



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Hirschfield, Alex

Policy Analysis in Crime Prevention: A new research frontier?

### Original Citation

Hirschfield, Alex (2009) Policy Analysis in Crime Prevention: A new research frontier? In: Brasilia ECCA 2009: Environmental Criminology and Crime Analysis Symposium, 6th - 10th July 2009, Brasilia, Brazil. (Unpublished)

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/9626/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

# Policy Analysis in Crime Prevention: A new research frontier?

ECCA Conference, Brasilia, 7<sup>th</sup>- 9<sup>th</sup> July 2009

Professor Alex Hirschfield  
Applied Criminology Centre,  
University of Huddersfield, UK

[a.hirschfield@hud.ac.uk](mailto:a.hirschfield@hud.ac.uk)



# Main Themes

- Definition of crime prevention 'policy analysis'
- Comparison with other forms of analyses
- Purpose and rationale
- Methods, data requirements and challenges
- Burglary and Target Hardening Case Study
- Conclusions and Issues for Discussion

# Crime and its Context

## Crime Data

Recorded crime

Command & control

Victimisation surveys

Offender records

## Data about\* Crime

Land use

Facilities & Services

Infrastructure

Design (buildings/products/spaces)

Population

## Policy Interventions:

*Content, Agencies, Governance, Cost, Impact, Effectiveness*

\* *The context of*

# The Crime Analysis Typology

- **Descriptive** What is the principal crime problem in this area? Is it on an upward or downward trajectory?
- **Investigative** How were these offences perpetrated? Were they committed by the same offender?
- **Tactical** Where should police patrols be sent on Friday nights?
- **Explanatory** What is driving reductions in crime ?
- **Strategic** How should resources for crime prevention be distributed?
- **Evaluative** Are these policy interventions having an effect?

# The Policy Dimension

## **Design**

What do we do about crime, in what order, where and with what intensity?

## **Delivery**

How do we make it happen?

## **Evaluation**

What did we achieve ?

## **Analysis**

How does what we have done relate to what we and others are already doing?

How does it *all* relate to crime ?

## **Policy Analysis: The Strategic View**

**Which policies have been implemented that might influence crime ?**

**How do they compare with each other in terms of:  
*aims, objectives, target areas, funding levels, timing ?***

**Do they use similar tactics ?**

**Do they target the same client groups ?**

**Who administers them ?**

**Do they complement, duplicate or contradict each other ?**

**Is there scope for rationalisation ?**

**What is their individual & collective impact on crime ?**

# Policy Analysis: The Detailed View

Where are we putting our crime prevention ?

How does this vary over time?

Do communities with similar levels and patterns of crime receive similar attention in terms of crime prevention (interventions/ levels of funding) ?

How far is there an 'inverse prevention law' (i.e. where areas with lower crime receive more attention)?

How do crime prevention measures correspond to the location and timing of different types of crime ?

Which is the best scale for studying relationships between crime and crime prevention activity:

- **Area level ?**
- **Address-property level ?**
- **Individual level ?**
- **Combination of all three ?**



## Why cross-reference crime patterns and crime prevention activity?

- To see how far the response to crime is appropriate to the offences being committed (**solving the right problem**)
- To assess how much crime it is feasible to influence by the scale of resources and measures that are available (**matching resources to the scale of the problem**)
- To establish where and when measures need to be deployed to influence crime (**targeting the right places at the right time**)
- To assess the spatial and temporal flexibility needed to respond to the dynamics of crime (**re-targeting and redeployment of measures**)
- To relate crime change to relevant interventions (**What works**)

## How easy is it to do this? What data are needed?

- Unlike crime, universal classification systems for recording policy interventions are non-existent
- There is a plethora of crime reduction projects and interventions that operate concurrently and are difficult to disentangle (Spaghetti effect)
- It is not obvious who is responsible for them, how much has been invested and who has benefited where, when and by how much
- Policy influences on crime are not restricted to criminal justice/ crime prevention measures
- Data are needed on the aim, objectives, tactics, investment (dosage), timing and location of policy
- Typically, this is collected afresh for each analysis which is not cost-effective or sustainable

# Burglary Analysis Projects

- Reducing Burglary Initiative Evaluation
- Liverpool Alley-Gating evaluations
- Burglary and Target Hardening in Manchester
- Burglary and Target Hardening in Liverpool

# Example of Data Sets

- **Domestic Burglary**
  - UPRN, Address, Location Codes (OA, Regeneration Area, Ward) date, repeat, tenure.....
- **Target Hardening**
  - UPRN, Address, Location Codes, Type of TH, Expenditure on TH, date, repeat TH, ....
- **Linked File**
  - UPRN, Address, Location Codes, Burglary(0,1,2,3+), Burglary date (1,2,3,+), TH (0,1,2,3+), TH date (1,2,3+), TH Spend (1,2,3+),tenure.....

