levels, treatment types offered, and teamwork (MADCE, 2012). The impact assessment aims to determine whether drug courts are more effective than control sites and, if so, to what extent and how specific court policies and offender attitudes account for any observed improvements. The costs and advantages of having a drug court are weighed in this study (MADCE, 2012). The study found that drug courts are an efficient means of preventing relapse among their clients. Six months after enrolling in the drug court program, individuals used drugs less often (1.5 vs 3.7 days;  $p .01$ ) and less severely (1.0 vs 2.2 days;  $p .05$ ) than the control group. Compared to a control group, those who participated in drug court reported considerably fewer instances of drug use overall (56% vs 76%,  $p .01$ ), severe use (41% vs 58%,  $p .01$ ), days of use per month (2.1 vs 4.8,  $p .001$ ), and days of heavy use per month (1.1 vs 2.3;  $p .001$ ). Compared to the comparison group, those who had attended drug court were less likely to report using illicit drugs (MADCE, 2012). This was especially true for marijuana, "heavy" alcohol use, prescription drug abuse, and methadone abuse. However, no statistically significant differences were found between the two groups regarding cocaine, heroin, amphetamines, or hallucinogens, although the differences reported tended toward less use by the drug court sample (MADCE, 2012). Moreover, drug court participants report much lower recurrence rates after six months and 18 months than the general population. A modest but statistically significant proportion of the control group reported no sobriety over the study period of 18 months (MADCE, 2012).

Through interviews with 150 individuals involved in drug courts around the nation, including those in New York, Las Vegas, and Philadelphia. John Goldkamp and colleagues validated the significance of judges' engagement in drug courts (Goldkamp, White, & Robinson, 1998). When questioned, participants repeatedly cited their intimate connection with the judge as a significant factor in their decision to complete the program (Goldkamp, White, & Robinson, 1998). Though it is hard to pin down the precise effect of this connection, it seems that a sense of being

heard by the judge plays a significant role in the model's effectiveness (Goldkamp, White, & Robinson, 1998). Given the gravity of the position, several studies have investigated what makes a good drug court judge. It has been shown that drug courts with regular judges appointed for at least two years tend to be the most successful (Goldkamp, White, & Robinson, 1998).

According to studies conducted by Shannon Carey et al. (2012), appointing a judge for a minimum of two years helps maintain consistency in programming and provides sufficient time for the judge to become an integral part of the team. More frequent judicial turnover is associated with less efficient courts (Carey et al., 2012). Some researchers have looked at the dynamics of the judge's contacts with the drug court defendants, while others have focused on how long the judge has been sitting on the bench. It has been proposed that judges give each litigant at least three minutes of bench time (Carey et al., 2012). This gives the judge enough opportunity to check in, provide constructive criticism, and handle any issues that may have arisen. It also improves results by increasing judges' probability of being seen as fair (Farole & Cissner, 2007).

As such, it is crucial that newly appointed drug court judges get education on both drug courts and substance usage. The effectiveness of drug courts has been attributed, in part, to therapeutic jurisprudence (Hora, 2002). Fundamental to the notion is that judges may encourage and modify client conduct through their interactions with them (Wexler, 2000). While just a minority of drug court judges are seen as predominantly therapeutic (Shaffer, 2011), the nature of the feedback given to participants does seem to make a difference. Participants who were given more favourable as opposed to negative comments from the judge were more likely to complete the program, according to research by Scott Senjo and Leslie Leip in 2000. Therapeutic jurisprudence principles should guide judges' actions, and training may assist in making that happen. Training is essential since, despite the team's collaborative character, the judge is usually responsible for making the ultimate judgment on participants (Senjo & Leip, 2000).

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) examined six drug court programs in New York State in 2005 and concluded that five significantly reduced crime. A year after the program ended, a 6-13% drop in new arrests resulted in a conviction. This is supported by a meta-analysis of sixty Drug Court outcome assessments published in 2006, which found that Drug Courts cut recidivism by an average of 10% in post-judgment and 13% in pre-judgment courts (Shaffer, 2006). Another research revealed that the average rate of rearrests (a metric of recidivism) was cut by 44% in Oregon's 24 Drug Court programmes (Carey & Waller, 2011). Belenko (2001) evaluated peer-reviewed and unpublished studies on Drug Courts from 1999 to 2001 in a review for the National Drug Court Institute. According to his findings, drug usage and criminal behaviour decreased significantly among Drug Court participants. The national program completion rate was about 47% and has been relatively constant since then. As Belenko pointed out (2001), there needs to be more conclusive evidence about long-term effects. More research on the services provided to Drug Court participants and the lasting effects of Drug Courts was recommended in his report. Since this pivotal study, many studies on Drug Courts have emerged in response to his questions (Kearley, B., & Gottfredson, D. 2020; Krebs, C. P., et al. (2007).

