Proceeding of ICSPHS 2026 Symposium:Ethics, Law, and Psychology: Interdisciplinary Reconstruction of Humanities in Medicine
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

The Influencing Factors of Crime Control and Their Practical Implications

Jingzhi Wang

College of Educ, Crim, and Human Service, University of, Cincinnati, USA
Wang4jz@mail.uc.edu

Abstract. In recent years, policymakers have placed crime control at the centre stage, and urban violence has become concentrated at the micro-location. Each of these approaches, whether policing, sentencing, or community-based strategies, has been shown to have some effectiveness, but in isolation. Existing research lacks an overview of how these approaches interact with one another to produce what could be classified as sustainable crime reduction. This article will demonstrate the complementarity of each of the four selected policing, intervention, and punishment solutions by drawing on recent findings in hotspot policing, problem-oriented policing (POP), sentencing and rehabilitation models, and community violence intervention (CVI). The analysis finds that hot-spot policing reduces immediate risk, POP approaches the harmful impact of structural problem drivers, CVI strengthens informal social controls, and incentive-based sentencing reduces recidivism when deployed to align with threshold effects. The findings show that crime control is most effective when place-based enforcement is paired with relational and rehabilitative strategies. Whole-systems analyses (WSA) applied to cities that have abandoned unsustainable paradigms in favour of sustainable ones open an exploration of features and priority settings for real-life implementations of city-level Violence Intervention and Safety Platform (VISP) models that combine hot spots, POP, and risk-need-responsivity principles, together with sentence-tiering incentives and evaluation indicators for CVI programs. According to the study, an integrated, evidence-based model that balances enforcement and prevention demonstrates how coordinated strategies can lead to more equitable and durable public-safety outcomes.

Keywords: Crime Control Strategies, Hot Spots Policing, Problem-Oriented Policing (POP), Integrated Crime Prevention

1. Introduction

Crime in the city has been a major public issue for a long time. Environmental concentration, social disadvantage, and interpersonal issues are at the base of the crime. As cities continue to suffer violence occurrences at micro-locations, scholars and governments have more often sought strategies that can generate sustainable crime reduction rather than temporary suppression. Past criminological research already portrays crime as a clustering phenomenon rather than a perfectly even distribution across space. Rather, it occurs in 'hot spots'. In addition, crime reflects structural

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

problems and is influenced by chronic instability in high-risk communities. This indicates that addressing the underlying problems requires methods beyond traditional enforcement.

In the last ten years, a number of scholars with different approaches have suggested ways to explain and reduce crime. These can include micro-geographic policing, problem-oriented policing (POP), community-based interventions (such as Community Violence Intervention (CVI)), and sentencing, which includes rehabilitation and incentives. A few meta-analyses strongly support hot-spot policing. Updated reviews suggest POP is fairly effective. And research on CVI suggests modest crime reductions through social-relationship repair based on assessing vulnerability. According to judicial studies, there are threshold effects in sentencing and rehabilitation that deserve attention as an incentive-based programme to reduce long-term recidivism. Nonetheless, existing research still tends to look at these strategies in isolation. Very few studies take an integrated view of how spatial, organizational, and relational approaches interact, or how the judicial component can be aligned with policing and community interventions. When policies become fragmented, they severely hamper the ability of policymakers to create unified public-safety systems that reproduce reality.

To bridge this gap, the present study will synthesise findings from recent research on policing, sentencing, and community-based strategies to assess their potential for sustainable crime control. This article uses an evidence-informed framework to review empirical research on hot-spot policing, POP diagnosis, CVI outreach, and incentive-oriented sentencing reforms. It then evaluates effective conditions of implementation fidelity, community trust, organizational capacities, and so on. In conclusion, we present here a city-level development model that binds together micro-geographic enforcement, diagnostic problem-solving, and rehabilitative principles. Since this method was established, the paper aims to provide clearer insight into the mechanisms of crime control and to make relevant policy recommendations to develop long-term measures to ensure the safety of the population.

