

Advances in Police Theory and Practice Series

Policing in Israel

Studying Crime Control, Community Policing,
and Counterterrorism



Edited by
Tal Jonathan-Zamir
David Weisburd
Badi Hasisi



CRC Press
Taylor & Francis Group

Policing in Israel

Studying Crime Control, Community
Policing, and Counterterrorism

Advances in Police Theory and Practice Series

Series Editor: Dilip K. Das



**Policing in Israel: Studying Crime Control, Community
Policing, and Counterterrorism**

Tal Jonathan-Zamir, David Weisburd, and Badi Hasisi

**Policing Terrorism: Research Studies into
Police Counterterrorism Investigations**

David Lowe

Policing in Hong Kong: History and Reform

Kam C. Wong

**Cold Cases: Evaluation Models with Follow-up Strategies for Investigators,
Second Edition**

James M. Adcock and Sarah L. Stein

Crime Linkage: Theory, Research, and Practice

Jessica Woodhams and Craig Bennell

**Police Investigative Interviews and Interpreting:
Context, Challenges, and Strategies**

Sedat Mulayim, Miranda Lai, and Caroline Norma

Policing White Collar Crime: Characteristics of White Collar Criminals

Petter Gottschalk

Honor-Based Violence: Policing and Prevention

Karl Anton Roberts, Gerry Campbell, and Glen Lloyd

Policing and the Mentally Ill: International Perspectives

Duncan Chappell

Security Governance, Policing, and Local Capacity

Jan Froestad with Clifford D. Shearing

Policing in Hong Kong: History and Reform

Kam C. Wong

Police Performance Appraisals: A Comparative Perspective

Serdar Kenan Gul and Paul O'Connell

**Los Angeles Police Department Meltdown: The Fall of the Professional-Reform
Model of Policing**

James Lasley

Financial Crimes: A Global Threat

Maximillian Edelbacher, Peter Kratcoski, and Michael Theil

**Police Integrity Management in Australia: Global Lessons for Combating
Police Misconduct**

Louise Porter and Tim Prenzler

The Crime Numbers Game: Management by Manipulation

John A. Eterno and Eli B. Silverman

The International Trafficking of Human Organs: A Multidisciplinary Perspective

Leonard Territo and Rande Matteson

Police Reform in China

Kam C. Wong

Mission-Based Policing

John P. Crank, Dawn M. Irlbeck, Rebecca K. Murray, and Mark Sundermeier

The New Khaki: The Evolving Nature of Policing in India

Arvind Verma

Cold Cases: An Evaluation Model with Follow-up Strategies for Investigators

James M. Adcock and Sarah L. Stein

Policing Organized Crime: Intelligence Strategy Implementation

Petter Gottschalk

Security in Post-Conflict Africa: The Role of Nonstate Policing

Bruce Baker

Community Policing and Peacekeeping

Peter Grabosky

Community Policing: International Patterns and Comparative Perspectives

Dominique Wisler and Ihekwoaba D. Onwudiwe

Police Corruption: Preventing Misconduct and Maintaining Integrity

Tim Prenzler

FORTHCOMING

Corruption, Fraud, Organized Crime, and the Shadow Economy

Maximilian Edelbacher, Peter C. Kratcoski, and Bojan Dobovsek

**Collaborative Policing: Police, Academics, Professionals, and Communities
Working Together for Education, Training, and Program Implementation**

Peter C. Kratcoski and Maximilian Edelbacher

Stalking: Policing, Investigation, and Prevention

Karl Roberts and Michelle M. Garcia

Islamic Women in Policing: A Contradiction in Terms?

Tonita Murray

Female Criminals: An Examination and Interpretation of Female Offending

Venessa Garcia

Policing in Israel

Studying Crime Control, Community
Policing, and Counterterrorism

Edited by

Tal Jonathan-Zamir

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

David Weisburd

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia, USA

Badi Hasisi

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel



CRC Press

Taylor & Francis Group

Boca Raton London New York

CRC Press is an imprint of the
Taylor & Francis Group, an **informa** business

CRC Press
Taylor & Francis Group
6000 Broken Sound Parkway NW, Suite 300
Boca Raton, FL 33487-2742

© 2016 by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
CRC Press is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

No claim to original U.S. Government works
Version Date: 20150827

International Standard Book Number-13: 978-1-4987-2257-5 (eBook - PDF)

This book contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or the consequences of their use. The authors and publishers have attempted to trace the copyright holders of all material reproduced in this publication and apologize to copyright holders if permission to publish in this form has not been obtained. If any copyright material has not been acknowledged please write and let us know so we may rectify in any future reprint.

