The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Final Outcomes of Project ROAR: A Discussion of Findings and Implications for Future Research

Author(s):   Quint C. Thurman; Robert Lincoln; Julie Atella; Michael Massoglia

Document No.:   179978

Date Received: December 28, 1999

Award Number: 93-IJ-CX-0054 ; 96-IJ-CX-0074

Final Outcomes of Project ROAR: A Discussion of Findings and Implications for Future Research*

Quint C. Thurman, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminal Justice
Hugo Wall School of Urban and Public Affairs
Wichita State University
1845 Fairmount
Wichita, KS 67260-0135

Robert Lincoln, A.B.D.
Project Coordinator
Department of Political Science/Criminal Justice Program
Washington State University at Spokane
Spokane, WA 99202

Julie Atella, M.A.
Department of Political Science/Criminal Justice Program
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4880

Michael Massoglia
Department of Political Science/Criminal Justice Program
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4880

PROPERTY OF

. . . . Service (NCJRS)

. . . .

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the final outcomes from an evaluation of Project ROAR. Project ROAR (Reclaiming Our Area Residence) nas been supported by the Spokane Police Department and the Spokane Housing Authority since 1994. Project ROAR was designed to make the streets safer by enabling the community to value their neighborhoods. Focusing on the main business district area in Spokane, Washington, the project area has been known in the past for its crime and discord because of elevated rates of drug dealing, prostitution, and other related crimes. Originally initiated by Edmund McGarrel, Quint Thurman, and Andrew Giacomazi, and sponsored by the National Institute of Justice, six years of outcome evaluation data in the form of survey data, official crime statistics, and objective measures of neighborhood disorder are reviewed here to examine changes in residents' perceptions of the quality of their neighborhood life, perceptions of police services, as well as decreases in the levels of neighborhood crime. .

Introduction

Public housing residents living in many urban areas across the U.S. often find themselves subjected to problems of crime, drugs, and disorder that are commonly associated with an impoverished social and economic condition. As Skogan (1990) and others have noted, these problems typically erode a community's ability to defend it against other untoward consequences. [1] Street crime, the open sale and use of drugs, and other signs of social and physical disorder contribute to a resident's fear of crime, leading to further withdrawal from community life, and, in turn, contributing to further deterioration of a residential area.

The west Central neighborhood in Spokane, Washington has experienced many of these trends. Site of the largest public housing unit in the city, the neighborhood is located in an older and poorer section of the city. The neighborhood is comprised of the public housing unit, low-rent apartments, old residential hotels, and numerous clubs and taverns. This area also historically has been the locus for vice activities such as street-walking prostitution and open-air drug sales. An increase in the sale and distribution of crack cocaine allegedly dominated by gang members from California in recent years has added a new dimension, which exacerbates the existing problems with which local residents must contend.

In an effort to stem the tide of neighborhood decay, tenants of the public housing unit, local business owners, the Police Department, and the Housing Authority developed a program of drug crime elimination based on the principles of citizen empowerment and the co-production of order. This program, known by the acronym ROAR, "Reclaiming Our

1

Area Residents," reflects a collaborative, multi-level approach to neighborhood crime and disorder prevention.

Outcomes from ROAR that were documented through the original evaluation efforts of Principal Investigators Edmund McGarrell and Quint Thurman have appeared in quarterly reports to NIJ, papers presented at the most recent annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, and a dissertation by Dr. Andrew Giacomazzi. These findings include high participation rates among local residents in ROAR activities designed to promote citizen cohesion and safety, significant reductions in the proportion of arrests for drug sales in the experimental area relative to other parts of the city, notable improvements in the physical environment immediately surrounding the public housing complex, and substantial reductions in the fear of criminal victimization among public housing residents.

The momentum created by ROAR also has been observed to create at least two other significant developments. First, within the experimental area efforts were made to "win back the streets" from illegal commerce by instead promoting socially beneficial, legal commerce in the form of a public market place. It was hypothesized that a public market place/farmers' market place might enhance the ownership of legitimate residents in the area as well as attract legitimate non-residents into the area who come to shop. In so doing it was reasoned that saturating the area with conventional activities would drive out unconventional others who no longer can conduct illegal business without fearing public scrutiny and detection.

A second development, which merited scrutiny, was the impact of ROAR on community mobilization in adjacent neighborhoods. Residents living near the experimental

2

area observed ROAR revitalization effects and themselves began asking ROAR participants how they might go about forming collaborative partnerships with public sector officials and private businesses to promote similar interests.

This paper is based on a four year longitudinal evaluation supported by the NIJ to study the effects of this innovative, neighborhood-based, crime, drug, and disorder prevention program. Relevant data were collected for examining the effects of introducing conventional commerce in the form of a public marketplace into the experimental area and how this might result in improvements in the physical environment, reductions in the fear-of criminal victimization, and decreases in actual street crime. Simultaneously, we conducted a process evaluation to document the emergence of the ROAR model in order to better understand the robustness of ROAR as it might also apply in residential areas that differ from the original site in terms of crime visibility and the preponderance of public housing residences.

In the following pages we provide a review of the relevant research on the ecological study of crime and disorder, community policing, and community-based crime prevention. The following pages provide a description of the study site and the ROAR project, the design of the evaluation, and study results.

Reviewing the Literature: Communities, Disorder, and Crime

Criminologists have held a long-standing interest in explaining the variation across

communities in rates of crime and delinquency. Indeed, this variation and the relationship

between characteristics of communities and crime formed the basis of the Chicago School

of Criminology that occupied a dominant role in the field of criminology from the 1920s

through the middle part of the century. More recently, after a shift away from this

ecological focus during the 1950s through the 1970s to a focus on individual-level causes

of crime, there has been renewed interest once again in the relationship between

community characteristics and crime (e.g., Reiss and Tonry, 1986; Byrne and Sampson,

1986; Bursik and Grasmick, 1993).

Related to this development are recent studies of the relationship between

"disorder" or "incivilities," fear, crime, and the quality of community life (e.g., Skogan,

1990). And, contemporaneous with these research trends is the community policing

movement (e.g., Skolnick and Bayley, 1986) that promises a renewed relationship between

the police and neighborhood residents. All of these related developments have theoretical,

research, and policy implications for the study of community-based crime prevention

efforts.

Disorder, Crime, and Fear

Shaw and McKay's (1942) studies found that official crime and delinquency rates

were heavily concentrated in particular areas of a city. These areas typically are adjacent to

the central business district and characterized by overcrowded and deteriorating living

conditions, as well as by ethnic and racial segregation and high rates of a variety of social

4

problems such as physical and mental health problems, alcoholism, and truancy. Shaw and McKay considered these areas to have experienced a breakdown in traditional social controls, and over time, to become areas where delinquency flourishes.

An important implication of Shaw and McKay's research is that an effective approach to crime control should focus on neighborhood conditions as opposed to an exclusive focus on individual offenders. Indeed, this led Shaw to create the Chicago Area Project, a community based effort to empower local residents to address the range of problems experienced in their neighborhood (Schlossman and Sedlak, 1983).

Since then, locally-based responses to fear, disorder, and crime in the form of community-based crime prevention efforts, community policing, and multi-level collaborative approaches involving both citizens and the formal criminal justice system have proliferated, especially within the last two decades. These responses have been the result of the growing realization that the formal agents of social control cannot successfully combat crime in the absence of citizen assistance (Cirel et al., 1977). In fact, this realization was emphasized in the 1967 report from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, which stated that an active and involved citizenry not only can improve the performance of the criminal justice system, but also can aid in remedying the social and environmental conditions of communities—factors which often precede criminal behavior (Rosenbaum, 1986:11).

Community Crime Prevention

In essence, community crime prevention programs attempt to reverse the downward neighborhood spiral effect—which Wilson and Kelling (1982) describe—by mobilizing

5

residents, increasing their interactions, strengthening their sense of "community," increasing informal social control and ultimately creating a neighborhood which is not conducive to crime (Rosenbaum, 1988).