### ***Effectiveness of Hot Spots policing in troubled neighbourhoods***

The policy of hotspots policing has been the subject of academic reviews, all of which have concluded that it is effective at reducing crimes within hotspot regions without displacing the said criminal activities elsewhere (Sherman & Eck, 2002; Eck, 2002; Weisburd & Eck, 2004). Many studies have shown that the advantages of crime prevention extend beyond the intended initial locations (Sherman & Eck, 2002; Eck, 2002; Weisburd & Eck, 2004). Appropriately, a hot spot can be described as a physical spot of higher-than-average criminal activities... a region having a concentration of criminal activities, relative to the distribution of crime across the whole region of interest" (Chainey & Ratcliffe, 2005). Hot spots are "small places in which the occurrence of crime is so frequent that it is highly predictable, at least over one year" (Sherman & Weisburd, 1995, p. 36). These locations are considered "hot" due to the combination of high at-risk populations "including individuals who suffer from multiple victimizations and high hazard areas defined as locations where there is low control, lower levels of self-protection, less surveillance by guardians, and a concentration of offenders" and the resulting potential for crime in these locations is very high. ( Van et al., 2008) Since the 1990s, there has been a growing appreciation for police strategies targeting certain criminals and settings. Targeting "crime hot spots" to address public safety concerns has become standard practice for police departments. Even when there is less evidence supporting the benefit of targeting specific groups of offenders, taking a focused geographic approach to crime concerns may increase police efficacy in reducing crime and disruption (Skogan & Frydl, 2004)

The most in-depth examination of the effects of hot-spots policing is provided by the Campbell Collaboration, which conducted a systematic evaluation. In 2000, academics, practitioners, and policymakers formed the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group, which aims to provide and maintain internet access to systematic reviews of criminological therapies ([www.campbellcollaboration.org](http://www.campbellcollaboration.org)).

Using clear, transparent, state-of-the-art procedures, researchers assemble relevant evaluative studies on a particular subject, critically analyze them, and choose what is beneficial (Petrosino et al., 2001). As part of their attempts to establish scientific knowledge, the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group have systematically analyzed the effects of police programs targeting high-crime areas (Braga, 2001; 2005). The most current hotspots policing assessment, undertaken by Campbell, revealed 25 pilot studies and 19 in-depth analyses of police interventions in high-crime areas (Braga et al., 2014).

Ten researchers that met the criteria used quasi-experimental study designs to determine the effectiveness of hotspot policing on crime. Twenty out of twenty-five examinations of hot-spots police measures found substantial gains in crime control compared to the control areas (Braga et al., 2014). The primary effect sizes from the meta-analysis show that the use of hotspots policing strategies significantly reduced crime rates (Braga et al., 2014). Experiments in policing were conducted in 13 high-crime areas to see if the interventions shifted crime or distributed the benefits of reduced crime (Braga et al., 2014). Only immediate spatial displacement and diffusion effects were considered in any of the 13 displacement and diffusion tests conducted to determine if increased police presence in specific areas caused crime to "move around the corner" or if neighbouring areas reaped unexpected benefits from heightened policing efforts (Braga et al., 2014). The effect sizes favoured diffusion over displacement in nine of the thirteen tests comparing the two. Based on the displacement/diffusion meta-analysis results, the positive effects of crime-prevention strategies implemented in hotspots are expected to spread more slowly but broadly than previously thought (Braga et al., 2014). Concerning the impacts of hot-spots policing programs on the legitimacy of law enforcement. Weisburd and Telep (2014) highlight many places where additional knowledge about hotspots policing activities is required. Understanding the impact of hotspot policing on police legitimacy and how hotspot techniques affect non-spatial displacement are two such considerations.