Except as permitted under U.S. Copyright Law, no part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from this work, please access www.copyright.com (<http://www.copyright.com/>) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by the CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com>

and the CRC Press Web site at
<http://www.crcpress.com>

Contents

Series Preface	ix
Editors	xi
Contributors	xiii

1	Policing in Israel: Studying Crime Control, Community, and Counterterrorism: Editors' Introduction	1
	TAL JONATHAN-ZAMIR, DAVID WEISBURD, AND BADI HASISI	

Section I
CRIME CONTROL

2	Law of Concentrations of Crime at Place: Case of Tel Aviv-Jaffa	9
	DAVID WEISBURD AND SHAI AMRAM	
3	Vehicle Impoundment Regulations as a Means of Reducing Traffic Violations and Road Accidents in Israel	23
	TOVA ROSENBLOOM AND EHUD ELDROR	
4	Lean Management for Traffic Police Enforcement Planning	39
	NICOLE ADLER, JONATHAN KORNBLUTH, MALI SHER, AND SHALOM HAKKERT	
5	Organizational Structure, Police Activity, and Crime	63
	ITAI ATER, YEHONATAN GIVATI, AND OREN RIGBI	

Section II
THE POLICE AND THE COMMUNITY

6	Police, Politics, and Culture in a Deeply Divided Society	87
	BADI HASISI	

7	Crime Victims and Attitudes toward Police: Israeli Case	107
	GALI AVIV	
8	Procedural Justice, Minorities, and Religiosity	123
	RONI FACTOR, JUAN CARLOS CASTILLO, AND ARYE RATTNER	
9	Police Understanding of the Foundations of Their Legitimacy in the Eyes of the Public: The Case of Commanding Officers in the Israel National Police	137
	TAL JONATHAN-ZAMIR AND AMIKAM HARPAZ	
 <i>Section III</i>		
POLICING TERRORISM		
10	Terrorist Threats and Police Performance: A Study of Israeli Communities	159
	DAVID WEISBURD, BADI HASISI, TAL JONATHAN-ZAMIR, AND GALI AVIV	
11	Police Legitimacy under the Spotlight: Media Coverage of Police Performance in the Face of High Terrorism Threat	183
	REVITAL SELA-SHAYOVITZ	
12	Policing Terrorism and Police–Community Relations: Views of Arab Minority in Israel	207
	BADI HASISI AND DAVID WEISBURD	
13	How Has the Israel National Police Perceived Its Role in Counterterrorism and Potential Outcomes? A Qualitative Analysis of Annual Police Reports	221
	TAL JONATHAN-ZAMIR AND GALI AVIV	
14	Lessons from Empirical Research on Policing in Israel: Policing Terrorism and Police–Community Relationships	237
	SIMON PERRY AND TAL JONATHAN-ZAMIR	

Series Preface

While the literature on police and allied subjects is growing exponentially, its impact upon day-to-day policing remains small. The two worlds of research and practice of policing remain disconnected, even though cooperation between the two is growing. A major reason is that the two groups speak in different languages. The research work is published in hard-to-access journals and presented in a manner that is difficult to comprehend for a layperson. On the other hand, the police practitioners tend not to mix with researchers and remain secretive about their work. Consequently, there is little dialogue between the two and almost no attempt to learn from one another. Dialogues across the globe, among researchers and practitioners situated in different continents, are of course even more limited.

I attempted to address this problem by starting the IPES (<http://www.ipes.info>), where a common platform has brought the two together. IPES is now in its twenty-sixth year. The annual meetings that constitute most major annual events of the organization have been hosted in all parts of the world. Several publications have come out of these deliberations, and a new collaborative community of scholars and police officers has been created whose membership runs into several hundreds.

Another attempt was to begin a new journal, aptly called *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal (PPR)*, that has opened the gate to practitioners to share their work and experiences. The journal has attempted to focus upon issues that help bring the two on a single platform. *PPR* is completing its 16 years in 2015. It is certainly an evidence of growing collaboration between police research and practice that *PPR*, which began with four issues a year, expanded into five issues in its fourth year, and now it is issued six times a year.

Clearly, these attempts, despite their success, remain limited. Conferences and journal publications do help create a body of knowledge and an association of police activists but cannot address substantial issues in depth. The limitations of time and space preclude larger discussions and more authoritative expositions that can provide stronger and broader linkages between the two worlds.

It is this realization of the increasing dialogue between police research and practice that has encouraged many of us—my close colleagues and I connected closely with IPES and *PPR* across the world—to conceive and implement a new attempt in this direction. This led to the book series *Advances in Police Theory and Practice*, that seeks to attract writers from all parts of the world. Further, the attempt is to find practitioner contributors. The objective is to make the series a serious contribution to our knowledge of the police as well as to improve police practices. The focus is not only in work that describes the best and successful police practices but also one that challenges current paradigms and breaks new ground to prepare a police for the twenty-first century. The series seeks a comparative analysis that highlights achievements in distant parts of the world as well as one that encourages an in-depth examination of specific problems confronting a particular police force.

The current book reports on the advancement of police research in Israel. The studies included make important contributions to the policing literature in at least one of three ways: they replicate findings from English-speaking countries (such as in the area of hot-spots policing), and thus provide support for their validity and generalizability; they utilize the unique Israeli conditions to address questions that are difficult to test in other countries, such as in the area of counterterrorism; and they ask innovative questions in the study of policing that are yet to be addressed elsewhere. These three types of contribution are made in the context of major areas of interest in the policing literature: crime control, police–community relationships, and policing terrorism. Thus, this book not only provides the reader with a broad picture of both Israeli policing and police research carried out in Israel in the past decade, but also has important implications for policing scholars and practitioners outside of Israel and throughout the democratic world.