According to Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1986:21), the theoretical *underpinnings of* community crime prevention are grounded in two basic models: the social problem model and the opportunity reduction model. The social problem approach to community crime prevention seeks to remedy the underlying social conditions that lead to criminal activity (Podolefsky and DuBow, 1981). Under this approach, crime prevention efforts take the form of *enforcing social* norms (Greenberg et al., 1985), increasing interactions and developing a sense of community (DuBow and Emmons, 1981), and identifying neighborhood boundaries (Suttles, 1972).

Concomitantly, Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1986) posit the opportunity reduction model of community crime prevention. Crime prevention activities here include deterring potential offenders by altering the physical environment (Heinzelmann, 1983; Perkins et al., 1992, 1993; Cisneros, 1995) and by promoting individual or collective activities which may reduce the possibility of victimization, including educational crime prevention programs such as Block Watch or Neighborhood Watch. According to Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1986:22), efforts to develop closer, more meaningful working relationships between the police and local residents also fit within the opportunity reduction model.

The available literature suggests a need for a neighborhood-based (or block-based, see Taylor and Gottfredson, 1986) response to disorder and crime. To be effective, programs must have widespread support among residents and those in a position to effect social change within city government. As Bursik and Grasmick (1993) assert, such an

6

effort must focus on disorder and building community controls rather than exclusively focusing on crime per se. Accordingly, recent years have witnessed the emergence of community-based crime prevention programs and usually within a framework of community policing.[2]

Community Based Crime Prevention Programs and Community Policing

According to Lavrakas (1985) it was not until the late 1970s that the "community" began to play a major role in shaping and defining their own crime prevention initiatives. With urban crime rates and fear of crime on the rise, community-wide efforts to prevent crime (mainly burglaries and personal robberies) continued to increase (Smith and Davis, 1993). Several federally funded community anti-crime demonstrations projects were implemented in the early 1970s, and by the mid 1970s, the LEAA funded several national evaluations in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of specific programs such as citizen patrols and security surveys (Rosenbaum, 1986).[3]

Two key findings from evaluation research regarding community crime prevention programs suggest that media accounts of "successful" community anti-crime activities of the 1970's may have been overly generalized. Evaluations of crime prevention efforts of that time led researchers to conclude that (1) collective community crime prevention activities are unlikely to develop in poor, high crime areas, and (2) that these efforts require the involvement of many residents in order to be successful (Smith and Davis, 1993:124).

What has been learned since the 1970s and early 1980s, however, is that crime prevention activities can be successfully implemented in poor, high crime areas (although this typically is more difficult in comparison to more well-to-do areas), and that the

7

involvement of large segments of community residents—although desired—is not a

necessary precursor to effective community crime prevention efforts, especially since the

mid -1980s when the focus of crime prevention activities seemed to shift from primarily

preventing burglaries and robberies to preventing drug crimes (Smith and Davis, 1993).[4]

Whereas early community crime prevention efforts largely have been ineffective at

reducing burglaries and robberies due primarily to the fact that widespread neighborhood

involvement in reporting these events were necessary and unlikely to affect any reasonable

change in this activity (Rosenbaum, 1986; Smith and Davis, 1993), the very nature of drug

dealing makes both sellers and buyers easy targets to spot—even by small numbers of

citizens who may wish to become involved. In addition, there has been ample, yet mostly

anecdotal evidence that community anti-drug efforts have had some success in poorer, high

crime neighborhoods due to growing frustration by residents that their neighborhoods have

been overrun by criminals and the disorderly. Residents in these neighborhoods have

begun to mobilize and work with the police to rebuild their neighborhoods and fight drug

activity (Smith and Davis, 1993).[5]

Although scholars in the early 1980s began to focus almost exclusively on effective

community mobilization as the key variable for successful community anti-crime efforts

and virtually discounted the role of the criminal justice system (Rosenbaum, 1988), there

has been growing evidence that the police-citizen collaborative partnership may be the key

to effective community crime prevention (Skogan, 1987; Lewis et al., 1988; Roehl and

Cook, 1984; Yin, 1986).

Accordingly, as Lewis et al. (1988), Roehl and Cook (1984), and Yin (1986)

contend, collaborative partnerships between communities and criminal justice system

8

agents (i.e., the police) offer the most potential for defining and administering community

crime prevention undertakings. With community policing now emerging as a dominant

paradigm throughout the United states, true collaboration between community residents

and the police may prove to be one telling solution in the effort to prevent and control

crime, and to stem the tide of neighborhood decay—in those neighborhoods most in need

of such responses.[6]

For many, the need to develop problem-solving strategies became evident in the

1982 "Broken Windows" article by James Q. Wilson and George Kelling that called into

question the philosophical' and operational mission of police and their ability to effectively

control crime. In that seminal article, Wilson and Kelling (1982) contend that social and

physical disorder in neighborhoods leads to perceptions of fear, community withdrawal,

and low informal social control, ultimately resulting in a crime conducive environment.

The police, therefore, should be reoriented toward solving "little problems" (e.g. physical

and social incivility) which lead to fear and ultimately more serious crime problems

(Wilson and Kelling, 1982).

A number of police departments in the past few years have experimented with the

operational implementation of new policing strategies such as neighborhood resource

officers, foot patrol, storefronts, community newsletters, and problem-solving teams

(Thurman et al., 1993; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Kelling, 1986; Skolnick and

Bayley, 1986; Greene and Taylor, 1989; Sherman, 1986; Spelman and Eck, 1987).[7] The

recognition of the need to address disorder problems and to strengthen neighborhood

capacities for control, dovetails nicely with the recommendations that the police move

toward a community policing, problem-solving, style of operation (Goldstein, 1990; Skolnick and Bayley, 1986).[8]

Although newspaper headlines continue to herald community crime prevention efforts in conjunction with community policing as "successful" at either reducing crime, fear of crime, or neighborhood disorder problems, Rosenbaum (1986, 1988) and Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1986) have called into question many—if not most—of the empirical research studies designed to systematically evaluate these programs. Whether strictly citizen-based programs or collaborative anti-crime initiatives involving both citizens and the police, these authors have found serious methodological flaws in academic research designs attempting to evaluate community crime prevention programs. As such, "better" research has been called for in an effort to determine if crime prevention efforts can have any lasting impacts on crime, fear and disorder, especially as they are experienced in poor neighborhoods.

Although there is growing evidence that police-citizen, collaborative partnerships at the neighborhood level may be the key to effective community crime prevention, police partnerships with the poor, members of minority groups, and public housing residents in most cases is difficult to initiate and maintain. Long histories of police discrimination toward the poor and racial minorities have led many members of these groups to distrust the police (Skogan and Annan, 1993). And for public housing residents, collaborative partnerships with the police are particularly problematic: police officers often are suspicious and fearful of public housing residents, from whom they rarely receive cooperation in solving crimes, especially the very prevalent drug crimes in large public housing projects (Weisel, 1990). In addition, public housing residents typically are no

10

different from residents of "ordinary poor and minority neighborhoods" (Skogan and Annan, 1993). As such, many public housing residents have the same negative attitudes regarding the police as other poor and minority groups.

It appears that the key to effective community-police, anti-crime efforts in poor neighborhoods may come from the realization by both groups that neither can effectively control crime without the other (Rosenbaum, 1986). The ideas underbidding the community policing philosophy—collaborative problem-solving, mutual respect, and officer and citizen empowerment—may offer the best hope for breaking down the barriers between the police and members of those groups who traditionally have questioned the motivations, authority, and professionalism of the formal agents of social control.[9]

11

PROJECT ROAR

Against the backdrop of strong support for locally-based, collaborative approaches

that address disorder, crime, and fear of crime at the community level, and amid growing

frustration among public housing residents that the streets surrounding their homes had

been "taken over" by the disorderly and criminal, Project ROAR (Reclaiming Our Area

Residences) was established in Spokane, Washington in 1994."[10]

Project ROAR is a public housing drug-crime elimination program sponsored by

the Spokane Police Department and the Spokane Housing Authority. It reflects a

public-private, inter-agency collaboration that seeks to empower public housing tenants in

an effort to produce a safer neighborhood. ROAR targets a poor neighborhood in the

central business district with a large elderly and transient population that is experiencing

high rates of drug dealing and related problems, especially after the introduction of

crack-cocaine into the area in the late 1980s.