Currently, hotspot policing is the most pragmatic evidence-driven police policy. The fundamental underlying principle and technique of hotspots policing are that specific geographic sites in which offences take place are besieged by the police, given that the bulk of crime in a metropolis takes place in comparatively small distinctive spots consisting of houses and building blocks. This police policy not only dislodges criminal activities but also decreases the crime rate in general (Blomberg et al., 2016). Regrettably, conventional policing techniques consisting of random patrol, quick response to service calls, and leading investigations, compared to hot spot policing, are not effective at changing the anxiety of arrests of a would-be criminal (Skogan & Frydl, 2004). Hotspots policing policy significantly amplify the sureness of exposure and anxiety of arrest at places as such, raising a would-be offender's acuity of danger at places; thus, to the would-be offender, the risks of committing the crime outweigh the gain to be derived from crime commission (Braga, 2016). Sherman, Gartin & Buerger (1989) found that in Minneapolis calls made to the police and the addresses from which the calls were placed constituted 50 and 3 percent respectively thus justifying that crime are committed in hot spots. Weisburd and Green (1995) found that in Jersey City, New Jersey mayhems and physical assaults constituting 20 and 14 percent, respectively, came from illicit drug hot spots numbering 56. Weisburd and Green (1995) conducted a randomized experiment and found that employing hot spots policing in illicit drug sales is efficient in stemming drug trades. Braga (2008) reviewed hot spot policing using nine experimental or quasi-experimental assessments performed across five big United States metropolises, including an Australian hamlet and found evidence of considerable crime reduction in two, noting further the absence of crime diffusion to the immediate nearby spots. Similarly, Braga and Bond (2008) conducted randomized trials in Massachusetts and found that crime reduction was driven by problem-oriented police policy that curtailed crime at hot spots.

Weinborn, Ariel, Sherman, & Dwyer (2017) found that criminal activities constituting 50% were concerted in 3% of street sections, while harm constituting 50% was concerted in barely 1% of street sections. The findings here reveal that harm follows Weisburd's (2015) "law of concentration of crime in place." Accordingly, Weisburd et al. (2017) found that focusing on harm saves police costs associated with police patrols and reduces the likelihood of crimes perpetuated by victims. Recent systematic reviews have found the use of hot spot policing alongside its deterrence approaches involving problem solving to be effective (Braga, Turchan, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2019; Braga, Weisburd, & Turchan, 2019). Gottfredson and Taylor (1986) found evidence to indicate that the corporeal and communal makeup of a given building block and several houses inside an area defines criminal activities. Taylor (1997) conducted research using panel design in Baltimore. After examining misdemeanour and dread of crime through 90 street blocks, available evidence revealed a lofty measure of permanence of criminal activities at a given location over time. Similar findings were found in Seattle. Crime trend analysis at definite street sections performed over fourteen years indicated that given spots have constant and dense criminal activities through a period (Weisburd et al., 2004). Also, the most worthy adage, "the good copper knows where the crime is happening," suggests that officers can identify areas with the highest crime levels through their work (Ratcliffe & McCullagh, 2001).

(Braga et al., 2019) suggested: "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." Once an agency knows where these problem areas are, the typical response becomes to put available officers in those areas to identify, disrupt the anticipated criminal activity, and make arrests and investigations, which will result in crime reductions for that area (Braga et al., 2019).

Weisburd (2016) maintains that "hot spots policing properly implemented is likely to lead to less biased policing than traditional strategies, and there is currently little evidence that hot spots policing per se lead to abusive policing practices." Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau's (2012) meta-analysis found that hotspot practices, when combined with conventional policing practices such as patrol and arrest, are effective at reducing crime resulting in a decrease in crime rates at target areas.

More tactical critiques recognize the danger of hot spot policing to encompass little more than saturation patrols in a particularly problematic area over the short term. This may impact crime and disorder in that area, but the effects generally dissipate once the attention is pulled back (Weisburd & Majmundar, 2018). In addition, such emphasis may start to resemble a crackdown, which could see a greater propensity for aggressive policing that may, in turn, damage police-community relations and result in a return to the status quo once the treatment effect is removed (Weisburd & Majmundar, 2018). Rather than solving the problem, the increased patrols in hot spot areas may only serve to displace the problem or temporarily disrupt it at a high cost to the department both operationally and relationship-wise. These critiques, while intuitive, have yet to be empirically proven. (Weisburd & Majmundar, 2018). Based on the available research evidence, the National Research Council's Committee revealed that hot spots policing policy results in a statistically significant decline in criminal activities (Weisburd & Majmundar, 2018). A cardinal rationale for increased police presence in many marginal and deprived neighbourhoods is increased reported criminal activity cases (Kubrin, 2013). Research indicates that Policing in 1975 was based on using "the three Rs strategy" consisting of reactive investigations, rapid response, and random patrol (Berkow, 2011). The planning of a hot spot policing patrol policy in places commences with a determination of the exact places where police beat should be positioned; determination of the mode of patrol either through the use of vehicle, bicycle or foot; determining patrol channels either peculiar streets where there is more concentration of crime, and; ascertaining the number of police officers that are necessary to go through the patrol channels (Chainey, 2021). According to research by Koper (1995), only 15 minutes of police presence per hour in a high-crime area is enough to reduce crime. Macbeth and Ariel (2017) replicated Koper's experiments and came to the same conclusion: police presence in high-crime areas is most effective when it lasts for 15 minutes. Using crime mapping data and on-the-ground observations of trouble places, Weisburd et al. (2006) investigated the efficacy of hot spot policing in collaboration with the Jersey City police. The effects of crime control measures were studied in twenty problem areas with drug and prostitution problems, and the results showed that these measures had a positive ripple effect on neighbourhoods. According to the findings of a study by Koper and Woods (2010), "a heightened police presence in selected places with these regions averaging roughly 53 hours of officer presence per week" is being implemented in 83 high-crime zones in Jacksonville, Florida. There was no statistically significant difference between the control and treatment groups in a 2012 research on criminal activity hot locations in Las Vegas by the Las Vegas Smart Policing Initiative (Baldwin et al., 2014). According to research by Jang, Lee, and Hoover (2012), more significant police presence in the form of stops resulted in a decrease in severe crimes in high-crime areas of Dallas; but, less than a week after the units had left, the crime rate had risen again.