It is hoped that through this series, it will be possible to accelerate the process of building knowledge about policing and help bridge the gap between the two worlds—the worlds of police research and police practice. This is an invitation to police scholars and practitioners across the world to come and join in this venture.

Dilip K. Das, PhD

Founding President,

International Police Executive Symposium,

IPES, www.ipes.info



Founding Editor-in-Chief,

Police Practice and Research: An International Journal,

PPR, www.tandf.co.uk/journals



Editors

Tal Jonathan-Zamir is a lecturer at the Institute of Criminology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She earned her PhD at Hebrew University in 2010 and spent a year as a Fulbright postdoctoral fellow at the Department of Criminology, Law, and Society at George Mason University. Her research interests include police–community relationships, police discretion, police legitimacy, and policing terrorism.

David Weisburd is a distinguished professor of criminology, law, and society at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, and a Walter E. Meyer professor of law and criminal justice at Hebrew University Faculty of Law in Jerusalem. He is a recipient of many international awards including the 2010 Stockholm Prize in Criminology and the 2014 Sutherland Award from the American Society of Criminology. In 2015, he received the Israel Prize for his contributions to criminology.

Badi Hasisi serves as a chair of the Institute of Criminology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His main research focuses on policing divided societies, police–minority relations; law, history, and society; and terrorism and airport security.

Contributors

Nicole Adler

School of Business Administration
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Shai Amram

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Itai Ater

Faculty of Management
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv, Israel

Gali Aviv

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Juan Carlos Castillo

Institute of Sociology
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile
Santiago, Chile

Ehud Eldror

Department of Management
Research Institute of Human Factors of Road Safety
Bar Ilan University
Ramat Gan, Israel

Roni Factor

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Yehonatan Givati

Faculty of Law
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Shalom Hakkert

Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Technion—Israel Institute of Technology
Haifa, Israel

Amikam Harpaz

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Badi Hasisi

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Tal Jonathan-Zamir

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Jonathan Kornbluth

School of Business Administration
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Simon Perry

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Arye Rattner

Department of Sociology
School of Criminology
Center for the Study of Crime, Law, and Society
University of Haifa
Haifa, Israel

Oren Rigbi

Department of Economics
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
Beersheva, Israel

Tova Rosenbloom

Department of Management
Research Institute of Human Factors of Road Safety
Bar Ilan University
Ramat Gan, Israel

Revital Sela-Shayovitz

David Yellin Academic College
and
Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

Mali Sher

Research Unit
Traffic Department
Israel National Police
Bet Dagan, Israel

David Weisburd

Faculty of Law
Institute of Criminology
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel

and

Department of Criminology, Law, and Society
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Policing in Israel: Studying Crime Control, Community, and Counterterrorism

Editors' Introduction*

1

TAL JONATHAN-ZAMIR
DAVID WEISBURD
BADI HASISI

Policing has become an important area of innovation in criminology and in practice over the past few decades. In methodology, policing has emerged as a key area of evidence-based policy in criminal justice (Lum, Koper, and Telep 2011; Sherman 1998; Weisburd and Neyroud 2011), and the police have become one of the most open agents of the criminal justice system to new ideas and new approaches (Weisburd and Braga 2006). The science of policing has advanced greatly, and there is now much evidence not only that the police can be effective (National Research Council 2004; Weisburd and Eck 2004) but also that policing and police data can play a role in advancing scientific understanding of crime and the relationships between the community and criminal justice (e.g., Gill et al. 2014; Telep and Weisburd 2012; Tyler 2011; Weisburd, Groff, and Yang 2012).

The advances in police science over the past few decades in the United States and the United Kingdom have also impacted scientific study of the police in many other countries. This edited book (developed from a special issue of *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal* and other recent studies) reports on the advancement of police research in Israel. As the studies suggest, cutting-edge methods and cutting-edge questions are being asked regarding Israeli policing. But the studies in this book suggest as well that there is much to learn about the police enterprise by looking to Israel.

Clearly, comparative studies are critical to identify whether phenomena observed in the United States, for example, can also be found in other settings. Thus, some of the studies reported in this book replicate findings in important areas such as crime and place and hot-spots policing (Chapter 2), attitudes of crime victims toward the police (Chapter 7), and police legitimacy (Chapter 8). However, Israel is not simply a different setting; it is also a setting with characteristics that make it particularly interesting to conduct police research. For example, although Israel has a long tradition of democratic government for a country outside the United States, Europe, and Australia, and its policing oversight has many characteristics similar to these democracies, it has faced terrorism often to a much greater degree, and its police have had a more critical role in controlling terrorism than that of police in other Western countries. Thus, several chapters of this book report on the implications of this policing role in terms of the ability of the police to control crime (Chapter 10), public attitudes toward the

* Adapted from Weisburd, D., B. Hasisi, and T. Jonathan-Zamir. 2014. Trends in Israeli policing: Terrorism, community, victimization and crime control. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*. 15(2): 97–100.

police (Chapter 12), and media coverage (Chapter 11). Finally, some of the chapters in this book address innovative questions in the study of police, raised and tested by Israeli scholars in the Israeli context, such as police officers' understanding of the sources of their legitimacy in the eyes of the public (Chapter 9), and the implications of shifting responsibilities from one criminal justice agency to another (Chapter 5).