Key elements of ROAR include:

(1)   opening a "Cop Shop" within the public housing area;
(2)   assigning neighborhood resource officers (community policing officers)
        to the target area;
(3)   coordinating efforts with the city's Crime Prevention Center, located in
        the public housing unit;
(4)   hiring a resident resource coordinator;
(5)   creating an "adopt the tenants program" with local businesses;
(6)   addressing physical target hardening and neighborhood improvements;
(7)   and new in 1995, the assignment of a community corrections officer to
        the project area.

Project ROAR builds upon the ideas of past and present community based crime

prevention and reduction efforts and provides insight into the effectiveness of such

programs as they relate to the mobilization of public housing residents and the extent to

12

which they can create positive changes in perceptions of safety, neighborhood disorder, and crime rates.

Project ROAR is located in downtown Spokane, a city of approximately 180,000 in Eastern Washington. With a county population of 375,000, Spokane is the state's largest urban area east of the Cascade Mountains and serves as the commercial and cultural center for eastern Washington, northern Idaho, and northwestern Montana. Located on a major interstate highway, it is an attractive location for drug distribution networks.

Since 1992, Spokane Police have witnessed an increase in the sale and use of crack cocaine. Sale of the drug is largely centered in a downtown area known as the West First neighborhood and referred to as "The Block". This area has been described as "drug infested" and a "drug marketplace."

This downtown block is also the location of the Parsons Building, a public housing facility consisting of 50 units. In addition to the public housing facility, this target area is the location of several low rent apartment buildings and residential hotels, a number of taverns and clubs, and the city's bus transit station.

A number of environmental factors combine to place this area at high risk for neighborhood decay. These include the location of the city's main transit station, the concentration of older, multi-story residential hotels, a tradition of prostitution and street crime problems, a lack of community investment, a declining neighborhood economic base and a residential population with many elderly persons and people with disabilities.

Police consider the bus station (which originally was located in the ROAR project area and recently moved three blocks away into the central commerce area of the city) a center for the influx of gang members from California based gangs such as the "Crips"

13

(Compton, CA) who have selected Spokane as a distribution center. Spokane police have recovered hotel room keys from gang members disembarking from bus trips to Spokane. The gang members, who had never been to Spokane, allegedly carried the room keys rented by other gang members involved in the drug trade. As the police become familiar with gang members, new members are rotated into town. With the influx of crack cocaine activity has come an increase in crime and fear of area residents.

The concentration of elderly and disabled in the project area creates a resident population highly susceptible to street crime, harassment, and victimization. Residents of the public housing unit, and other local hotels and apartments, reduce their interaction on the streets and prefer to remain within the relative safety of their apartments. At night, the streets within the target zone have become the center for drive-through drug sales as well as visible street prostitution activity.

The well-publicized, though anecdotal reports of open, gang-related, crack dealing in the target zone are supported in police arrest statistics. During the first half of 1992 drug arrests for crack cocaine were negligible. During the second half of 1992 this changed dramatically. In January of 1992 there was one arrest for crack cocaine. In December 1992 there were 30 arrests for crack cocaine.

In terms of total felony drug arrests, the project area accounts for a disproportionate proportion of the city's total. In 1992, there were 427 felony drug arrests citywide. The project area accounted for 55 or 12.9 percent of this total. For the first three months of 1993, drug arrests were up citywide (64 to 80) and the project area accounted for 30 percent of the 1993 total. The project area also had 31 reported robberies and 33 reported burglaries in 1992.

14

Along with the increase in drug arrests, the city of Spokane has experienced an

increase in reported violent crime. In 1992, there were 1,570 reported violent crimes

(homicide, rape, robbery, and assault) in the city. This reflected an 84 percent increase

from 1982.

ROAR Program Components

ROAR relies upon a two-pronged security and preventive-based approach to attack

the problem of drug-related crime in its public housing multi-family Parsons building. It

involves the collaboration of the Spokane Housing Authority, the Spokane Police

Department, neighboring businesses and city service agencies. The program builds on the

Police Department's community policing efforts and seeks to take a "weed and seed" type

approach whereby there will be a joint focus on reducing disorder, crime, and fear, and on

tenant empowerment, provision of social services and drug prevention education for

long-term neighborhood recovery. The goal of ROAR is to work with Public Housing

residents, neighbors, local businesses and service agencies, toward the elimination of

drug-related crime and associated problems in the target area known as "The Block".

Accordingly, ROAR includes surveillance, education, training, and target hardening

components. Specific elements include:

1. Neighborhood Resource Officers and On-site Cop Shop

The Police Department has assigned one officer to act as a full-time Neighborhood

Resource Officer (NRO) in the project area. A second officer has been assigned to the

target area as a "quasi-neighborhood resource officer.[11] The NROs conduct foot patrols,

15

make contacts with residents and business owners, and promote business involvement in local community efforts.

The NROs also focus on disorder problems. As an example, ROAR provides the NROs with sidewalk sweeping equipment to facilitate a response to litter problems. The NROs also work with city housing inspectors and liquor board officials to respond to nuisance problems in the target area.

2. Crime Prevention Center

The city's Crime Prevention Center is housed in the Parsons Building. Among other activities the Center houses Block Watch staff. Although location of the Center in the Parsons Building is not a new resource, under the experimental program Crime Prevention staff are utilized to a much greater extent for tenant education and training. Training programs have been created to educate local residents and encourage them to take control of their neighborhood. In addition, the Crime Prevention Center holds monthly open houses to foster contact with Parsons tenants and neighborhood residents.

3. West First Avenue Improvement Committee

An Improvement Committee has been created to become actively involved in eliminating drugs from the target area. The Committee plans and coordinates educational and training programs. In addition to the Parsons Tenant Council, membership in the Committee includes the City's Neighborhood Action Program, Homeless Center, Public Housing Authority, Police Department, Block Watch, Private Businesses, and a member of the city council.

16

4. Tenant Resource Coordinator

Under the experimental program, a Tenant Resource Coordinator has been hired to act as liaison between tenants, the Police Department, and other agencies (Improvement Committee, Crime Prevention Center). The Coordinator also serves as an outreach person to neighborhood residents and businesses. The Tenant Resource Coordinator is a local resident who is employed on a half-time basis.

5. Adopt the Tenants Program

To increase neighborhood participation, an "Adopt the Tenants Program" was initiated. Each business in the target area is encouraged to adopt the tenants in one of the multi-family buildings in their area. Adoption includes activities such as providing a monthly lunch, free bus passes, sponsoring or working on a neighborhood workshop, or other social events. The goal is to increase opportunities for partnership and identification with the local neighborhood.

6. Target Hardening

Specific physical enhancements have been undertaken at the Parsons Building as part of the crime prevention effort, including the installation of exterior lighting, door alarms, low-light surveillance cameras, and security windows in alcoves and exterior exits.

7. Community Corrections Officer

In the summer of 1995 the State of Washington assigned a community corrections officer to the ROAR project area. Part of his charge is to work in collaboration with the NRO to promote community involvement among business owners in the revitalization of the local area. His daily routine includes meeting managers and owners of local bars, taverns and hotels to increase their awareness of crime prevention measures.[12]

17

8. Other Program Elements

Because of the explicit focus on resident empowerment, some aspects of the program remained undefined at the program's start in 1994, to be later determined by residents and related program participants. Since then, ROAR has developed monthly drug prevention programs, tenant crime prevention workshops, a tenant newsletter, volunteer hall monitors and a volunteer escort plan. In 1996 there was the creation of a local market place (farmers' market) which set up 1-2 times weekly during the late spring-early fall seasons.