Existing knowledge gaps on the topic of hot-spots policing programs were highlighted by Weisburd and Telep (2014) and include the need to understand the effects of the policy on police legitimacy empirically, redefining what policies are most valuable in tackling hot spots, determining whether the application of hotspots policing will be effective in less dense metropolis and countryside, and exploring future impacts arising from the continued use of hotspots policing. According to a systematic analysis undertaken by Braga et al. (2014), only three studies have examined the impact of police initiatives on communities. Although police "hot spots" might reduce crime in some areas, such arbitrary and harsh tactics can potentially cause tensions between the police and local inhabitants (Rosenbaum, 2006; Tonry, 2011). However, it is essential to note that these evaluations, interviews and surveys were conducted on residents and business people residing in hotspot locations only, without persons detained, jailed, or under police interrogation following an arrest made at hot spots. Weisburd et al. (2011) conducted a randomized controlled trial in three mid-sized California cities and failed to find evidence of "backfire effects" associated with the hotspots policing program. The concentration of criminal activity at particular hotspot places in the community provides a significant opportunity for police to meet people who are particularly vulnerable to discrimination and who live in perpetual fear due to the low quality of life stemming from persistent and intensified criminal activity and mental disorder. Unfortunately, police frequently have a negative impression of those who live in communal settings, calling into doubt the legitimacy of their efforts to reduce crime in the area (Brunson &

Gau, 2014). As a result, residents and business owners in "hot spot" areas with high crime rates are disgruntled and distrust the police.

As a result, it is best to begin building connections with residents and business owners in high-traffic areas (Brunson & Gau, 2014). As an added complication, the city's few neighbourhood police encounters are spread around unevenly. It is likely to have significant effects on the general legitimacy of police if the police can win over the hearts and minds of long-suffering community members in hotspot locations (Brunson & Gau, 2014).

### Conclusion

The creation of drug courts was motivated by the twin goals of alleviating some of the strain placed on the legal system and cutting down on the use of illegal substances and criminal activity. The utilization of drug courts is beneficial in reducing recidivism, drug-related crimes, and drug use, and appointing a judge for a minimum of two years in a drug court helps maintain consistency in programming by providing sufficient time for the judge to become an integral part of the team. Drug courts with more frequent judicial turnover are associated with lower levels of efficiency since the judge needs more time to check in, provide constructive criticism, and follow up on any difficulties that may have emerged since the first court appearance of the respondent. Policing "hot spots" effectively reduces crime within hot spot regions without displacing the illegal activities in question to other areas. However, the employment of such severe measures can produce tensions between the police and the residents of the area where they are used, even though police "hot zones" may help reduce crime in the location.