These three axes (replications, the use of unique Israeli conditions, and innovative questions in the study of police) interact in this book with three themes that represent major areas of interest in the policing literature, and thus formed the organizational structure of the book: crime control, the police and the community, and policing terrorism. All studies reported in this book have already been published in peer-reviewed journals, but are brought together to provide a broad picture of both Israeli policing and police research carried out in Israel in the past decade. At the same time, however, and as illustrated in the specific chapters, the findings and conclusions of the studies bear important implications for policing scholars and practitioners outside of Israel and throughout the democratic world: they provide additional evidence for theories or approaches developed elsewhere and support their generalizability; they provide answers to contemporary questions that are being asked in many Western democracies, but are virtually impossible to test in these countries; and they raise new questions in the study of the police that are yet to be tested elsewhere. Some of the studies contribute in more than one way. For example, in Chapter 8 Factor et al. replicate the well-known legitimacy model (e.g., Sunshine and Tyler 2003) in the Israeli context, and thus provide additional evidence for its validity and generalizability, but at the same time add the religiosity component, which has not yet been tested in this context. Given the broad benefits emerging from the study of Israeli policing, we think this book also points to the advantages of conducting policing research outside English-speaking countries more generally.

The first theme of the book, crime control, includes four studies. The chapter by Weisburd and Amram (Chapter 2) provides a good example of the utility of examining key findings in different contexts. These researchers show that the concentration of crime at microgeographic units, or crime "hot spots," occurs in the city of Tel Aviv, Israel. Indeed, their results are strikingly similar to those reported in Seattle, Washington, and other American cities (e.g., Weisburd et al. 2012). They argue for a law of crime concentrations, and thus in order to be effective in controlling crime, the police should focus their efforts on these small areas where much of the crime in the city takes place. Examining crime hot spots in Israel provides accordingly important comparative data for advancing this area of study.

Another interesting replication can be found in Chapter 3. Rosenbloom and Eldror examine the deterrent effect of vehicle impoundment on both subjective perceptions (as reflected in survey responses) and actual driving behavior (using police records). They find that drivers whose vehicle was impounded report safer driving behaviors, and police records indeed show that these drivers committed fewer violations than the controls. At the same time, and in contrast to findings from California (see DeYoung 1999), no effects on involvement in traffic accidents were found. The authors suggest that a longer period (and thus more accident cases) may be required for statistically significant effects to emerge. Nevertheless, overall their findings provide further support for impoundment as a deterrent for several types of traffic violations.

Still in the area of traffic enforcement, Adler et al. (Chapter 4) develop an innovative road safety strategy. They use an optimization modeling approach from the operations

management philosophy, which aims to increase the effect of police traffic enforcement given the budgetary and resource constraints imposed on the traffic police in Israel. They demonstrate the effectiveness of their strategy with a case study: their models were implemented by the Israel traffic police over 6 years (2004–2009) and, in turn, improved both the quality of the enforcement process and the process flow. Their analysis is the first to develop a model of road safety enforcement for the traffic-police ticketing process.

In Chapter 5, Ater, Givati, and Rigbi raise an innovative question in the study of police—whether the organizational structure of the criminal justice system affects crime control—and take advantage of a unique Israeli situation—shifting the responsibility for housing arrestees (who have not yet been convicted) from the Israel National Police to the Israel Prison Service. Their analysis took advantage of the fact that the reform diffused gradually throughout the country, allowing for the comparison of arrests and reported crime before and after the reform, both within and across the different Israeli regions. They found that, probably because of the externalization of financial and managerial costs, after the reform the police arrested more suspects and for longer periods (although the arrests were of lower quality and for less severe offenses). The reform also led to lower rates of reported crimes. They conclude that the organizational structure of criminal justice agencies does indeed affect both police activity and crime, and these effects should be considered when making similar reforms.

The second theme of this book, the police and the community, begins with an important examination of the relationship between the police and minority groups. Utilizing the unique political and cultural situation in Israel, in Chapter 6 Hasisi studies the views of Jews and Arabs toward the police, while tying the discussion to the concept of “deeply divided societies.” Although most of this literature treated political differences as the primary explanation for relatively weak relationships between the police and minorities, Hasisi argues for the importance of the cultural component. Responses to a telephone survey indicate that, overall, Jews view the police more positively than Arabs. At the same time, Israeli Arabs are not homogeneous: Druze are similar in their political orientation to Jews, and as a result their perceptions of the police are more positive than those of Muslim and Christian Arabs. However, they appear to be culturally similar to Muslims, which explains why their responses to statements concerning receptivity to the police are closer to those of Muslim Arabs. Thus, Hasisi takes advantage of the unique characteristics of Israeli society to add an important dimension to the study of police in deeply divided societies more generally.

