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Experimental criminology is a part of a larger and increasingly expanding scientific research and evidence-based movement in social policy. The chapters in this volume report on new and innovative contributions that experimental criminology is making to basic scientific knowledge and public policy. Contributors explore cutting-edge experimental and quasi-experimental methods and their application to important and topical issues in criminology and criminal justice, including neurological predictors of violence, peer influence on delinquency, routine activities and capable guardianship, early childhood prevention programs, hot spots policing, and correctional treatment for juvenile and adult offenders. It is the first book to examine the full scope of experimental criminology, from experimental tests – in the field and in the laboratory – of criminological theories and concepts to experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations of crime prevention and criminal justice interventions.
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Foreword

We need this new field of experimental criminology. The design of cost-effective policy requires good evidence on what works well and, equally important, what doesn’t. Intuition, casual observation, and good intentions are not enough.

The exceptional case, albeit from another field, helps prove the rule. Cambridge Professor Gordon Smith and his colleague Jill Pell once pointed out that there had been no rigorous evaluations of parachute use as a method of preventing death resulting from jumping out of an airplane. They noted that “advocates of evidence based medicine have criticised the adoption of interventions evaluated by using only observational data” (2003: 1459) and suggested that those advocates participate in a randomized field trial of parachute use. The point is that observational data combined with our understanding of basic mechanisms (gravity, vulnerability to trauma) is entirely persuasive in this case, just as is the usual evidence we have about which switch controls a particular light. But such easy cases are rare. The processes by which innovations in policing or corrections or social policy might influence crime rates are complex and cannot be confidently assessed by what might be called “common sense” alone. More systematic evidence is required. And the new field, well documented in this book, is beginning to provide just that.

Of course, even in the absence of rigorous evidence of the sort discussed in this book, there is no lack of opinions. The abundance of opinions originates not only from laypeople (everyone’s a social scientist by virtue of personal experience) but also from those who have a real claim to expertise – police chiefs, judges, criminals, corrections
program administrators, and scholars with a deep knowledge of crime and its making. The marketplace for ideas about crime policy is glutted. The great challenge is sorting through the offerings, creating a sort of quality control that distinguishes ideas that are merely plausible from those that have actually been subjected to rigorous testing and survived. The power of plausibility in influencing public support is strong, as witnessed by programs such as Scared Straight, DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education), and gun buybacks that remain popular despite the null or negative findings of well-done evaluations. But the good evidence on these matters is now part of the debate, and that’s progress.

Indeed, it is a brave program manager or advocate who opens the door to a rigorous evaluation. He or she is volunteering to raise the bar. As opposed to relying on a convincing narrative, personal testimonials, and outcomes data limited to certain subgroups (those who stayed in the program, say), a randomized controlled trial (RCT) or regression-discontinuity analysis creates a real possibility of a null result. The history of corrections research in particular has Robert Martinson’s famously negative conclusions as a cautionary tale – his review of evaluations (primarily from the 1960s), including several high-quality RCTs, has been summarized as “nothing works.” More generally, the leading figure in social policy evaluation, Peter Rossi, has made a strong case for skepticism. His Iron Law of Evaluation asserts that the expected value of any large-scale social program is zero, which he coupled with his Stainless Steel Law of Evaluation, that the better designed the impact assessment of a social program the more likely is the resulting estimate of impact to be zero. In sum, if you have a pet program, it would be risky to invite a high-quality evaluation.

Of course not every rigorous evaluation has negative results. Sometimes the usual situation is reversed, where the best evidence supports interventions that are widely viewed as implausible. My list of counterintuitive interventions that have been shown convincingly to reduce crime would start with raising alcohol excise taxes and implementing coerced abstinence programs for felony probationers. Of particular interest in the context of this book is how much has changed in criminologists’ assessment of the influence or potential influence
of the police; it is fair to say that two decades ago most criminologists believed that variations in the size of the police force or policing strategies were pretty much irrelevant to determining a city’s crime rate – a view that was also often endorsed by police chiefs. Now, thanks in part to high-quality evaluations conducted by Lawrence Sherman, David Weisburd, Anthony A. Braga, Emily Owens, and others in the experimental criminology movement, we have a much more positive view. Police departments, at least some police departments, have been surprisingly receptive to running experiments, and the accumulation of high-quality evidence in this arena has influenced practice. Hot spots policing is the signature program of experimental criminology.

The publication of this book serves as a milestone in the development of this important new field. The editors and authors make the case that the evidence base for policy making has become stronger thanks to the incorporation of rigorous experimental and quasi-experimental evaluation methods – and that the general approach and mission has gained broad acceptance. The normal science of criminology will never be the same.

Philip J. Cook
Duke University

Preface

Experimental criminology is an important area of research and scholarship and is closely linked with the evidence-based movement in social policy. Its profile has been elevated in recent years with any number of new scholarly and policy-oriented developments, methodological advancements, and a rapidly expanding body of experimental studies. Experimental methods have deep roots in criminology and the social and behavioral sciences more generally. These can be found in the study of criminal activities, development and testing of criminological theories, and evaluations of programs and policies to reduce crime. Experiments take place in varied field settings as well as in laboratories and are a rich source of scientific knowledge that has helped to advance the field of criminology and public policy. This book sets out to recapture the full breadth of experimental criminology and report on new and innovative contributions that it is making to basic scientific knowledge and more effective public policy.
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of reviewing and editing, and papers were accepted for inclusion in the volume.
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