PURPOSE: Repeat and near-repeat victimisation analysis has been gaining prominance in an operational context for over a decade. Its purpose is to identify those people, properties and places that are at a disproportionate risk of victimisation. Pure *repeat victims* are targets that are victimised multiple times (e.g., a domestic violence victim or a school that is burgled three times in one year). *Near-repeat victims* are targets that are situated in close proximity to an original target, and that get victimised soon after the original target. Previous (near) victimisation has been shown to be the best predictor of future victimisation, for many crime types and in a variety of contexts.

THEORY: Repeat and near-repeat victimisation is believed to happen for two main reasons. These are known as the *boost* and *flag* accounts.

The *boost*
because offenders are known to minimise the effort they go to when searching for targets. If they have already encountered a suitable target, they are more likely to return to it once an initial crime has been committed. For example, a house that has been burgled may be burgled again to target replaced goods, or the house may be revictimised simply because it is now familiar to the offender (hence making it easier to access). The boost explana tn(en)e 111.5 ty 393P7i62n4(se3(en)6n)3( )-13. If (s)11

IDENTIFYING THE EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM: The first part of any prediction of repeat victimisation (RV) involves establishing the impact that RV and near-repeat victimisation (NRV) has on local crime levels.

There a number of ways you can measure the level of RV. The simplest is to use one year of

APPLICATION: Knowledge relating to reducing repeat victimisation (RV) and near-repeat victimisation (NRV) have been widely applied in many industrialised countries. Here we provide one example of where the Trafford Borough of Greater Manchester Police systematically integrated these principles into their burglary dwelling reduction activities.

The first step in the analytical process was to the heightened risk of victimisation of burglary dwelling following an initial incident. This focused on the space and time patterns in burglary.

Police and partner agencies then used the risk maps to focus crime prevention activities at key places and times that were highlighted.

Figure 2

To minimise the risk of RV a crime prevention officer visited the burgled property within 12-24 hours to perform a security audit. The main aim of this was to identify vulnerable features about the property and initiate immediate action to address these (e.g., improving locks, fitting timer switches to lighting). These situational responses were undertaken to send a signal to the offender that the house is occupied and it is riskier to break. This is believed to deter future victimisation.

Other crime prevention activities included tasking Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) to deliver door-to-door messages to residents in areas identified as being at a greater risk of NRV. These were done verbally where possible and swiftly (preferably within 24 hours) after an initial incident. Crucially, this message had three components to it; informing, reassuring and advising residents. The aim here was to

GENERAL RESOURCES:

Near repeat calculator   downloadable from http://www.temple.edu/cj/misc/nr/

Training course on predictive mapping delivered by the Jill Dando Institute   details at http://www.ucl.ac.uk/jdi/short-courses/ and on twitter #predictivepolicing

The Trafford Experiment:
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/scs/research-consultancy/geographical-analysis/GMPTraffordExpmnt

The International Crime and Intelligence Analysis Conference, 2011: Disrupting the optimal forager: predictive risk mapping and domestic burglary reduction in Trafford, Greater Manchester   http://www.ucl.ac.uk/jdi/events/int-CIA-conf/Abstracts/ICIAC11_Stream5

Weisel, D. (2005). Analyzing Repeat Victimization.   Problem-Solving Tool Guides. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Available at: http://www.popcenter.org/tools/repeat_victimization/

UK GOVERNMENT REPORTS:

Farrell, G. & Pease, K. (1993). Once bitten, twice bitten: Repeat victimisation and its implications for crime prevention. Police Research Group. Paper no 46. London: Home Office.

Johnson, S. D., Birks, D., McLaughlin, L., Bowers, K. J. & Pease, K. (2007). Prospective Crime Mapping in Operational Context: Final Report. On-line Report 19/07, London: Home Office.

Pease, K. (1998). Repeat victimization: taking stock. Police Research Group: Crime Detection and Prevention Series Paper 90. London: Home Office.

A SELECTION OF ACADEMIC PAPERS AND BOOK CHAPTERS:

Bowers, K. J., Johnson, S. and Pease, K. (2004). Prospective Hotspotting: The Future of Crime Mapping? British Journal of Criminology. Vol 44 (5), pp. 641-658.

Johnson, S. D., and Bowers, K. J. (2004). The burglary as clue to the future: the beginnings of prospective hot-spotting. European Journal of Criminology. Vol 1(2), pp. 237-255.

Johnson, S. D., Bernasco, W., Bowers, K. J., Elffers, H., Ratcliffe, J., Rengert, G. & Townsley, M. T. (2007). Near Repeats: A Cross National Assessment of Residential Burglary. Journal of Quantitative Criminology. Vol 23(3), pp. 201-219.

Johnson, S. D., Summers, L. and Pease, K. (2009). Offender as Forager? A Direct Test of the Boost Account of Victimization. Journal of Quantitative Criminology. Vol 25, pp. 181-200.

Ratcliffe, J. H. and McCullagh, M. J. (1998). Identifying repeat victimisation with GIS. British Journal of Criminology. Vol 38(4), pp. 651-662.