In Chapter 7, Aviv asks whether data on victims in Israel mirrors that of U.S. and European studies, but, importantly, also examines a broader set of attitudes than previously examined, which stem from the literature on police legitimacy (e.g., Tyler 2004). In line with previous studies carried out in Western democracies, her findings reveal that victims view the police less positively than nonvictims in terms of police treatment and performance. Victims also display significantly lower levels of trust in the police. Aviv’s study provides important new data in a different national context in support of work that reveals differences between the way victims and nonvictims evaluate the police, but shows this gap in the specific context of the legitimacy model.

The legitimacy model also provided the background for the study by Factor, Castilo, and Rattner (Chapter 8). Although public views are often measured in Israel, the “legitimacy” of the police as frequently examined today (e.g., National Research Council 2004; Tyler 2004, 2009), its antecedents, and outcomes have rarely been examined in the Israeli

context (see Jonathan-Zamir and Weisburd 2013, for an exception). Factor et al. replicate the process-based model established in an earlier work (Sunshine and Tyler 2003), and find support for the validity of the model in Israel. Similar to previous assessments, mostly in English-speaking countries, they find that the main predictor of police legitimacy is assessments of fair processes. Legitimacy, in turn, is associated with greater support for the police. Importantly, in addition to replicating the model, they examine the effect of religiosity, which has not yet been tested in this context. They find that, among the Jewish population, those who consider themselves more religious tend to view the police as less legitimate.

The last study in this section (Chapter 9) takes an innovative approach to the study of police legitimacy. To date, police legitimacy has mostly been examined from the perspective of citizens. Recently, Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) have argued that the way the police perceive their own legitimacy should also be considered. In this study, Jonathan-Zamir and Harpaz examine Israeli police officers' understanding of the factors that affect their external legitimacy ("What makes citizens view us as legitimate?"). They find that in contrast to citizen priorities as reflected in surveys, Israeli police believe that their legitimacy in the eyes of the public depends more on their accomplishments in fighting crime than on procedural justice. This study is an important example of pioneering investigations of police carried out in Israel that should be replicated in other local/national contexts.

The studies in the last section of the book, policing terrorism, make use of unique Israeli circumstances to answer important questions that are being asked in many Western democracies, particularly since the terror attack of 9/11, but often cannot be empirically tested in those countries because of relatively low rates of terrorist attacks, and because their local police have relatively little experience in facing terrorism threats. The Israel National Police resembles local police agencies in many Western democracies in its core functions and restraints, but, at the same time, has been responsible for "internal security" since the early 1970s, and over the years has faced numerous and diverse terrorism threats.

Weisburd, Hasisi, Jonathan-Zamir, and Aviv (Chapter 10) take advantage of the diversity in terrorism threats across Israeli communities during the period of the "Second Intifada," and examine if and how terrorism threats have affected police performance in fighting crime, as reflected in clearance rates. They also examine if terrorism threats have a different effect in majority-Jewish versus minority-Arab communities. They find that in Jewish communities, probably as a result of limited resources and changing priorities, as terrorism threats increase—the ability of the police to solve crime decreases. At the same time, the effect is opposite in Arab communities: the higher the terrorism threats, the higher the clearance rates. They attribute this effect to growing surveillance in these communities as a result of heightened suspicion in high-threat periods.

Sela-Shayovitz (Chapter 11) also uses the high-threat period of the Second Intifada and examines media coverage of the police within the framework of police legitimacy, comparing the way the police were portrayed before and during the Intifada period. She finds that the high-threat period resulted in more media coverage that both reflects and encourages trust in the Israel National Police. Periods of intense terrorism threats also led to favorable coverage of police performance and fair treatment. Multivariate analyses showed the important effect of high terrorism threats on trust in the police (as reflected in media coverage) independent of other variables often associated with police legitimacy. Thus, this study supports earlier findings regarding the effects of external threats on internal cohesion, while tying the findings to the legitimacy model (e.g., Sunshine and Tyler 2003).

In Chapter 12, Hasisi and Weisburd use the Israeli situation to examine the extent to which the Arab minority in Israel differs in its evaluations of policing terrorism and its impacts on traditional policing and the community. Their research reinforces findings that minorities with national or religious affiliations with the sources of terrorism in a country will feel particularly vulnerable and threatened by a police focus on terrorism. However, their survey also suggests that even in Israel, where minority/majority relationships are complicated by national identities, there is much commonality between the majority and minority communities. Both recognize the importance of policing terrorism, and both are aware that such an emphasis in policing may negatively impact police performance in other areas and complicate the relationships of the police with minority communities.

The chapter by Jonathan-Zamir and Aviv (Chapter 13) focuses on how the police have understood their counterterrorism role and its implications over the years. Centering on three critical periods, they analyze Israeli police annual reports and find that fighting terrorism was not always perceived as an easy and natural role for the Israeli police, and it often took precedence over traditional crime-fighting roles in Israel. Their analysis also reveals that this agency shows only partial acknowledgment of the potential outcomes of counterterrorism functions, particularly with regard to the relationship between the police and the public.