### References

- Akers R. L. Sellers C. S. & Jennings W. G. (2016). *Criminological theories: introduction evaluation and application* (Seventh). Oxford University Press.
- Alberts, J.K., Miller-Rassulo, M.A., & Hecht, M.L. (1991). A typology of drug resistance strategies. *Journal of Communication Research*, 19(3), 129–151.
- Alper, M., Durose, M., & Markman, J. (2018). Update on prisoner recidivism: A 9-year follow-up period (2005–2014). NCJ 250975. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Bonta, J., Hoge, R.D., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F.T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28(3), 369–404.
- Andrews, D. A.; Bonta, J.; Hoge, R. D. (1 March 1990). "Classification for Effective Rehabilitation". *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 17 (1): 19–52.
- Apel, R. J., & Nagin, D., (2011). General deterrence: A review of recent evidence. In James Q. W., & Joan P. (Eds.), *Crime and public policy*. New York; Oxford University Press.
- Bales, W.D., & Piquero, A.R. (2012). Assessing the impact of Imprisonment on recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 8(1), 71–101.
- Barr, R., & Pease, K. (1990). Crime placement, displacement, and deflection. Pp. 277–315 in M. Tonry and N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Volume 12. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ben Johnson (2019). Do Criminal Laws Deter Crime? Deterrence Theory in Criminal Justice Policy: A Primer. Minnesota House Research
- Bennett Moses L, Chan J (2018) Algorithmic prediction in policing: Assumptions, evaluations, and accountability. *Policing and Society* 28(7): 806–822.
- Bernard, T.J. and R.R. Ritti. 1990. The role of theory in scientific research. In *Measurement issues in criminology*, ed. K.L. Kempf (pp. 1–20). New York: Springer Verlag.
- Black, D. 1976. *The behaviour of law*. New York: Academic Press.
- Belenko, S. (1999). "Research on Drug Courts: A Critical Review,". *National Drug Court Institute Review*. 2.
- Bird, M., Lofstrom, M., Martin, B., Raphael, S., & Nguyen, V. (2018). *The impact of Proposition on crime and recidivism*. Sacramento, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Blumstein, A., & Wallman, J. (2006). Crime drop & beyond. *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences*, 2, 125–146.
- Blumstein, A., Jacqueline C., & Nagin, D., (1978). *Deterrence and incapacitation: Estimating the effects of criminal sanctions on crime rates*. Washington, DC: Panel on Research on Deterrence and Incapacitation Effects. National Research Council, National Academy Press.
- Braga A. A., (2016). "The science and practice of hot spots policing." In Thomas G. B., Julie M. B., Kevin M. B., & William D. B., (eds.), *Advancing Criminology and Criminal Justice Policy*. New York: Routledge
- Braga, A. (2005). "Hot Spots Policing and Crime Prevention: A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1 (3): 317 – 342.
- Braga, A. A. (2001). The Effects of Hot Spots Policing on Crime. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 578(1), 104–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271620157800107>