In sum, Project ROAR exists today as a police-resident-housing authority-business collaboration for reducing disorder, crime, and fear in a section of town that could be described as a "copping zone" (Skogan, 1990:30). This is the type of neighborhood where, typically, no one feels responsible for community life, and drug, crime, and disorder problems flourish. On the one hand, it is the type of neighborhood that has often seemed resistant to organizing efforts (Skogan, 1990), yet is also the type of neighborhood most in need of a meaningful response to these problems. In this case, a multi-level, collaborative program was designed and offered the opportunity for evaluation research.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation of Project ROAR was a pre-post, quasi-experimental design with comparison sites that were used in the study (see Appendix D for select results from the previous ROAR evaluation). The comparison sites consist of a specific matched site and the remainder of the city. The proposed matched site for this evaluation was the same matched site designated in the original NIJ sponsored study that was selected for its

18

similarity in size, population, and land use to the ROAR area. The matched site shares the following features to those of the project site: a concentration of older, residential apartments; large transient population; similar number of taverns and clubs; and a number of social service programs such as homeless centers and food programs. The comparison site had very similar numbers of burglaries and rapes as the project area but fewer drug arrests and robberies based upon 1992 statistics that were used to identify it as the matched control in the original evaluation.

In addition to the formal comparison area, respondents from the target area were compared to citywide residents on perceptions of neighborhood problems, identification with the neighborhood, fear, victimization attitudes toward the police, and related dimensions. The Spokane Police Department has sponsored two waves of a citywide citizen survey and one wave since has been conducted using NIJ resources provided to the principal investigators of the original study. The first survey was conducted in the late spring of 1992 and the second followed during the fall of 1993. Since then, data have been collected during the fall of 1995. These data provide a longitudinal component to the study rarely available in this type of evaluation. The evaluation included both a process and an outcome component.

Process Evaluation

The process evaluation provided a qualitative and quantitative account of the activities undertaken in the ROAR project. Monthly contacts were maintained with all key program personnel including the Police Department NROs, the Tenant Resource Coordinator, staff at the Crime Prevention Center, the Housing Authority coordinator, and

19

the Neighborhood Improvement Committee. These meetings were designed to identify all programs undertaken in the previous month, planned for the subsequent month, and to identify problems and strategies. In addition, evaluation staff attended all formal meetings and workshops so as to develop a descriptive account of ROAR as it matured into its advanced stages of development.

Data were collected on the following program activities:

(1)   number of and attendance at meetings, workshops, open houses, training sessions,
(2)   number of volunteers active in escort and hall monitoring program,
(3)   number of businesses and residents involved in Adopt a Tenant Program,
(4)   number of and attendance at the public market place,
(5)   NRO initiated resident contacts (sample),
(6)   drop-ins to Cop Shop (sample),
(7)   requests for programs to NRO, Tenant Resource Coordinator, or Crime,
(8)   Prevention Center.

The evaluation team worked with the Police Department and the crime Prevention Center to collect similar data on crime prevention activities in the comparison site. While in an ideal experimental evaluation no "treatment" would occur in the comparison site, city officials are obliged to respond to requests from residents of the comparison area. Consequently, it was crucial to measure the number of programs offered in the comparison area so as to be able to contrast the difference in level and nature of such activities with those occurring in the project site.

In general, the process evaluation set out to describe the social activities, crime prevention activities, individual and group activities, news coverage (text, spin, changes over time) and specific police responses.

20

Outcome Evaluation

Data were collected on the impact of ROAR on citizen perceptions and attitudes, crime data, and physical signs of disorder.

1. Citizen Surveys

As mentioned above, this study benefited from the fact that pre-program data and during program data had already been collected on citizen perceptions. Previous waves of survey data collected in 1992, 1993, and 1995 from random samples of the city's population provide information on:

(1)	contacts with (and satisfaction) the police,
(2)	assessment of the level and quality of police services,
(3)	perception of neighborhood crime and disorder problems,
(4)	attitudes toward community policing,
(5)	self-reported crime prevention and self-protection measures,
(6)	victimization,
(7)	fear of crime,
(8)	background demographic measures.

These data are broken down according to the Department's four sector areas as well as twenty traditional neighborhood districts. The most recent survey instrument is included in Appendix E. It was slightly modified from 1992 (prior to grant funding) for administration in 1993 and subsequently to include measures of neighborhood satisfaction, territoriality, stability, solidarity, interaction, and perceived efficacy of prevention measures (Skogan, 1990). In 1993 and 1995 the instrument included items added for respondents living in residences in the ROAR project area concerning their awareness of, and participation in, ROAR project activities (see Appendix F). Respondents also were asked to assess the effectiveness of ROAR activities.

21

The 1992 survey did not include sufficient numbers of respondents to produce a

sample from the program and comparison sites, though there were sufficient numbers to

represent the larger downtown neighborhood where these two areas reside. In the 1993 and

1995 administrations, the principal investigators over-sampled residents from the project

and comparison sites in order to draw representative, samples for comparison to each other

and to the city-wide sample. These surveys were conducted with a random sample of

approximately 1200 city residents so as to draw approximately 60 residents per each of the

20 city neighborhoods. Face to-face surveys were undertaken in the spring of 1996 using

the remainder of NIJ funds from the original grant to examine ROAR resident perceptions.'

Personal interviews were repeated in 1997 using the same format.

2. Official Statistics

Monthly crime statistics recorded by the Spokane Police Department were collected

as they have since the period beginning in October 1991. This provided 24 months of

pre-implementation crime data and 48 months of post-implementation data.[13] Once again,

the principal focus was on felony drug arrests (by type of drug), robberies, and burglaries.

For drug offenses, burglaries, and robberies, comparisons were made with the project site,

the comparison site, and with citywide trends. In addition, an examination of the number

and type of all arrests occurring in the project and comparison site were made. [14]

3.Physical Disorder Survey

Following Taylor's (Taylor et al., 1985) research in Baltimore, trained observers

walked and observed the project and comparison sites for signs of physical disorder.

Attention was focused on indicators such as: litter; broken lights and windows; abandoned

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report
has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those
of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the
U.S. Department of Justice.

cars; abandoned buildings; and graffiti. Independent raters (with reliability checks) conducted these observations during the Spring of 1996 and 1997.

4. Displacement Effects

One of the possible effects of a program such as ROAR is that drug dealing activity and associated problems will simply be displaced from the West First neighborhood to other neighborhoods of Spokane. Having two years of pre-program survey data and two years of during program data has allowed us to examine whether displacement may have occurred through the analysis of reported problems in the other neighborhoods of the city. Displacement was monitored by working with the Police Department's Crime Analysis Unit and Neighborhood Officers.

5. Focus Group Meetings

Focus group meetings were held with key stakeholders in the project area. These meetings were held with residents of the Parsons Public Housing Unit, NROs, crime prevention personnel, local business owners, members of the Neighborhood Improvement Committee, and others involved in the program. The purpose of the focus groups was to supplement the survey data with more in-depth perceptions of neighborhood problems, program goals, successes, failures, and perceived changes in the program and the neighborhood. Three focus group interviews resulting from these meetings were conducted at six-month intervals beginning in spring of 1996.

6. Walk Abouts

Systematic walk abouts with the NRO were conducted for the purpose of observing the attitudes of the citizenry towards an officer walking the beat. These were initiated during the Spring and Summer months of 1997 in both the target and control areas. The

23

control areas consisted of neighborhoods near Project ROAR's site. Officers were accompanied by an observer who took notes about their examination of police and citizen relations.