Finally, Perry and Jonathan-Zamir (Chapter 14) review recent research on policing in Israel. They focus on two important areas—policing terrorism and police–community relationships, and thus this chapter is relevant to both the second and third themes of this book. They identify that most studies on policing terrorism in Israel highlight the unintended outcomes of excessive focus on counterterrorism, both with regard to the ability of the police to solve crime and in terms of police–community relationships, particularly with the Arab minority. Studies on the relationship between the police and the public not only reveal a long-term drop in public support for the Israeli police but, taken together, suggest that this drop is largely the result of disregard for the principles of procedural justice.

This edited book illustrates the important advances in Israeli police science over the past decade. It also shows that studying Israeli policing can provide important knowledge for advancing police science more generally. Empirical research in Israel, or other countries outside the traditional research domains of the United States, Europe and Australia, can provide important comparative data about key concepts and findings in policing. This was the case, for example, for hot spots research, examination of crime victims' attitudes, and police legitimacy here. However, the book also suggests that new knowledge that raises new questions can be identified in such comparative studies.

Some of the studies reported in this book, such as testing the outcomes of shifting responsibilities from one agency in the criminal justice system to another, developing models for the purpose of improving traffic enforcement effectiveness given budgetary and resource constraints, or examining police legitimacy from the perspective of the police rather than the public, suggest innovative outlooks to the study of police. Moreover, the Israeli setting provides an important laboratory for testing questions related to policing terrorism in a democratic society, particularly the outcomes of such “high policing” roles (see Bayley and Weisburd 2009). These questions would be difficult to examine in other countries where terrorism threats were less intense or have not varied over time, or where the police are not bound by democratic principles. Israel also shows a continuing drop

in public trust, which raises broader questions about maintaining long-term public support. We believe that other democratic societies, with their distinctive features, allow for the examination of similarly important and unique questions. We hope that this book on Israel will lead to greater focus on research in other comparative settings. We also think that it is important in illustrating the advances in police science in Israel.

References

- Bayley, D. and D. Weisburd. 2009. Cops and spooks: The role of police in counter terrorism. In *To protect and to serve: Policing in an age of terrorism*, eds. D. Weisburd., T. E. Feucht, I. Hakimi, L. F. Mock and S. Perry, 81–99. New York: Springer.
- Bottoms, A. and J. Tankebe. 2012. Beyond procedural justice: A dialogic approach to legitimacy in criminal justice. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 102(1): 119–170.
- DeYoung, D. J. 1999. An evaluation of the specific deterrent effects of vehicle impoundment on suspended, revoked, and unlicensed drivers in California. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 31: 45–53.
- Gill, C. E., D. Weisburd, T. Bennett, C. W. Telep and Z. Vitter. 2014. Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder, and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 10(4): 399–428.
- Jonathan-Zamir, T. and D. Weisburd. 2013. The effects of security threats on antecedents of police legitimacy: Findings from a quasi-experiment in Israel. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 50(1): 3–32.
- Lum, C., C. S. Koper and C. Telep. 2011. The evidence-based policing matrix. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 7: 3–26.
- National Research Council. 2004. *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. Committee to Review Research on Police Policy and Practices. W. Skogan and K. Frydl (Eds.), Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Sherman, L. W. 1998. *Evidence-based policing*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Sunshine, J. and T. R. Tyler. 2003. The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law and Society Review* 37: 513–548.
- Telep, C. W. and D. Weisburd. 2012. What has been learned from systematic reviews in policing? Paper presented May 1 at the conference: *What has been learned from systematic reviews in criminology?* Jerusalem, Israel.
- Tyler, T. R. 2004. Enhancing police legitimacy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 593(1): 84–99.
- Tyler, T. R. 2009. Legitimacy and criminal justice: The benefits of self-regulation. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 7(1): 307–359.
- Tyler, T. R. 2011. Trust and legitimacy: Policing in the USA and Europe. *European Journal of Criminology* 8(4): 254–266.
- Weisburd, D. and A. Braga. 2006. *Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Weisburd, D. and J. E. Eck. 2004. What can police do to reduce crime, disorder and fear? *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 593: 42–65.
- Weisburd, D. and P. Neyroud. 2011. Police science: Toward a new paradigm. *New Perspectives in Policing*.
- Weisburd, D., E. R. Groff and S. M. Yang. 2012. *The criminology of place: Street segments and our understanding of the crime problem*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Law of Concentrations of Crime at Place

Case of Tel Aviv-Jaffa*

2

DAVID WEISBURD
SHAI AMRAM

Contents

Concentration of Crime at Place	10
The Study	12
Crime Incidents at Street Segments	12
Results	14
Concentration of Crime at Place	14
Discussion and Conclusions	17
References	19

Although the individual and “macro” units of place such as the community have long been a focus of research and theory regarding social problems, only recently have scholars begun to explore crime and other antisocial behavior at very small “micro” units of geography. The roots of such approaches can be found in the efforts of scholars to identify the relationship between specific aspects of urban design (Jeffery 1971) or urban architecture (Newman 1972) and antisocial behavior, but broadened to take into account a much larger set of characteristics of physical space and criminal opportunity (e.g., Brantingham and Brantingham 1975). These studies drew important distinctions between the specific location of antisocial behavior and the larger geographical area (such as neighborhood, community, police beat, or city) that surrounds it.

