The Limitations of Conventional Policing Methods

**Preventive Patrol**
- Between calls for service, officers are expected to randomly cruise neighborhoods, to deter crime.
- This creates the illusion of significant police presence. It was believed that preventative patrol decreased citizen’s fear and deterred would-be offenders.
- While this may increase the public’s feeling of safety, research such as the Kansas City experiment shows no significant difference in criminal activity.

**The Kansas City Experiment**
- The city was divided into three zones
- In one zone, patrol was totally eliminated
- The second zone was saturated with patrol
- The third zone acted as the control group by continuing past practice of moderate patrol levels
- The experiment found no significant difference in crime levels in any zone

**Rapid Response**
- Common wisdom suggests that responding quickly to the scene of an incident increases the police’s ability to catch the offender.
- In addition, a quick response aids in victim assistance.
- As a result, calls for service are dispatched swiftly, and new technology is continuously sought to improve response time.
- A fast response time is helpful when a citizen reports the crime immediately. If the citizen delays reporting for five to ten minutes, the chances for an arrest at or near the scene drop to almost zero.
- In ninety percent of reported crimes, citizens wait at least five to ten minutes before contacting the police.

**Follow-up criminal investigation** is the reactive response in the professional crime-fighting model.
- If officers do not prevent a crime from occurring in the first place, or if they do not catch the offender at the time of the crime, a follow-up criminal investigation is initiated.
- This model has a medium to low clearance and a low property recovery rate.
- There is a marked difference between the perception of safety and the actual crime rate.