2. Core concepts & framework

Crime control may be interpreted as a multilevel strategy that incorporates problem-oriented policing, deterrence and rehabilitation, and community violence intervention (CVI) as its three key pillars. All the frameworks emphasize different mechanisms: policing concerns spatial patterns of crime, sentencing policies emphasize behavior change and deterrence, and CVI focuses on social relationships and collective efficacy [1,2]. Collectively, these comments indicate that crime control should not be one-sided; enforcing this issue alone is not effective without a social aspect. The interviewee has suggested this ambivalent view, which increases the agreed reasoning that criminality stems not just from individual decision but also from environmental, institutional, and relational aspects.

These strategies are not solitary but rather dynamic in a given institutional and community setting; they affect each other in their effectiveness and define the nature in which crime control strategies are applied in the real world. Indicatively, the policing approaches might lessen the immediate danger within the high-crime locales, yet over an extended period, success would be mainly linked to providing assistive sentencing procedures and local nature-based interventions that restrict social circumstances. The success of the specific strategy that is applied relies heavily on its ability to match the nature of the issue, adherence to the implementation process, and geographic variables of the area community [3,4]. An example is that problem-oriented policing would be effective in situations where the local agencies customize interventions to prescribed crime clusters, as uniform responses tend to disregard contextual differences and maximize net ineffectiveness. The

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

dependence here is rather a case of context and the need to suit strategies to local needs, resources, and community engagement patterns.

In addition, the interplay between policing, judicial response, and community interventions reveals that there is no single mechanism that can adequately cover the tricky social interaction that gives rise to crime. A coordinated model is thus needed in the sustainable management of crime where various agencies interact, exchange information, and align their goals at various levels of the justice process.

Lastly, the paper adheres to a hierarchy of evidence to make it easier to analyze: the highest level of reliability is presented by systematic reviews and meta-analyses, then there are empirical studies presented by other scholars, and finally, there are reports provided by recognized institutions. That is why such a structure guarantees the discussion is based on verifiable and clear evidence and not anecdotal and politically motivated assertions. Applying such a hierarchy will allow not only enhancing the analytical base of the paper but also distinguishing between established findings and the emergent or situation-specific studies.

3. Influencing factors

3.1. Policing strategies

Hot spot policing and problem-oriented policing (POP) are some of the most evidence-based crime control methods. According to recent meta-analyses, focusing the police in micro-geographic hot spots can cause small-to-moderate, but statistically significant, decreases in violent crime [5,6]. These results indicate that there is no generalized distribution of crime among the cities, a tendency that highlights the relevance of location-specific approaches in relating scarce resources more effectively and directing efforts at the points that have the most significant probability of generating the most visible decrease. The spatial view also disrupts the mainstream belief that expansive growth in policing inevitably leads to city-wide changes, underscoring the importance of specific placements.

Problem-oriented policing (POP) builds on this reasoning by insisting on keen diagnosis of the underlying issues and development of custom-fit solutions. Recent reviews show that an average of 30% reduction could be achieved if case interventions are properly designed and tracked [5,6]. Nonetheless, the strategy is most viable when the police departments take time to examine the causes of the frequently witnessed problems instead of using reactive patrol. This particular focus on problem-specific analysis can illustrate how strategic flexibility can magnify the impact of police resources, especially in communities with distinct crime patterns.

Moreover, there is an indication that universal inclusion of these techniques in broader urban approaches can yield greater benefits [4]. These combined strategies enable police to strike the right balance between precision targeting and the broader long-term prevention objectives, thereby providing the law and order system with a more sustainable structure. These types of coordination enhance more efficient information sharing among agencies. It also assists in making sure that short-term enforcement initiatives do not hinder long-term development of trust in the community, which goes along with long-term crime cuts of a more sustainable nature.

3.2. Sentencing & recidivism

The question of the length of sentencing and interaction with recidivism is not new in criminal justice studies, with persistent discussion over time on whether an increase in the sentence will

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

actually prevent recidivism or only postpone it. Recent statistics from the U.S. Sentencing Commission show that sentences longer than 60 months are typically associated with lower recidivism rates, but this effect does not persist beyond a certain point [7]. That is, it is not always true that very long imprisonment reduces recidivism proportionately, and the deterrent effect levels off after several years. These conflicting results show that the length of the sentence is not the only factor that can contribute to recidivism, since individual risk factors and prison regimes also influence the outcome of returned individuals. Combined, this evidence would imply that incarceration works best with opportunities for rehabilitation and regular after-release support.