**Data Sources:** Recorded Crime; Target Hardening Records; National Land and Property Gazetteer; Population Census; ACORN; Digital Administrative Boundaries

# Scales of Analysis

## ***Area Level :***



Burglary and Target Hardening by Ward, Census Output Area, Policy Zone, Street

## ***Individual Property Level :***

- Burgled and never target hardened
- Never burgled and target hardened


### Burgled and Target Hardened:

- No Prior Burglary – Target Hardened – Subsequent burglary
- Prior Burglary – Target Hardened – No subsequent burglary
- Prior Burglary – Target Hardened – Subsequent burglary



**Table 23 Resource targeting table, burglary and target hardening by Liverpool Neighbourhood Renewal Areas (2005 – 2007)**

	Number of Burglaries	% Liverpool Burglaries	Cumulative % Burglaries	% Properties Target Hardened	Cumulative % Target Hardening	Cumulative % Households
Kensington	700	4.6	4.6	14.9	14.9	3.5
Anfield Breckfield	506	3.4	8.0	36.4	51.3	5.7
Princes Park	201	1.3	9.3	3.2	54.5	7.1
Lodge Lane	181	1.2	10.5	2.6	57.1	8.0
Picton	123	0.8	11.3	2.1	59.2	8.5
Granby	44	0.3	11.6	0	59.2	8.9










# Alignment of Target Hardening/ Burglary

	Target Hardened Properties	% of all Target Hardened Properties
No Prior Burglary	1,466	84.3
One Burglary	191	11.0
Two or more Burglaries	82	4.7
Total	1,739	100.0

### Target Hardened Properties: Burglary Profile



# Target Hardening Points & Clusters



July – Sept 2005

Oct – Dec 2005

Jan – Mar 2006

Apr – Jun 2006

July – Sep 2006




Oct – Dec 2006

Jan – Mar 2007

Apr – Jun 2007

July – Sep 2007


Oct – Dec 2007



**1.0 Most Dissimilar**

↑

**0.1 Least Dissimilar**



Hot spot 3  
(Near Anfield Breckfield  
NRA)

Hot spot 2  
(Near Kensington NRA)

Hot spot 1  
(Near Picton  
NRA)

Legend:

- Liverpool Wards
- NRA Areas
- Target Hardening

Burglary Hotspot

Lowest Intensity

Highest Intensity

0 1 2 Kilometers

Research Festival  
23 March ~ 2 April  
09

**Table 34 Percentage of properties by profile and burglary hot spot risk (2005 – 2007)**

	Hot Spots					Total
	Lowest risk<----->Highest risk					
	1	2	3	4	5	
All Properties Burgled	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	100 (N=15088)
Burgled Never Target Hardened	21.5	21.0	20.2	19.4	18.0	100 (N=11540)
All Properties Burgled and Target Hardened	7.0	11.0	16.8	27.8	37.4	100 (N=273)
Burgled, Target Hardened, Then No Burglary	6.3	7.5	14.5	32.1	39.6	100 (N=159)
Burgled, Target Hardened, Then Burgled	10.0	15.0	20.0	15.0	40.0	100 (N=20)
Not Burg, Target Hardened then Burgled	7.4	16.0	20.2	23.4	33.0	100 (N=94)
Target Hardened Never Burgled	2.2	3.5	8.1	32.1	54.1	100 (N=1466)

## Some Issues for Discussion

- Should information on crime prevention be captured in a consistent way ?
- Who would be responsible for, pay for and maintain such data ?
- How far are methods and techniques for crime pattern analysis transferable to crime prevention policy analysis?
- To what extent do new measures, indices and tools need to be developed to analyse the delivery of crime prevention activities on the ground and relate these to crime?
- What are the implications of such analyses for the design and delivery of policy interventions?
- Does knowledge about patterns of crime prevention activity change what one does ?
- What are the theoretical implications of integrating crime and crime prevention analyses ? Do we need a theory of how and why policies are devised and implemented?

## Contact Details

Professor Alex Hirschfield,  
Applied Criminology Centre,  
University of Huddersfield,  
Floor 14, Central Services Building,  
Quuensgate Huddersfield HD1 3DH

**Tel: 01484 473676**

**Email: [a.hirschfield@hud.ac.uk](mailto:a.hirschfield@hud.ac.uk)**