7. Business Owners Survey

Business surveys, similar to those conducted with the Parsons residents were conducted to measure changing perceptions of fear of crime and satisfaction with the police. These were also added to the existing data collection schedule initiated in 1997 and were conducted during the Summer months of 1997. Business surveys primarily consisted of a couple dozen questions that asked about their feelings about the neighborhood they work in.

FINDINGS

The following analyses focus on one of the crucial aspects of Project ROAR: the perception of place. We argue that physical and social conditions of a neighborhood affect an individual's perception of place. Taking the findings from the Parson's interviews, as well as the data from the business surveys, some results have been analyzed to better understand the dynamics of community perception of place. The population we are selecting from is people interviewed in December 1994 and October 1997, and separately, the business survey's population from the control area and the project area.

In order to measure the dependent variable (perception of place), different attitudinal indicators are offered. For instance, the interviews examine the respondent's perspective on potential changes in the neighborhood, both physical and social. The interviews also ask the respondent to report their opinions of these changes. It is important to investigate the nature of their responses in order to interpret the impact such attitudes have on perceptions of place.

To find measurable indicators of whether perceptions of place are different between the groups of the two separate sets of data, chi-squared analysis is utilized. In the case of both the Parson's interviews and the business survey, the null hypothesis to test is that the two independent groups do not differ from one another significantly. In other terms, for the Parson's interviews, the null hypothesis is the results from December 1994 interviews are not significantly distinct from the October 1997 interviews. If the null hypothesis is true, the attitudes reported from 1994 are not different from 1997. Likewise, the null

hypothesis of the business survey is the data from the control area is not significantly diverse from the project area.

Chi-squared has been chosen according to the recommendation of Siegal and Castellan (1988). The data utilized consists of frequency in discrete categories. It is measured on a nominal level, thus our choice of tests are limited. This non-parametric method has been selected for a number of reasons, among them are:

(1)   We are measuring nominal data.
(2)   We have a small sample size.

Ultimately, the chi-squared test (for two independent samples) will allow for testing whether the independent groups differ from one another with respect to their attitudes about the neighborhood. The samples were weighted allowing each comparison to have equal subjects per sample. To quantify the information, portions of the results have been examined.

Parsons' Interviews

Residents of Parsons were interviewed a number of times during the course of Project ROAR. As mentioned earlier, the interviews from December 1994 and October 1997 have been compared using chi-square, (an important thing to remember is the samples were weighted to allow the comparisons to have equal subjects in each sample). Residents were asked how safe they felt walking alone during the day and during the night, the result was a statistically significant difference ($\alpha<.01$) in the responses from 1994 contrasted with the responses from 1997. The residents appeared to be more fearful, both during the daytime and the nighttime walking alone at night in 1994. This is a valuable indicator that there may be more contentment in 1997 among the tenants. These variables

26

can be further qualified with the outcome of the comparison between the two samples on neighborhood satisfaction. When Parsons' tenants were surveyed on their satisfaction with their neighborhood, the chi-square result revealed a significant difference at the .001 level. Viewing the weighted scores, once again it is apparent the residents were much more pleased with their neighborhood in 1997 than they had been in 1994.

When questioned if the resident noticed social changes in their neighborhood, another significant result was found. Residents had noticed positive social changes, such as different types of people in the neighborhood over the years. It appears from the raw data that the residents view the social changes as positive, more so than they had in 1994. The chi-square value here was significant surpassing the .01 level.

Business Surveys

Surveys were sent to businesses in both the control and project area, which focused on perceptions of both social and physical characteristics of the neighborhood, much like the Parsons' interviews. The survey was in the form of open-ended questions which were later coded to measure for significant findings. Significant differences ($\alpha < .01$) were found between the areas where the businesses were located for some of the questions. When asked to illustrate concerns with the neighborhood of their businesses, the business owners of the control area largely named homelessness as a concern. The project area did not claim this to be a concern at all. Additionally, many surveyed in the project area noticed physical changes, such as the area being more lighted and cleaner. The difference between these two groups regarding this question was significant at the .01 level.

Walk-About Observations

It was not possible to quantify the field notes taken during the walk-abouts. What is intriguing about the figures is that the control group was found to have more positive contact quality over the project group. These differences may not be significant, but it is interesting to note that there were positive interactions between the officer and the citizen in the control area. This suggests that the efforts to better the quality of officer/citizen communications in the project area may have shifted to the control area.

Discussion

Through the data collection and analysis of the Spokesman Review Archives, minutes from civic organization meetings, crime rates, and types of crimes, it is evident that the citizens in the Project ROAR area have modified their perception of their environment. The statistical implications of the data collected show that people in this community are noticing positive changes. The next question is why are they noticing changes. The discussion to follow will examine a few explanations of why perceptions have changed. A discussion of the role of the media, the occurrence of unexpected events, and the view of social capital will try to explore why perceptions change.

The media, such as the Spokesman Review newspaper, plays a large role in the definition of crime in a given area. This is not am attempt to implicate the media as a cause of crime, nor diminish the role the media may play in the rise in crime rate. Rather, the emphasis is placed on the role the media plays in defining crime. Recent data has indicated 95% of the general population cite the media as their primary source of information.

The emergence of the media in the definition of crime has been a relatively recent phenomenon. Around 1970, some researchers began to recognize the media possessed the potential for influence under specific circumstances. Some argue as the prevalence of television increased traditional social ties, structures and values weakened while people became more geographically mobile. Thus, people became more dependent on media rather than other people for information. These shifts on social structure coupled with

29

improvement in the research techniques of the social sciences, allowed for academics to

make the following assumptions regarding media's ability to influence attitudes:

(1)   media has ability to help shape attitudes to new attitudes where little prior opinion exists;
(2)   media may influence weakly held attitudes;
(3)   media can influence strongly held beliefs when they are able to reports to new facts.

The ability of the media to influence attitudes coupled with the media's propensity

to run a high number of stories on crime related activities indicates the media has the

ability to influence crime. The analysis of the Spokesman Review Archives supports these

notions. With constant scrutiny by the media, West First Avenue had much publicity as

the physical conditions changed.

As the buildings were remodeled and the clientele of businesses altered, perceptions

of place have changed. People who lived in the Parsons appeared to redefine their

viewpoint of where they lived. The modification of perception is an interesting process. In

this case it appears to have been essential for a catastrophic event to occur in order to

provoke citizens to unite. This can be observed in the area where Project ROAR was

implemented. The drive-by-shooting episode in June of 1996 enabled the neighborhood to

incorporate their resources and implement changes. While each community has different

levels of tolerance communities will not collaborate with one another until some type of

event occurs that demands immediate action. It is evident that the drive-by shooting

surpassed the level of tolerance this community had for crime. The community joined

together and began discussing goals and expectations. What transpired through the

countless hours of information gathering was the making of both short term and long term

goals. The community no longer wanted to be prisoners of their own place.

30

Social Capital

Regarding the process of advancing changes in perception, it is also important in order for change to occur the residents feel a sense of community. McMillian and Chavis (1986) define this sense as "a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together" (1986:9).

If a community does not feel protected, and if there is not ammunition to challenge their obstacles, community ties will be nonexistent. Project ROAR was designed to empower the tenants in order to provide protected neighborhoods, relinquish drug activity and prostitution. Such changes could not occur if the citizens did not manage the problems and unite their vigor with the police and other agencies that could offer assistance to their cause. Additionally, the citizens could not fuse together without social capital.

Putnam (1995) defines social capital as..."features of social organizations such as networks, norms and trust that facilitate cooperation or coordination for mutual benefits..." Additionally, it "...is responsible for the levels of trust or engagement found in a community" (1995:665). According to Correia and Lovrich (1997), social capital reflects inherent individual commitment to the community and government, promotes the maturation of trust among citizens, and induces increased trust between citizens and government. When neighbors expedite higher levels of social responsibility to one another, there will be higher levels of trust towards others. This may be evident by the decreased levels of fear during the day and the night.