The main theoretical impetus to the micro place approach to antisocial behavior is found in a group of theoretical perspectives that emerged in the late 1970s. In a seminal article on routine activities and crime, for example, Cohen and Felson (1979) suggested that a fuller understanding of crime must include a recognition that the availability of suitable crime targets and the presence or absence of capable guardians influence crime events. Routine activities focused attention on the specific ecological contexts in which suitable targets, motivated offenders, and the absence of capable guardians occurred. Researchers at the British Home Office, in a series of studies examining the effects of “situational crime prevention,” also challenged the traditional focus on offenders and communities (e.g., see Clarke 1983). In contrast to offender-based approaches to crime prevention, which usually focus on the dispositions of criminals, situational crime prevention begins with the opportunity structure (and immediate physical context) of the crime situation (Felson and Clarke 1998). Paul and Patricia Brantingham also emphasized the role of place characteristics in shaping the type and frequency of human interaction in their work on environmental criminology (Brantingham and Brantingham 1991).

* Reproduced from Weisburd, D. and S. Amram. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal* 15(2): 101–114, 2014.

One implication of these emerging perspectives was that places at a “micro” geographic level should be an important focus of scholarly inquiry. Although concern with the relationship between social problems and place is not new and indeed goes back to the founding generations of modern criminology, the “micro” approach to places suggested by recent theories has just begun to be examined (Weisburd, Bernasco, and Bruinsma 2009). Places in this “micro” context are specific locations within the larger social environments of communities and neighborhoods (Eck and Weisburd 1995). Recent studies point to the potential theoretical and practical benefits of focusing research on crime places. In particular, there has been a consistent finding that crime is tightly concentrated at just a small number of micro places in a city. For example, in one of the pioneering studies in this area, Sherman, Gartin, and Buerger (1989) found that only 3.5% of the addresses in Minneapolis, Minnesota, produced 50% of all calls to the police. Fifteen years later, in a retrospective longitudinal study in Seattle, Washington, Weisburd et al. (2004) reported that between 4% and 5% of street segments in the city accounted for 50% of crime incidents for each year over 14 years.

The findings of remarkable concentrations of crime at place raise a more general question about the phenomenon of crime in cities. Is there some general law that applies across cities that dictates the general concentration of crime? This is the question raised in a recent book by Weisburd, Groff, and Yang (2012) titled *The Criminology of Place*. Studying crime at street segments in Seattle, they found a remarkable stability of crime concentrations each year over a 16-year period. They argue that these data, as well as prior studies showing similar concentrations of crime for specific years in other cities (e.g., see Pierce, Spaar, and Briggs 1988; Sherman et al. 1989) suggest that crime concentrations at micro places are relatively constant with about 5% of places producing about 50% of crime in a city each year (see also Weisburd, Telep, and Lawton 2014).

The idea of a “law” of crime rates is not a new one. Emile Durkheim raised this possibility more than a century ago. Durkheim suggested that crime was not indicative of pathology or illness in society, but at certain levels was simply evidence of the normal functioning of communities (Durkheim 1895, 1964). For Durkheim, the idea of a normal level of crime reinforced his theoretical position that crime helped to define and solidify norms in society. Although Durkheim’s proposition regarding a normal level of crime in society does not seem to fit recent experience and is seldom discussed by criminologists today, Weisburd et al. (2012) argue that there is indeed a “normal level of crime” in cities, but one that relates to the concentration of crime at place and not to the overall rate of crime. Whereas the absolute levels of crime in cities vary from year to year, the extent of crime concentrations remains similar (Pierce et al. 1988; Sherman et al. 1989; Weisburd et al. 2004).

Weisburd et al. (2004) conclusions are based primarily on data on crime concentrations in Seattle and other American cities. In this paper, we examine such concentrations in Tel Aviv-Jaffa, Israel. If the “law of crime concentrations” applies to Tel Aviv-Jaffa, then we have another important data point for advancing this proposition about crime concentrations in modern urban areas.

Concentration of Crime at Place

A number of studies, beginning in the late 1980s, suggest that significant clustering of crime at place exists, regardless of the specific unit of analysis defined (see Brantingham and

Brantingham 1999; Crow and Bull 1975; Pierce et al. 1988; Roncek 2000; Sherman et al. 1989; Weisburd and Green 1994; Weisburd, Maher, and Sherman 1992; Weisburd et al. 2004, 2009). Perhaps the most influential of these was Sherman et al.'s (1989) analysis of emergency calls to street addresses over a single year. Sherman et al. (1989) found that only 3.5% of the addresses in Minneapolis produced 50% of all calls to the police. They regarded these results as so startling that they called for a new area of study, which they termed the "criminology of place."