- Braga, A. A., & Brenda J. B., (2008). "Policing Crime and Disorder Hot Spots: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Criminology* 46.3, 577-607.
- Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. (2010). *Policing problem places: Crime hot spots and effective prevention*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Braga, A. A., Andrew P., & David H., (2014). "The effects of hot spots policing on crime: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis". *Justice Quarterly*, 31: 633-663.
- Braga, A. A., Andrew V. P., & David M. H., (2010). "The Concentration and Stability of Gun Violence at Micro Places in Boston, 1980–2008." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 26.1, 33–53.
- Braga, A. A., Hureau, D. M., & Papachristos, A. V. (2011). The Relevance of Micro Places to Citywide Robbery Trends: A Longitudinal Analysis of Robbery Incidents at Street Corners and Block Faces in Boston. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 48(1), 7–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427810384137>
- Bronson, J., & Carson, E.A. (2019). Prisoners in 2017. NCJ 252156. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Brunson, R. K., & Jacinta G., (2014). Race, place, and policing the inner-city. In Michael R. and Robert K., (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of police and policing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bunion. W. M., Roll, J. M., Prendergast, M. L., & Rawson, It A. (2001). Drug courts and contingency management. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 37(1), 73-90
- Bureau of Justice Assistance, (2022). 30 Years of Drug Courts: Justice Reform That Works. Retrieved May 31, 2023, from <https://bja.ojp.gov/news/blog/30-years-drug-courts-justice-reform-works>
- Carey, S. M., Mackin, J. IL, & Finigan, M. W. (2012). What works? The ten key components of drug court: Research-based best practices. *Drug Court Review*, 8, 6–42.
- Carson, E. A., & Sabol, W. J. (2012). *Prisoners in 2011*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Center for Effective Public Policy. (2017). A framework for evidence-based decision making in state and local criminal justice systems (4th ed.). Retrieved November 4, 2019, from <https://nicic.gov/news-media/media-releases/evidence-based-decision-making-framework>
- Chainey, S. P., Matias, J. A. S., Nunes Junior, F. C. F., Coelho da Silva, T. L., de Macêdo, J. A. F., Magalhães, R. P., de Queiroz Neto, J. F., (2021). Improving the Creation of Hot Spot Policing Patrol Routes: Comparing Cognitive Heuristic Performance to an Automated Spatial Computation Approach. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 10(8), 560. MDPI AG. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijgi10080560>
- Charis E. K., (2013). "Crime and the Racial Composition of Communities", in Weisburd D., & Gerban J. N., (eds). *Encyclopedia Of Criminology And Criminal Justice* 673-81
- Clear, T.R. (2007). *Imprisoning communities: How mass incarceration makes disadvantaged neighbourhoods worse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, P. J. (1980). Research in Criminal Deterrence: Laying the Groundwork for the Second Decade. In Norval Morris and Michael Tonry (eds.), *Crime and justice: An Annual Review*, p. 2 .
- Cullen, F. T., & Chouhy. C., (2016) "The Role of Theory, Ideology, and Ethics in Criminal Justice Policy." In Thomas G. B., Julie M. B., Kevin M. B., & William D. B., (eds.), *Advancing Criminology and Criminal Justice Policy*. New York: Routledge
- Cullen, F.T. (1995). Assessing the penal harm movement. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32(3), 338–358.
- Cullen, F.T., & Gilbert, K. (2013). *Reaffirming rehabilitation*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Cullen, F.T., & Jonson, C.L. (2012). *Correctional theory: Costs and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- D.A. Andrews, Ivan Zinger And Robert D. Hoge Et Al. Does Correctional Treatment Work? A Clinically Relevant And Psychologically Informed Meta-Analysis \*. *Criminology*. Vol. 28(3):369-404. Doi: 10.1111/J.1745-9125.1990.Tb01330.X
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A (1999). What works for female offenders: A meta-analytic review. *Crime and Delinquency*, pp. 45, 438–452.
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A (2000). Effective correctional treatment and violent re-offending. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, pp. 42, 449–467.
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A (2004). The importance of staff practice in delivering effective correctional treatment: A meta-analytic review of core correctional practice. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, pp. 48, 203–214.
- Drug Courts Program Office. (1998). *Looking at a decade of drug courts*, Washington, DC: Author.
- Eck, J. E., & Weisburd, D. (1995). Crime places in crime theory. In John E. E & Weisburd D., (Eds.), *Crime and place*. New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Elizabeth Macbeth & Barak Ariel(2019). Place-based Statistical Versus Clinical Predictions of Crime Hot Spots and Harm Locations in Northern Ireland, *Justice Quarterly*, 36:1,93–126.  
DOI: 10.1080/07418825.2017.1360379