31

Theories of Crime and Place

The purpose of this report is to understand the dynamics of place and community. "Recent research suggests that, like offenders, some victims and places are particularly crime-prone" (Spelman, 1995). The location of criminal activities being higher in one area than in another has been an underlying question in recent research. Spelman produces this notion of hot spots, showing that ten percent of places are victims of sixty percent of crimes. If this is the case; then it seems relevant to direct criminal justice studies toward understanding the dynamics of place to understand why perceptions change.

Eck and Weisburd (1995) state that crime places can be divided into three categories: facilities, clustering, and features. "One way places matter is that different types of facilities increase or decrease crime in their immediate environment" (1995:8). A facility is defined as a facility as a church, tavern, school, etc. "At the place level, clustering - repeat events at the same place - has been established" (1995:12). Some crime experts would call this clustering a "hot spot," meaning criminal activity is not uniformly distributed. Additionally, Eck and Weisburd note that some social and physical features of crime places are more enticing to offenders than other places are.

In the research literature, scholars such as Sampson (1987) believe that lifestyle-routine activity (LRA) and opportunity theory should be extended in the understanding of victimization. "(T)he underlying theoretical structure of the LRA thesis rests on the assumption that routine activities outside the home increase the risk of crime by strangers, even though previous studies have not tested this notion" (1987:331). The lifestyle concept within this theory is relevant to criminal place, because it is a direct indicator of

32

how often a person goes out (to bars, restaurants, etc.) in a given week. This notion can be extended to the opportunity theory, assuming that the more often a person goes out, the more at risk they are of victimization. "Specifically, the opportunity model assumes that the risk of victimization is increased when people are exposed to criminal offenders in the absence of capable guardians who could potentially prevent the occurrence of a crime" (1987:331).

In collaboration with Eck, Felson (1995) states that crime can be discouraged from occurring at certain places. "Originally the routine activity approach took offenders as given, but later work took account informal social control of offenders" (1995:54). Therefore, the routine activity theory has been combined with Hirschi's (1969) control theory. "The result is a two-step version of control theory. As a first step, society establishes social bonds and thus attaches a "handle" to each individual.... This leads to the second step of social control: "the task of identifying exactly who is breaking the rules" (1969:54). Felson and Eck collectively ascertain there are three entities that can be supervised: the target, the offender, and the place. Furthermore, there are three types of supervisors: the guardian (for the target), the handler (for the offender), and the manager (for the place).

Most theories of crime are influenced by two critical variables, individuals and communities as Sherman (1995) explains, "(t)he two major questions for these theories are, first, why this person and not that one committed a crime, and second, why there is more crime of type X in this society than that one, or in this society now than before?" (1995:37). Sherman also contends that there are four hypotheses that can explain why there is variance in crime for different places. Using a Canadian study of tavern violence,

33

Sherman gives the following possible explanations for why some bars have higher rates of violence: the patron hypothesis, the management hypothesis, the behavior setting hypothesis, and the neighborhood hypothesis. The first three are derived from routine activity. The patron hypothesis suggests that amount of crime in a given bar depends on how many criminals are clients. The management hypothesis suggests that disorder can be controlled if the right type of management is in charge. The behavioral setting hypothesis considers all of these factors, "the configuration of people, informal rules, space, time and objects associated with more or less violence" (1995:45). The last conjecture Sherman offers, the neighborhood hypothesis, indirectly includes the routine activity theory. "A neighborhood hypothesis suggests that bars in bad neighborhoods will generate more crime than bars in good neighborhoods, regardless of the criminality of the patrons" (1995:45).

If the police and citizen reflect on where and what the neighborhood is – its location, its place – then understanding patterns mentioned in the findings may be more evident.

Conclusion

What is the relationship between place and behavior? Part of the evaluation of project ROAR includes an examination of this question via what Cresswell refers to as "transgressive acts." These are acts judged as inappropriate not only because marginalized groups commit them but also because of where they occur. Geographical deviance is thus used as ideological tools to either maintain and established order, or establish a new order.

Cresswell argues that space and place are key factors in the definition of deviance and, conversely, space and place are used to construct notions of order and propriety. In addition, whereas ideological concepts being expressed about what is good, just, and appropriate often are delineated geographically, the transgression of this delineation reveals the normally hidden relationships between place and ideology. In the project area we see a link between the challenging of spatial boundaries and the possibility of social transformation. Transgression means crossing a boundary. The boundary is both social and spatial. When someone transgresses they become 'out of place' and are labeled deviant.

In the project area, a correlation between place and expectations of appropriate behavior were established. Important questions are who determines the definition of appropriate behavior, how are they able to establish the relationship between this particular place and the new levels of acceptable behavior, and ultimately what are the affects on fear of crime. We have suggested that media attention, "trigger events," and social capital collectively play a role in answering these questions, along with Cresswell's transgression.

35

In the context of this study, place clearly refers to something more than a spatial referent. Implied is a sense of the proper. Someone may belong in one place and not in another. What one's place is, is related to one's relation to others. There are expectations about behavior that relate a position in a social structure to actions in space. In this sense "place" combines the spatial with the social. There are expectations about behavior in certain places that are related to the position of the place in the social structure. Expectations about behavior in a "place" are important components in the construction, maintenance, and evolution of ecological values.

Project ROAR ultimately is about changing expectations concerning place and behavior, and how the results change perceptions of fear of crime. In redefining "appropriate" behavior in a particular place it is mostly a matter of asserting what is out-of-place, even though that particular behavior may have been previously acceptable. By separating certain behaviors from a wider context and referring instead to a single place, those making the definitions of appropriate remove the issue from the realm of the social and the political and simply assert the out-of-place nature of the behavior. The key to defining what is appropriate behavior is to make inappropriate behavior seem unnatural in a particular place. It is here where "place" and "appropriate behavior" intersect.

The clear suggestion of the ROAR project is that those violating the redefinition of social disorder simply do not belong. The laws of place are violated when there is a transgression of expectations concerning appropriate behavior in this particular place. It is not enough for appropriate behavior to be redefined; the place itself also was redefined. The business and political leaders in the West First neighborhood were able to manipulate the properties of place to make ideological and political arguments. They used certain

36

aspects of place (social disorder) to reframe the question in terms of the quality of the "place." Instead of focusing on wide social issues they question only particular behaviors in this particular place. The effect of place is not simply a geographical matter. It always intersects with socio-cultural expectations.

What we can ascertain from the data analysis and discussion is the importance perception of place holds in understanding changes in attitudes. Collectively, the media, "trigger events," social capital, and transgression all better explain how and why perceptions have changed from one year to the next and from control area to project area. The data from Project ROAR have offered engaging insight into the domain of citizen's perception of their neighborhood and to what persuades an individual to be satisfied with their place.

---

[1] Schuerman and Kobrin (1986) provided empirical support for this idea in their longitudinal study of neighborhoods in Los Angeles. They found that neighborhood decay preceded rises in feedback effect whereby crime led to further withdrawal, instability, and social and physical deterioration.

[2] There have been a number of attempts to organize community residents into self-help, voluntary, organizations that can increase the "intervention capacity" (Skogan, 1990:128) of neighborhood residents to address problems of disorder, fear, and crime (Rosenbaum, 1986). Typically, they seek to increase the sense of territoriality, and feelings of mutual responsibility and obligation. Research on these efforts indicates that participants are more likely married with children, homeowners, more educated, and longer term residents (Greenberg et al., 1985). They also tend to be individuals most likely to take crime prevention measures themselves (Rosenbaum et al., 1986). Similarly for the neighborhoods likeliest to organize, crime prevention efforts tend to be more stable and homogenous (Bennet et al,. 1986). According, those neighborhoods most in need of effective responses to crime and disorder problems tend to be the most difficult to organize and then sustain community self-help crime prevention efforts (cf. Thurman et al., 1993).