Against a backdrop of mounting criticism of mass incarceration and diminished effectiveness of long sentences on long-run deterrence of crime, a number of new reforms have attempted to escape the punishment dimension of the crime-sentencing nexus and instead include incentives of rehabilitation into the sentencing policy. Reform efforts, including the First Step Act (FSA), are a move towards reducing punitive-oriented systems and towards an incentive-driven system of correction. According to The Sentencing Project, people who underwent FSA programs were reported to have a significantly lower recidivism rate than their traditional release groups [8]. The possible reason is that incentive-based strategies directly involve individuals in education and treatment programs that focus more on criminogenic needs than on long-term custody. These results imply that the reward structure and rehabilitative program not only increase reintegration but also improve social safety. On the whole, current studies show that the sentencing policy that should be implemented should promote a balance between accountability and human capital formation, with the objective of preventing criminal behavior rather than simply postponing it.

3.3. Community & public health approaches

A more recent addition to the crime control arsenal is Community Violence Intervention (CVI), which has developed as a reaction to the shortcomings of the traditional punitive mode and the rise in acknowledgment that social and public health elements also contribute to violence. The goals of CVI programs are to break the cycles of violence by outreach, mediation, and social support of at-risk populations by a group of credible messengers; those individuals who are familiar with the issues of the at-risk populations [2,9]. These programs aim to deter retaliation and enhance community trust, especially in the neighborhoods that had tense relationships with the police in the past, focusing on relationship-building and conflict resolution. Since CVI functions beyond the framework of professional law enforcement, it has an opportunity to target individuals that might not react to the efforts organized by the police, providing a new avenue of pathways to violence-reduction within disadvantaged communities.

As a methodological approach, CVI research brings criminology and public health closer together by focusing on behavioral (e.g., decreases in shootings or arrests) and social (e.g., increases in community cohesion) outcomes. Researchers have initiated the creation of more powerful quantitative indicators and mixed methodology designs to explain these two aspects [9]. However, because program designs differ across cities, it is difficult to generalize findings, and methods to evaluate programs that account for local circumstances and fidelity are necessary. In this regard, the success of CVI is also closely tied to methodological progress, as only accurate measurement can confirm the effectiveness of the methods and enable practitioners to develop sustainable strategies for preventing violence. In summary, CVI shows that crime prevention and practical control should focus on strengthening social structures and addressing the causal factors that lead to violence, rather than the outcomes.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

3.4. Social/environmental & order maintenance

The environmental and social order, as opposed to policing and sentencing, is also instrumental in crime pattern development. The meta-analyses indicate that disorder policing, or keeping open areas visible to criminal activity by enhancing lighting, manipulating the environment, and conducting mundane community-related patrols, is effective. can have a significant negative impact on crime rates when applied in proportional and community-sensitive ways [10]. However, its success greatly hinges on context: unselective or violent enforcement may have a detrimental effect on legitimacy and compliance in the long term. Such context specificity indicates that disorder policing has proven most effective when incorporated into broader community relations, which help ensure that order-maintenance policies reinforce, rather than test, police-community relationships.

Simultaneously, psychological researches show that moral disengagement serves as a mediating process in violent activity [11]. It entails that when societal norms are perceived as loose or inconsistent, people can justify harmful actions. Moral and educational interventions that support social order maintenance may thus serve as a non-punitive means of prevention. These mixed interventions also address external conditions and inner thought processes and seem to fit well in the community, where physical disorder and poorly developed social norms reinforce each other. Combined, the methods of environmental design and moral engagement help highlight how structural and psychological stability reinforce one another in maintaining crime control.

4. Practice implications

4.1. Strategy combination

Following the review of the evidence presented in policing, sentencing, and community-based strategies, it is clear that each crime-control strategy cannot exist independently of the others. A firmer, more sustainable model emerges when they are brought together. Recent research suggests that the most promising fusion is hot-spot policing, which reduces immediate risks such as violent incidents and property crime in micro-geographies, combined with problem-oriented policing (POP) and Community Violence Intervention (CVI) outreach. Hot-spot policing instantly reduces risk and harm by deploying resources to locations most likely to experience crime. The result of this is quantifiable short-term reductions in violence [5]. Nonetheless, it will not be as successful in the long run without the application of diagnostic tools. POP helps close this gap. Agencies identify repeat and unusual crimes, and their causes are identified. Then, agencies customize their interventions to the specific sources of these crimes rather than resorting to even more enforcement [1].