- Farole, D. J., & Cissner, A. B. (2007). Seeing eye to eye: Participant and staff perspectives on drug courts. In G. Berman, M. Rempel, & R. V. Wolf (Eds.), *Documenting results: Research on problem-solving justice* (pp. 51-73). New York: Center for Court Innovation.
- Festinger, D. S., Marlowe, IL B., Lee, P. A., Kirby, K C., Bovasso, G., & McLellan, A T. (2002). Status hearings in drug court: When more is less and less is more *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 68, 151–157.
- Franco, C. (2010). *Drug courts: Background, effectiveness, and policy issues for Congress*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. .
- Gendreau, P. (1995). Technology transfer in the criminal justice field: Implications for substance use In T. E. Backer, S. L David, & G. Saucy (Eds.), *Reviewing the behavioural science knowledge base on technology transfer.*, Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Gendreau, P. (1996). The principles of effective intervention with offenders. In A Harland (Ed.), *What works in community correction* & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Gendreau, P. (1996). The principles of effective intervention with offenders. In A.T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply* (pp. 117–130). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology*, 34(4), 575–607.
- Green, L. (1995). Cleaning up drug hot spots in Oakland, California: The displacement and diffusion effects. *Justice Quarterly*, 12(4): 737–754.
- Hora, P. F. (2002). A Dozen Years of Drug Court Treatment Courts: Uncovering Our Theoretical Foundation and the Construction of a Mainstream. *Paradigm Substance Use and Misuse*, 37, 1469–1488.
- Kaeble, D., & Cowhig, M. (2018). *Correctional populations in the United States, 2016*. NCJ-251211. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Kearley, B., & Gottfredson, D. (2020). Long-term effects of drug court participation: Evidence from a 15-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 16(1), 27–47.
- Koper C. S., (1995). Just enough police presence: Reducing crime and disorderly behaviour by optimizing patrol time in crime hot spots, *Justice Quarterly*, 12:4, 649–672, DOI: 10.1080/07418829500096231
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Koetse, W., & Lattimore, P. K. (2007). Assessing the long-term impact of drug court participation on recidivism with generalized estimating equations. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, 91(1), 57–68.
- Lawrence W. S., & Weisburd D., (1995). General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime “hot spots”: A randomized, controlled trial, *Justice Quarterly*, 12:4, 625–648, DOI: 10.1080/07418829500096221
- Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2007). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Lowenkamp, C.T., Latessa, E.J., & Smith, P. (2006). Does correctional program quality matter? The impact of adhering to the principles of effective intervention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 575–594.
- Multi-Site Adult Drug Court Evaluation (MADCE), 2003-2009 (ICPSR 30983) Version Date 2012. Available at <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/NACJD/studies/30983>
- Marlin, E S., Butzin, C. A, Saum, C. A., & Inciardi, J. A (1999). Three-year outcomes of therapeutic community treatment for drug-involved offenders in Delaware: From prison to work release to aftercare. *Prison Journal*, 79, 294-320.
- Marlowe, a B., Festinger, D. E, Dugosh, K L., Arabia, P. L., & Kirby, K. C. (2008). An effectiveness trial of contingency management in a felony pre-adjudication drug court. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 41, 565–577.
- Marlowe, D. B., Festinger, D. E, Dugosh, K L., Lee, P. A., & Benasuffi, K. M. (2006). Adapting judicial supervision to the risk level of drug offenders: Discharge and 6-month outcomes from a prospective matching study. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 88, 4–13.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 35, 22–54.
- Mitchell, O., Wilson, IL B., Eggers, A" & MacKenzie, D. L. (2012). Assessing the effectiveness of drug courts on recidivism: A meta-analytic review of traditional and non-traditional drug courts. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40, 60-71.
- Mitchell, O., Wilson, D.B., Eggers, A. And Mackenzie, D.L. (2012), *Drug Courts' Effects On Criminal Offending For Juveniles And Adults*. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 8: I-87.
- Mumola, C. J, & Karberg, J. C. (2006). *Drug use and dependence, state and federal prisoners, 2004* (NCJ 213530). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (1997). *Defining drug courts: key components*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. (2003)
- Mumola, C. J. (1998). (with Bonczar, T. P) (NCJ 166611) *Substance abuse and treatment of adults on probation, 1995*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- Nagin, D., (2013). Deterrence in the 21st century: A review of the evidence. In Michael Tonry, (ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research*, vol 42.
- Nagin, D.S., Cullen, F.T., & Jonson, C.L. (2009). Imprisonment and re-offending. *Crime and Justice*, 38(1), 115–200.
- Palmer, T. (1975). Martinson revisited. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 12(2), 133–152.
- Paternoster, R. (2010). How much do we really know about criminal deterrence? *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 100(3), 765–824.
- Paternoster, R., & Bachman, R. (Eds.) (2001). *Explaining criminals and crime: Essays in contemporary criminological theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paternoster, R., (1987). The deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly*, 4: 173-217.
- Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L. E., & Madensen, T. D. (2006). The Empirical Status of Deterrence Theory: A Meta-Analysis. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (Eds.), *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory* (pp. 367–395). Transaction Publishers.
- Raymond P., (1987). The deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly*, 4:2, 173–217, DOI: 10.1080/07418828700089271
- Rempel, M., Fox-Kralstein, D., Cissner, A., Cohen, R., Labriola, M., Farole, D., Bader, A., & Magnani, M. (2003). *The New York State Adult Drug Court Evaluation: Policies, participants and impacts* (Tech. Rep.). New York: Center for Court Innovation.
- Rosenbaum, D.P., and Lurigio A.J. (1994). An inside look at community policing reform: Definitions, organizational changes, and evaluation findings. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3): 299–314.
- Rossman, S. B., Rempel, M., Roman, J. K., Zweig, J. M., Lindquist, C. H., Green, M., & Farole, D. J., Jr. (2011). *The Multi-Site Adult Drug Court Evaluation: The impact of drug courts*, Vol. 4. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Schiff, M., & Terry, W. C., III. (1997). Predicting graduation from Broward County's dedicated drug treatment county. *Justice Systems Journal*, 19, 291–310.
- Senjo, S. R., & Leip, L. A. (2001). Testing and developing theory in drug court: A four-part logit model to predict program completion. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 12(1), 66-87.
- Sherman, L., & Weisburd, D., (1995). General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime hot spots: A randomized controlled trial. *Justice Quarterly*, 12: pp. 625–648.
- Sherman, L.W. (1986). Policing communities: What works? Pp. 343–386 in A.J. Reiss and M. Tonry (Eds.), *Communities and Crime* (Volume 8, *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sherman, L.W., Rogan, D.P. and others (1995) Deterrent effects of police raids on crack houses; A randomized, controlled experiment. *Justice Quarterly*, 12(4): 755–781.
- Sherman, L.W., and Weisburd, D. (1995). General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime "hot spots": A randomized, controlled trial. *Justice Quarterly*, 12(4): 625–648.
- Sherman, L.W., Gartin, P.R. & Buerger, M.E. (1989). Hot Spots Of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities And The Criminology Of Place. *Criminology*, 27: 27–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1989.tb00862.x>
- Sherman, L.W., Gartin, P.R., & Buerger, M. (1989). *Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place*. *Criminology*, 27, 27-56.
- Skogan, W., & Kathleen F., eds. (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Skogan, W., & Tracey M., (2004). Lawful policing. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593: pp. 66–83.
- Spohn, C., Piper, R K, Marlin, T., & Frenzel, K D. (2001). Drug courts and recidivism: The results of an evaluation using two comparison groups and multiple indicators of recidivism. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 31, 149476.
- Stoops, W. W., Tindall, M. E, Mateyoke-Scriver, A., & Leukefeld, C. (2005). Methamphetamine use in non-urban and urban drug court clients. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49, 260–276.
- Taylor, R. B. (1997). Social Order and Disorder of Street Blocks and Neighborhoods: Ecology, Microecology, and the Systemic Model of Social Disorganization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34(1), 113–155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427897034001006>
- Thomas G. B., Julie M. B., Kevin M. B., & William D. B., (eds.), (2016) *Policing*. In *Advancing Criminology and Criminal Justice Policy*. New York: Routledge
- Toray, T, Coughlin, E, Vuchinich, S., & Patricelli, P. (1991). Gender differences associated with adolescent substance abuse: Comparisons and implications for treatment. *Family Relations*, 40, 338–344.
- United States. *Office of National Drug Control Policy*. National drug control strategy. Overview briefing. Washington, D.C.