[3] Perhaps the greatest boost to community crime prevention activities in the 1970's occurred as a result of Congress' authorization of LEAA's Anti-Crime Program, which allocated $30 million to community groups to become more involved in preventing crime, reducing fear and contributing to neighborhood revitalization. Although this funding led to the design and implementation of many community crime prevention programs, the effectiveness of such efforts remains in question.

[4] As Wilson and Kelling (1982) and Skogan (1990) contend, the nature of many "victimless crimes" such as street-walking prostitution and drug dealing tend to contribute to the overall social disorder of particular communities. However, these crimes are markedly different in the nature of their occurrence from street crimes such as burglaries and robberies, the latter two of which often target unknown persons or

37

establishments in a neighborhood at random (Smith and Davis, 1993). Prostitution and drug dealing, on the other hand, require some degree of visibility in rather stationary locations.

[5] A key obstacle to effective community crime prevention is the problem of community mobilization, especially when trying to involve residents who reside in the most economically disadvantaged neighborhoods of cities and towns (Greenberg et al., 1985; Taub et al., 1981). Ironically, it has been in those neighborhoods most in need of effective community-based responses to crime and its related impacts that have been the most difficult to mobilize. In addition, crime prevention efforts which strictly involve citizens have been relatively ineffective at creating neighborhood-level change (Garofalo and McLeod, 1986).

[6] Two decades of research on the limited capacity of the police to affect the level of crime through the traditional incident-based mode of operation, coupled with concerns over the estrangement of the police from many of the communities they serve, combined to lead many academicians and police executives to argue for a problem-solving, community-oriented style of policing (see Kelling and Moore, 1988).

[7] It should be noted that the community policing model encompasses more than a set of strategies but rather a guiding philosophy and set of values emphasizing community partnership, problem-solving, and community and line-level officer empowerment (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990).

[8] Two community policing efforts that have received considerable attention are the Newark and Houston P.D. projects (Skolnick and Bayley, 1986; Pate et al., 1986; Skogan, 1990). Both projects involved major departmental commitments and included evaluation components. In Newark, Physical and social disorder declined, fear of crime was reduced, neighborhood satisfaction increased, and satisfaction with the police increased. Thus, it appeared that a decentralized effort with "structured citizen input" (Skogan, 1990:117) produced more beneficial effects than aggressive enforcement efforts alone. In Houston, the community policing effort involved opening a storefront police-community station, creating a community organizing response team, and initiating a citizen contact patrol (Skogan, 1990). Houston's programs achieved what Skogan referred to as "modest" success (1990:105), although one troubling finding was that the most positive findings in terms of disorder, fear, and satisfaction, tended to be confined to white residents and homeowners. There was little evidence of program impact on blacks, Hispanics or renters.

[9] For example, Toch and Grant (1991) reviewed a five city project sponsored by the Police Executive Research Forum involving problem-oriented approaches to urban drug-crime. Although the specific projects varied, they shared in common a collaborative approach involving the police, residents, housing authority officials, and representative of various city agencies. These projects suggest that the police and residents of drug-ridden neighborhoods can work together in an effort to stem neighborhood decay.

[10] Although key organizing events concerning the project occurred in late 1993, Project ROAR officially was implemented with a media kick-off in January, 1994 at the Parsons' Public Housing Building.

[11] The distinction here is that the "quasi-NRO remains responsible for responding to life-threatening calls outside the project area.

[12] One example of the community corrections officers' success in the project area was his ability to intervene on behalf of local residents who were fearful of suspicious persons loitering near a popular bus stop. Since the suspected "loiterers" refused to move from the bus stop and contended that they had the legal right to wait for the bus where it stopped regardless of the fear that was generated by their presence (many were "clients" of the Department of Corrections and suspected to be engaged in illegal drug trafficking and sales), the community corrections officer took it upon himself to solve this problem. He did so by contacting the local transit authority and asking them to re-locate the bus stop to the corner in front to the ROAR cop shop. From that point on "loitering" ceased to be a problem.

38

[13] The original ROAR evaluation by McGarrell and Thurman was scheduled to end in December of 1995. The approval of a no-cost extension by NIJ allowed field research to continue for an additional six-months using already appropriated research dollars.

[14] In addition to the police statistics, the citizen survey also includes self-report data on perceived neighborhood disorder, assessment of the neighborhood and citywide crime problem, and reported victimization and fear.

References

Bursik, R.J. and H.G. Grasmick. 1993. *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control.* New York: Lexington Books.

Byrne, J.M. and R.J. Sampson. 1986. *The Social Ecology of Crime.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cirel, P., P. Evans, D. McGillis, and D. Whitcomb. 1977. *An Exemplary Project: Community Crime Prevention Program, Seattle, Washington.* Washington, DC: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Cisneros, H.G. 1995. "Defensible Space: Deterring Crime and Building Community: Second in a Series of Essays." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

39

Cresswell, Tim. 1996. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dillman, D.A. 1978. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method.* New York: Wiley-Interscience.

DuBow, F. and D. Emmons. 1981. "The Community Hypothesis," in D. Lewis (ed.) *Reactions to Crime.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Garofalo, J. and M. McLeod. 1986. *Improving the Effectiveness and Utilization of Neighborhood Watch Programs.* Unpublished report to the National Institute of Justice from the State University of New York at Albany, Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center.

Garofalo, J. and M. McLeod. 1989. "The Structure and operations of Neighborhood Watch Programs in the United States." *Crime and Delinquency* 35:326-344.

Goldstein, H. 1990. *Problem-oriented Policing.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greenberg, S., W. Rohe, and J. Williams. 1983. "Neighborhood Conditions and Community
Crime Control," in *Community Crime Prevention.* Washington, DC: Center for Responsive Governance.

Greenberg, S.W., W.M. Rohe and J.R. Williams. 1985. *Informal Citizen Action and Crime Prevention at the Neighborhood Level.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Greene, J.R. and R.B. Taylor. 1989. "Community-Based Policing and Foot Patrol: Issues of
Theory and Evaluation." In *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S.D. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

Heinzelmann, F. 1983. "Crime Prevention from a Community Perspective," in *Community Crime Prevention.* Washington, DC: Center for a Responsive Governance.

Kelling, G. 1986. *Foot Patrol.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Kelling, G. and M. Moore. 1988. "The Evolving Strategy of Policing," in *Perspectives on Policing.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Lavrakas, P.J. 1985. "Citizen Self-Help and Neighborhood Crime Prevention Policy," in

L.A. Curtis (Ed.) *American Violence and Public Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lewis, D.A., J.A. Grant, and D.P. Rosenbaum. 1988. *The Social Construction of Reform: Community Organizations and Crime Prevention*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Lurigio, A.J. and D.P. Rosenbaum. 1986. "Evaluation Research in Community Crime Prevention: A Critical Look at the Field," in Dennis P. Rosenbaum (ed.) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pate, A. 1986. "Experimenting with Foot Patrol: the Newark Experience." In *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?*, edited by D. Rosenbaum. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pate A., M.A. Wycoff, W.G. Skogan, and L. Sherman. 1986. *Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark: A Summary Report*. Washington, DC: The Police Foundation and the National Institute of Justice.

Perkins, D.D., J.W. Meeks, and R.B. Taylor. 1992. "The Physical Environment of Street Blocks and Resident Perceptions of Crime and Disorder: Implications for Theory and Measurement." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 12:21-34.

Perkins, D.D., A. Wandersman, R.C. Rich, and R.B. Taylor. 1993. "The Physical Environment of Street Crime: Defensible Space, Territoriality and Incivilities.11 *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 13:29-49.