CVI is a third layer that offers the opportunity to prevent in terms of engagement, relationship building, and mediation. Because of credible messengers, it is possible to reach individuals who would not respond to traditional policing, and CVI interventions will minimize cycles of retaliation that lead to violence, in addition to enhancing informal social control [2]. These three elements introduced in cooperation result in a self-sustaining system in which hot-spot actions reduce short-term damage; public interest protests (POPs) offer permanent solutions to the problem; and CVIs create the social infrastructure required to enable sustainable security. It is a converging model that integrates law enforcement and prevention solutions in its implementation, converging on environmental, social, and interpersonal factors that contribute to crime, allowing cities to trade short-term suppression for long-term community stabilization. In addition to these three main elements, research on focused deterrence has shown that interventions are more efficient when the

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

perspectives and life experiences of those directly engaged in violent conflicts are taken into account, which, in turn, underscores the importance of integrating enforcement with communication and support [12]. This implies that a holistic approach can yield more foreseeable and justifiable outcomes for communities with diverse needs.

4.2. Implementation conditions

The best-designed strategies also require the conditions of their implementation. The study reveals that the quality of policing or community programs is determined not only by their basic elements but also by the level of their faithfulness and appropriateness to the local conditions. Implementations with high fidelity are especially relevant to complicated methods like POP and CVI, in which coordination and roles are heavily defined. To illustrate, during POP interventions, the most effective approach is to ensure that agencies devote themselves to a thorough analysis of the problem instead of viewing the model as a sequence of disjointed activities [1]. Equally, community-based programs involve stable staffing, regular outreach, and intensive connection to the neighborhood institutions to gain credibility and influence.

Another necessary status is data-driven site selection since crime usually has a spatial pattern, and the correct identification of micro-locations plays a decisive role in the success of the interventions. It has been shown that crime can be micro-related in a location and not uniformly distributed throughout the cities, and hence, consideration of the hot spots is a very important matter in ensuring actual success with respect to the intervention [4]. This means that effective implementation will involve keeping the current crime information, continuous analysis, and modification of deployment strategies according to dynamic circumstances.

Last but not least is community trust, which is of central concern in the success of interventions. As illustrated by Braga, a proportional and community-sensitive approach is critical in preserving legitimacy, which eventually promotes compliance and cooperation by the residents [10]. In the case of a lack of trust, the enforcement-heavy strategies will work to create resistance or fear, which will diminish the effectiveness over time, despite the crime reduction that was promising in the short term. In this way, the implementation process requires a blend of rigor and relationship-building so that the interventions are evidence-based and socially based.

4.3. Judicial stage

Control measures of crime are not limited to policing or community interventions, but also include the judicial process, where sentencing structures will have a high influence on the final recidivism of a year. According to the evidence provided by the U.S. Sentencing Commission, there exists a threshold effect to incarceration: sentences longer than sixty months are indeed linked with a certain reduction in the reoffending rate, but the benefits are actually negative after the size of the sentences reaches extreme levels [7]. This suggests that the mere increase in the length of imprisonment is not an effective way of enhancing citizen safety, particularly in terms of the economic and social expenses associated with long imprisonment.

Based on these reports, judicial policies would be advised to focus on optimal and not maximal punishment with empirical thresholds and risk will set assessments to allocate proportional terms. Another alternative is provided by rehabilitation and incentive-based models. By highlighting that reward systems, including sentence reductions in response to program attendance, can considerably decrease the rate of recidivism by encouraging involvement in education, treatment, and reintegration planning, the First Step Act provides an example of this measure [8]. These models do

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

not emphasize incapacitation but rather capacity building, similar to vocational training and cognitive-behavioral programs wherein people are given the skills and supports they require to make successful reintegration.