Other studies produced similar evidence of the concentration of crime in crime hot spots. Weisburd and Mazerolle (2000), for example, found that approximately 20% of all disorder crimes and 14% of crimes against persons were concentrated in just 56 drug crime hot spots in Jersey City, New Jersey, an area that comprised only 4.4% of street segments and intersections in the city. Similarly, Eck, Gersh, and Taylor (2000) found that the most active 10% of places (in terms of crime) in the Bronx, New York, and Baltimore, Maryland, accounted for approximately 32% of a combination of robberies, assaults, burglaries, grand larcenies, and auto thefts. A study conducted by Weisburd et al. (2004) not only confirms the concentration of crime, but also the stability of such concentrations across a long time span. Weisburd et al. examined street segments in the city of Seattle from 1989 through 2002. They found that 50% of crime incidents over the 14-year period occurred at only 4.5% of the street segments. Crime concentrations appear to be greater in examining specific types of crime. In another study in Seattle, Weisburd et al. (2009) examined the concentration of crime incidents in which a juvenile was arrested. They found that only 86 street segments out of more than 25,000 accounted for one-third of all official juvenile arrest incidents over a 14-year period.

In a recent study extending the research of Weisburd et al. (2004) in Seattle, Weisburd, Groff, and Yang (2012) found that crime concentrations continued at similar levels over the additional 2-year period examined. Moreover, they found that the 1% of street segments in the city accounted for fully 23% of crime incidents. They also examined the extent to which such crime concentrations represented larger community area effects, or local processes generated at the street segment level. Their analyses suggest overall that there is a tremendous level of street-by-street variability in developmental patterns of crime at street segments in Seattle (see also Groff, Weisburd, and Yang 2010). For example, simple descriptive maps pointed to the spread of crime hot spots across Seattle. Although certain areas, such as the downtown center of the city, evidenced larger numbers of chronic hot spots, hot spot street segments were generally dispersed throughout the city. They concluded that an approach that assumed that hot spots were clustered only in a few "very bad" neighborhoods would misrepresent the spread of such problems in the city.

Similarly, drawing conclusions from spatial statistics, they found that trajectory patterns are interspersed, for example, with crime-free street segments often likely to be bounded by higher crime street segments, or chronic hot spots near street segments evidencing less serious developmental patterns. Indeed, 85% of street segments within 800 ft (nearly 244 m) of chronic crime hot spots were places with little or no crime. While acknowledging that community and larger area processes are important for understanding crime, they conclude that the action of crime begins at a very micro level of geography—in their case, the street segment.

Although these studies suggest that there is indeed a law of concentrations of crime operating across cities, and that these crime concentrations at micro places are not simply a reflection of larger area trends, there is little known about the concentration of crime

outside of the United States, and to some extent Australia, the United Kingdom, and Europe, where such studies are just beginning to emerge. In the following discussion, we test the law of crime concentrations in the context of one such city, Tel Aviv-Jaffa, Israel.

The Study

Our data are drawn from the city of Tel Aviv-Jaffa, which is the heart of Israel's largest metropolitan urban area. The city itself had a population of 404,400 for the year 2010, which makes it the second largest city in the country behind Jerusalem. However, the metropolitan area of Tel Aviv-Jaffa includes a population of 3.3 million, nearly 43.4% of the total population of Israel. The city was established in 1909 and played a central role in the development of the Zionist movement in the country as the first new city in Palestine. It was the center of the political renaissance of Jewish institutions in Palestine, and of the new socialist labor movement of the twentieth century. Today, it is the economic and cultural capital of Israel. It is the home of the Israeli stock exchange, and includes the corporate offices of many international companies based in Israel. It is also home to such key cultural institutions as the Israeli Opera and Israel's most prestigious theater, "HaBima." And as a tourist attraction with entertainment available 24 hours a day, it is nicknamed in Israel as "the city that never sleeps."

The city population is primarily of Jewish background (92%), although it includes a significant minority population composed of Arab Muslims and Christians and non-Arab Christians. The Arab population (3.9%) is concentrated in the old city of Jaffa, incorporated into Tel Aviv-Jaffa in 1948, and is primarily Muslim. Tel Aviv-Jaffa, like other major cities around the world, includes an overrepresentation of older citizens, younger professionals, and students. The rate of elderly persons (aged 65 years or older) in Tel Aviv-Jaffa is 14.2%, which is higher than the average number of elderly in the general population (9.7%). The rate of the younger population in the city aged 21–39 years is 38.8%, whereas the national rate is 29.2%.

The city has emerged in recent years as a major urban center, which is reflected by the large growth of urban business towers and residences across the city. Tel Aviv-Jaffa's property crime rate was 54 incidents per 1000 persons, which placed it first among cities in Israel in 2010, the year of our study data. Tel Aviv-Jaffa's violent crime rate of 10.8 per 1000 persons is also one of the highest among Israeli cities.

Crime Incidents at Street Segments

We used computerized records of written reports for the calendar year of 2010, often referred to as "incident reports," to examine crime trends. Tel Aviv-Jaffa experienced a total of 43,258 crime incidents during the research period. Incident reports are generated in Tel Aviv-Jaffa by police officers or detectives after an initial response to a request for police service or as a result of a crime identified by the police. In this sense, incident reports are more inclusive than arrest reports but less inclusive than calls for service. Incident reports have been used in a series of other studies examining crime at place including those conducted by Weisburd and colleagues (see Weisburd and Green 1995; Weisburd and Mazerolle 2000; Weisburd et al. 2004, 2012, 2014), thus allowing us to make direct comparisons to prior research.

The geographic unit of interest for this study is the street segment (sometimes referred to as a street block or face block), defined as the two block faces on both sides of a street