Podolefskyl A. and F. DuBow. 1981. *Strategies for Community Crime Prevention*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Reiss, A.J. 1986. "Why Are Communities Important in Understanding Crime?" In *Communities and Crime*, edited by A.J. Reiss and M. Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reiss, A.J. and M. Tonry, eds. 1986. *Communities and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Roehl, J.A. and R.F. Cook. 1984. *Evaluation of the Urban Crime Prevention Program*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Rosenbaum, D.P. 1988. "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature," *Justice Quarterly* 5:323-95.

Rosenbaum, D.P., D.A. Lewis and J. Grant. 1986. "Neighborhood-based Crime Prevention:
  Assessing the Efficacy of Community Organizing in Chicago." In *Community Crime_Prevention: Does It Work?*, edited by D. Rosenbaum. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schlossman, S. and M. Sedlak. 1983. "The Chicago Area Project Revisited." *Crime and Delinquency* 29:398-462.

42

Selected Sources

Bursik, R.J. and H.G. Grasmick. 1993. *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control.* New York: Lexington Books.

Byrne, J.M. and R.J. Sampson. 1986. *The Social Ecology of Crime.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cirel, P., P. Evans, D. McGillis, and D. Whitcomb. 1977. *An Exemplary Project: Community Crime Prevention Program, Seattle, Washington.* Washington, DC: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Cisneros, H.G. 1995. "Defensible Space: Deterring Crime and Building Community: Second in a Series of Essays." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Cresswell, Tim. 1996. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dillman, D.A. 1978. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method.* New York: Wiley-Interscience.

DuBow, F. and D. Emmons. 1981. "The Community Hypothesis," in D. Lewis (ed.) *Reactions to Crime.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Garofalo, J. and M. McLeod. 1986. *Improving the Effectiveness and Utilization of Neighborhood Watch Programs.* Unpublished report to the National Institute of Justice from the State University of New York at Albany, Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center.

Garofalo, J. and M. McLeod. 1989. "The Structure and operations of Neighborhood Watch Programs in the United States." *Crime and Delinquency* 35:326-344.

Goldstein, H. 1990. *Problem-oriented Policing.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greenberg, S., W. Rohe, and J. Williams. 1983. "Neighborhood Conditions and Community Crime Control," in *Community Crime Prevention.* Washington, DC: Center for Responsive Governance.

Greenberg, S.W., W.M. Rohe and J.R. Williams. 1985. *Informal Citizen Action and Crime Prevention at the Neighborhood Level.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Greene, J.R. and R.B. Taylor. 1989. "Community-Based Policing and Foot Patrol: Issues of Theory and Evaluation." In *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S.D. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

Heinzelmann, F. 1983. "Crime Prevention from a Community Perspective," in *Community Crime Prevention*. Washington, DC: Center for a Responsive Governance.

Kelling, G. 1986. *Foot Patrol*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Kelling, G. and M. Moore. 1988. "The Evolving Strategy of Policing," in *Perspectives on Policing*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Lavrakas, P.J. 1985. "Citizen Self-Help and Neighborhood Crime Prevention Policy," in L.A. Curtis (Ed.) *American Violence and Public Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lewis, D.A., J.A. Grant, and D.P. Rosenbaum. 1988. *The Social Construction of Reform: Community Organizations and Crime Prevention*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Lurigio, A.J. and D.P. Rosenbaum. 1986. "Evaluation Research in Community Crime Prevention: A Critical Look at the Field," in Dennis P. Rosenbaum (ed.) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pate, A. 1986. "Experimenting with Foot Patrol: the Newark Experience." In *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?*, edited by D. Rosenbaum. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pate A., M.A. Wycoff, W.G. Skogan, and L. Sherman. 1986. *Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark: A Summary Report*. Washington, DC: The Police Foundation and the National Institute of Justice.

Perkins, D.D., J.W. Meeks, and R.B. Taylor. 1992. "The Physical Environment of Street Blocks and Resident Perceptions of Crime and Disorder: Implications for Theory and Measurement." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 12:21-34.

Perkins, D.D., A. Wandersman, R.C. Rich, and R.B. Taylor. 1993. "The Physical Environment of Street Crime: Defensible Space, Territoriality and Incivilities.11 *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 13:29-49.

Podolefskyl A. and F. DuBow. 1981. *Strategies for Community Crime Prevention*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Reiss, A.J. 1986. "Why Are Communities Important in Understanding Crime?" In *Communities and Crime*, edited by A.J. Reiss and M. Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reiss, A.J. and M. Tonry, eds. 1986. *Communities and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Roehl, J.A. and R.F. Cook. 1984. *Evaluation of the Urban Crime Prevention Program*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Rosenbaum, D.P. 1988. "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature," *Justice Quarterly* 5:323-95.

Rosenbaum, D.P., D.A. Lewis and J. Grant. 1986. "Neighborhood-based Crime Prevention: Assessing the Efficacy of Community Organizing in Chicago." In *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?*, edited by D. Rosenbaum. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schlossman, S. and M. Sedlak. 1983. "The Chicago Area Project Revisited." *Crime and Delinquency* 29:398-462.

Schuerman, L. and S. Kobrin. 1986. "Community Careers in Crime." In *Communities and Crime*, edited by A.J. Reiss and M. Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, C.R. and H.D. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sherman, L. 1986. "Policing Communities: What Works?" In *Communities and Crime*, edited by A.J. Reiss and M. Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Skogan, W.G. 1987. "Community Organizations and crime," in Albert J. Reiss, Jr. And Michael Tonry (eds.) *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Skogan, W.G. 1990. *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. New York: Free Press.

Skogan, W.G. and S. Annan. 1993 "Drug Enforcement in Public Housing," in Robert C. Davis, Arthur J. Lurigio, and Dennis P. Rosenbaum (eds.) *Drugs and the Community: Involving Community Residents in Combating the Sale of Illegal Drugs*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Skolnick, J. and D. Bayley. 1986. *The New Blue Line*. New York: Free Press.

Smith, B.E. and R.C. Davis. 1993. "Successful Community Anticrime Programs: What Makes Them Work," in Robert C. Davis, Arthur J. Lurigio, and Dennis P. Rosenbaum (eds.) *Drugs and the Community:- Involving Community Residents in Combating the Sale of Illegal Drugs*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Spelman, W. and J.E. Eck. 1987. *Problem-oriented Policing*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Suttles, G. 1972. *The Social Construction of Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, R.B. and S. Gottfredson. 1986. "Environmenu.. Design, Crime, and Prevention: An Examination of Community Dynamics." In *Communities and Crime*, edited by A.J. Reiss and M. Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, R.B., S.A. Schumaker, and S.D. Gottfredson. 1985. "Neighborhood level Linkages Between Physical Features and Local Sentiments: Deterioration, Fear of Crime, and Confidence." *Journal of Architectural Planning and Research* 1985:261-275.

Taub, R.P., D.G. Taylor, and J.D. Dunham. 1982 *Safe and Secure_ Neighborhoods: Territoriality, Solidarity and the Reduction of Crime*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Thurman ' Q.C., P. Bogen, and A. Giacomazzi. 1993. "Program Monitoring and Community Policing: A Process Evaluation of Community Policing officers in Spokane, Washington." *American Journal of Police* 12:89-114.

Toch, H. and J. Grant. 1991. *The Police as Problem Solvers*. New York: Plenum.

Trojanowicz, R. and B. Bucqueroux. 1990. *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati*, OH: Anderson.

U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. 1978. "Got a Minute? You Could Stop Crime." Washington, DC: Ad Council, Inc.

Walker, S. 1980. *Popular Justice: A History of American Criminal Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weisel, Deborah L. 1990. *Tackling Drug Problems in Public Housing: A Guide for Police*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Wilson, J.Q. and G. Kelling. 1982. "Broken Windows." *The Atlantic Monthly* March:29-38.

Yin, R.K. 1986. "Community Crime Prevention: A Synthesis of Eleven Evaluations," in Dennis P. Rosenbaum (ed.) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.