The judicial strategies may also supplement the wider system of crime control by allowing greater coordination with the services that are based in the communities. When reentry planning, mental health services and support networks are considered in the sentencing policies, the criminogenic needs that cannot be resolved by the police are addressed. In this respect, the judicial level serves as an intermediary between the immediate efforts of enforcement and the prevention in the long-term perspective. It is thus important that sentences that should be designed take into consideration accountability and human development in order to perform fewer offenses in the future, as well as to assist dangerous communities.

4.4. Assessment and ethics

Crime control strategies should be applied in a sound judgment that is considerate of the repercussions. Ethical practice should ensure that negative externality is reduced, e.g., the reduction of surveillance, stigmatization, or displacement of the marginalized group. Evaluations should be effective enough to not only establish the presence of a working intervention, but also how, who, and in what circumstances interventions yield desirable results. According to recent scholarship, the creation of standardized measures and a strident evaluation system is particularly necessary in the case of complex community-based interventions like the CVI [9]. It is hard to compare the results across cities or enhance the program design without consistent measurement tools.

The other ethical requirement is that of open communication. The communities that are in line with crime control policies need to be given clear explanations of aims, processes, and anticipated results. Transparency would help in containing fears of over-policing and result in increased legitimacy so that residents of the area see the interventions not just as punishment but as help. Reduction of negative externalities is also an ethical practice. Incidentally, one instance where police brutality can decrease an apparent display of chaos may still harm trust where it is administered in an inadequately sensitive manner to the dynamics of a community [10]. The listener must strike a balance that is more effective rather than unfair; hence, it is crucial to ensure that strategies that bring harm to communities ultimately help to secure crime control over the long term.

Lastly, a continuous enhancement based on continuous assessment should be created via periodic reviews, standardized indicators, and a feedback loop within the community. The results of the evaluation should be used to make changes in the policy to ensure that ineffective or negative practices are either changed or eliminated. Through this process of iteration, there comes accountability and better coordination of criminal justice interventions to the people's values. This is because, by basing decision-making processes on both evidence and ethical considerations, policymakers will come up with crime control strategies that are effective in addition to being just and viable.

5. Discussion & suggestions

5.1. Consistent conclusion

The supporting evidence in policing, sentencing, and community-based interventions all point to a common conclusion that the most effective control of crime is achieved when the enforcement policies, which tend to rely on the geography of a problem, are augmented with community-oriented

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

interventions that tend to rely on missions to repair relationships, outreach, and building long-term trust. Hot-spot policing and POP focus on the spatial and structural aspects of recurring crime issues, whereas CVI programs interfere with interpersonal and social aspects that spur conflict and retaliation. Taken together, these models indicate that there is a commonality of behavior in why violent crime is influenced by environmental concentration as well as relational instability. This makes enforcement and community engagement in themselves inadequate, and long-term crime reduction is only possible through combining both in a coordinated and context-sensitive manner.

5.2. Disagreements/limitations

Although this convergence takes place, there are a number of points of disagreement and limitation. To begin with, the problem of disorder policing is licentious and proves the sensitivity of scenarios. Braga notes that visible order-maintenance strategies can indeed lead to a decrease in crime, but when used in proportional amounts, they also can lead to a decrease in legitimacy when used aggressively or without community participation [10]. Such a two-sidedness shows the vulnerability of trust in the situation when the citizens have encountered unjustified practices. Second, although CVI has become more popular, measurement instruments on these programs are in their early stages. Such disparity leads to diversified implementation, staffing, and local conditions, thus rendering it hard to generate standardized measures or extrapolate results across cities [9]. Third, the organizational capacity of police departments is crucial when it comes to the effectiveness of POP. An agency having fewer analytic skills or high turnover may be unable to undertake the in-depth analysis of the problem, which may result in shallow or temporary interventions [3]. All those restrictions have the emphasis that evidence-based strategies are supported by both conceptual power and institutional stability, and long-term investment.