- Van Brunshot, E. G., & Kennedy, L. W. (2008). *Risk balance & security*. SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452204079>
- Vold, G. B. and T. J. Bernard. 1986. *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Weisburd, D., & Eck, J. E. (2004). What Can Police Do to Reduce Crime, Disorder, and Fear? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 42–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203262548>
- Weisburd, D., & Telep, C. W. (2014). Hot Spots Policing: What We Know and What We Need to Know. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 200–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986214525083>
- Weisburd, D., (2016). "Does Hot Spots Policing Inevitably Lead to Unfair and Abusive Police Practices, or Can We Maximize Both Fairness and Effectiveness in the New Proactive Policing?," University of Chicago Legal Forum: Vol.16
- Weisburd, D., and Green, L. (1995). Policing drug hot spots: The Jersey City drug market analysis experiment. *Justice Quarterly*, 12(4): 711-736.
- Weisburd, D., Farrington, D.P., Gill, C. (2017). What Works in Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16: 415–449.
- Weisburd, D., Hinkle, J. C., Famega, C., & Ready, J. (2011). The possible "backfire" effects of hot spots policing: An experimental assessment of impacts on legitimacy, fear and collective efficacy. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(4), 297–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-011-9130-z>
- Weisburd, D., Wyckoff, L. A., Ready, J., Eck, J. E., Hinkle, J. C., & Gajewski, F. (2006). Does crime just move around the corner? A controlled study of spatial displacement and diffusion of crime control benefits. *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 44(3), 549–592.
- Welsh, B.C., Farrington, D.P. (2007). Evidence-Based Crime Prevention. In: Welsh, B.C., Farrington, D.P. (eds) *Preventing Crime*. Springer, New York, NY. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-69169-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-69169-5_1)
- Wilson, J.Q., & Boland, B. (1978). The effect of police on crime. *Law and Society Review*, 12: pp. 367–390.
- Wilson, J.Q., & Kelling, G.L. (1982). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, March.
- Vazsonyi, A. T., & Huang, L. (2010). Where Self-Control Comes From: On The Development Of Self-Control And Its Relationship To Deviance Over Time. *Developmental Psychology*, 46(1), 245–257. <https://doi.org/10.1037/A0016538>
- Zedlewski, E.W. (1987). *Making confinement decisions*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Zimring, F., & Hawkins G., (1973). *Deterrence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press