5.3. Actionable recommendations

On the basis of the above, a number of policy-oriented and actionable recommendations can be suggested. One, cities are expected to build an interconnected crime-control system on the basis of gradual stages. In the first stage, there is the division of hot spots, the second stage is the POP diagnosis, and the RNR individual-focused intervention (Risk-Need-Responsivity). Hot-spot deployment could enable the management of immediate threats, POP may facilitate problem-focused problem-solving, and RNR can facilitate the ability to match the interventions with specific criminogenic needs, especially when sentencing and reentry planning. These three layers would provide ideal congruency between the person and place-based approaches. Second, there should be sentencing policies that have thresholds and tiered incentives. The U.S. Sentencing Commission's evidence has shown that sentencing after a certain period does not bring appreciable returns. Courts can encourage rehabilitation through providing tiered rewards when taking part in education and treatment and skill-building programs, and ensure relative responsibility. Third, CVI projects involve standardized evaluation indicators and cross-agency data sharing so that practitioners can follow the outcomes of the participants and can decide interventions more appropriately. It would be possible to have a more consistent assessment by setting clear metrics, which would then be the level of engagement of participants, the result of communication of conflict mediation, and the changes in community cohesion. Information exchange between the police agencies, service agencies, and community groups can assist in tracking the progress, finding the gaps, and preventing the overlaps.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU30729

To conclude, the future of crime control is in the development of systems that incorporate spatial accuracy, diagnostic accuracy, and relational interaction. By strengthening institutional capacity and standardizing evaluation practices, cities can develop crime-control strategies that are not only effective but also equitable and sustainable.

6. Conclusion

This study examined policing, sentencing, and community-based strategies to determine the key factors influencing crime control and the reasons behind the consistent effectiveness of some strategies. A combination of micro-geographic concentration of crime, structural problem drivers, and social-relational dynamics shapes crime. Consequently, crime-control models are best integrated with place-based enforcement, diagnosis, problem-solving, and the repair of community-level relationships. Hot-spot policing decreases imminent danger, problem-oriented policing discovers and tackles root causes of crime problems that keep occurring, and elsewhere CVI interventions interrupt retaliation cycles and bolster informal social controls. When strategies are matched to contexts and implemented with high fidelity, crime control is more successful, the findings indicate.

Across the literature, to ensure successful implementation strategy fidelity, context must be aligned. Interventions that are not well-adapted, inappropriately implemented, or implemented without community trust fail. Policy implementation should adopt a combined micro-geographic targeting and POP diagnostic and risk-need-responsivity approach that employs tiered sentencing incentives and standardized evaluation.

Moving forth, future studies ought to investigate how these elements interact in real-life practice, particularly in different cities with varying organizational capacities and communities. We require more stringent assessment instruments for CVI programs and comparative studies of integrated policing models. The policy-makers should be able to have an effective and sustainable crime-control system by illustrating forward-thinking strategies that are informed, contextual, and morally correct.

References

[1] Hinkle, J. C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., & Petersen, K. (2020). Problem-oriented policing for reducing crime and disorder: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 16(3), e1112.
[2] Ziminski, D., Rodriguez, J., & Butts, J. A. (2025). Identifying community violence intervention (CVI) approaches: A scoping review. INQUIRY.
[3] Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice. (2024). When is problem-oriented policing most effective?
[4] Smith, M. R., Corsaro, N., & Connealy, N. (2024). Hot spots policing as part of a city-wide violent crime strategy. Social Science Research.
[5] Turchan, B., Koper, C. S., Braga, A. A., et al. (2024). The effects of hot spots policing on violence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Aggression and Violent Behavior.
[6] Tregle, B., Vito, C., & Makin, D. (2025). Examining the impact of hot spots policing on crime reduction. Crime Science.
[7] U.S. Sentencing Commission. (2022). Length of incarceration and recidivism.
[8] he Sentencing Project. (2023). The First Step Act: Ending mass incarceration in federal prisons?
[9] Girma, T., et al. (2025). CVI evaluation and methodological development.
[10] Braga, A. A., Welsh, B., & Weisburd, D. (2024). Disorder policing to reduce crime: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Criminology & Public Policy.
[11] Navas-Martínez, M. J., et al. (2025). The mediating role of moral disengagement in predicting violence: A systematic review. IJERPH.
[12] Kochel, T. R., & Weisburd, D. (2025). Voices from inside focused deterrence: Implications for policy and practice. Social Science Research, 118, 102972. https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2025.102972.