This is to certify that the

thesis entitled
"An Examination of Nonprofit Community-Based Crime Prevention Strategies"

presented by

Timothy Alan Akers

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Master of Science degree in Criminal Justice-Urban Studies

Charles J. Corley, Ph.D.

Major professor

Date August 8, 1991

AN EXAMINATION OF NONPROFIT COMMUNITY-BASED CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

By

Timothy Alan Akers

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Criminal Justice-Urban Studies

College of Social Science, School of Criminal Justice,
and Urban Affairs Programs

1991

ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF NONPROFIT COMMUNITY-BASED CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

By

Timothy Alan Akers

The purpose of this study was to identify community and community-based organizational (CBO) characteristics that may distinguish between CBOs that do and do not initiate crime prevention projects. This study further examines how community and CBO characteristics may influence the initiation of various types of crime prevention strategies. Primary, secondary, and comprehensive crime prevention strategies were the dependent variables examined.

Data from 132 projects were collected. The collection methodology consisted of a content analysis of grant application files and a survey questionnaire.

The major findings of this study indicate that certain community and CBO variables as: 1) geographical area, 2) perceptions of crime, 3) race of the community, 4) number of full-time paid staff, 5) number of volunteers, 6) year the CBO was established, and 7) type of CBO were not statistically significant in terms of their relationship to the types of strategies initiated by CBOs.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents,

Patton and Willa Mae Akers

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this thesis can be attributable to the support and cooperation of the School of Criminal Justice and Urban Affairs Programs at Michigan State University.

First, my sincere gratitude is expressed to Dr. Charles Corley, my graduate committee chairperson, for his enduring patience and tolerance in advising, editing, and reviewing every step of this study. This study would have been virtually impossible without his insight. Secondly, I am deeply greatful to Dr. Dennis Payne. Dr. Payne's sophisticated knowledge of the criminal justice system has expanded my perception of the system through his valuable insight. Lastly, I owe special thanks to Dr. John Schweitzer, a friend and mentor, to whom I owe a tremendous debt of thanks which can never be repaid. Thank you Dr. Schweitzer for sharing with me your optimism, encouragement, and genuine kindness.

I further extend a sincere thank you to my brother, Thomas Patton Akers, and my friends and colleagues, Bob Meesig, Tim Collardy, Gina Cambone, and Lynn Anderson for their optimism and support when the pressure was high.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

For the past twenty years community-based crime prevention programs have been increasing. Several community-based crime prevention strategies have been implemented over the years in order to offset the level of crime in various communities. In general, strategies initiated by community-based organizations (CBOs) to circumvent neighborhood crime include anticrime activities such as neighborhood watch, dispersal of dead-bolt locks to neighborhood residents, increased street lighting, drug prevention and delinquency prevention programs, tutorial mentorship programs, educational programs, neighborhood clean-up and beautification initiatives, and other programs designed to reduce neighborhood crime and residents' fear of perceived crime (Bennett and Lavrakas, 1989; Skogan, 1989; Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a; Podolefsky & Dubow, 1981; Rosenbaum, 1987).

These diverse community-based crime prevention strategies need to be studied in terms of their level of prevention (Lab, 1988; Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a). More specifically, the collective responses to crime by CBOs fall into two broad

categories: 1) a causes of crime approach (primary) and 2) an opportunity reduction approach (secondary). Aside from the two separate responses, which will be discussed more fully later, there exists a third, more comprehensive approach that includes elements of both types of approaches (Podolefsky & Dubow, 1981).

When strategies incorporate elements of both primary and secondary approaches, this is commonly considered a comprehensive crime prevention strategy. Usually, this comprehensive model is a collective response by CBOs to attack the "root causes" of crime as well as increase residential involvement in crime reduction related projects, and to reduce opportunity through environmental design projects, just to mention a few.

Each of the preventative approaches (primary, secondary, and comprehensive) respond to the crime problem at different stages of development, either prior to the commission of a criminal act or after the occurrence of criminal behavior (Lab, 1988; Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a). However, for our purposes, rather than collapse the various anticrime activities, it is more appropriate to identify the qualitative differences between strategies and their methods used to avert criminal behavior or victimization.

For example, many CBOs approach their collective anticrime activities under the assumption that criminal behavior is caused by "social problems" such as unemployment,

poverty, homelessness, and lack of education (Podolefsky & Dubow, 1981; Rosenbaum, 1988). The obvious outcomes of the "causes of crime" strategies are activities that address a variety of social problems or "root causes" of crime. For instance, primary prevention measures initiated by both CBOs and individual citizens consist of drug and delinquency prevention, educational and recreation/sports, neighborhood beautification, and other programs targeted at the origins of crime. These specific strategies are designed to intervene prior to the onset of some threatening situation so as to keep the potential for trouble from even developing (Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a).

On the other hand, opportunity reduction strategies are measures aimed at reducing or minimizing the likelihood that some specific target--person, home, or community--will be victimized. More specifically, the various opportunity reduction approaches include neighborhood/block watch programs, security lighting around a neighborhood or community, security locks on homes and businesses, citizen patrols, and other initiatives focusing on aberrant behavior (Johnson, 1987; Lab, 1988; Lavrakas & Bennett, 1988a, p. 223; Troyer & Wright, 1985).

Generally, primary, secondary, and comprehensive strategies originate from a wide variety of CBOs (i.e., human service organizations, neighborhood associations, community action agencies, community development corporations, business

associations, and other multipurpose CBOs that have "crime" as one of many objectives) (Lewis, Grant, & Rosenbaum, 1988; Podolefsky, 1983; Rosenbaum, 1988; Shernock, 1986). That is, CBOs vary not only in terms of the type of CBO and their particular organizational characteristics (i.e., number of volunteers, age of the organization, number of full-time paid staff), but also in the type of crime prevention strategy initiated (i.e., causes of crime, opportunity reduction, or a combination). However, one real commonality is that CBOs typically undertake a primary or secondary approach, with limited specificity and research identifying the type of strategy initiated (Lewis, Grant, & Rosenbaum, 1988; Rosenbaum, 1988).

Aside from the different types of CBOs and their organizational structure, distinctions may be observed concerning the specific crime prevention strategy initiated and community demographical characteristics. For example, the racial composition of an area, the geographical boundaries served by CBOs, and the perception of crime in a community may dictate the specific type of community crime prevention strategy initiated. More specifically, minority communities (primarily, the African American community) tend to utilize secondary approaches more readily than other diverse racial communities (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982). The purpose of this research is to initially identify the community and CBO characteristics that may distinguish between those CBOs that

do and do not initiate a crime prevention project. Secondly, this study focuses on CBOs that initiate various crime prevention strategies. More specifically, the various types of crime prevention strategies will be analyzed in terms of community and CBO characteristics.

The community characteristics include: 1) the size of the geographical area served by CBOs, 2) perceptions of crime by the community, and 3) race/ethnicity. The identifying of community characteristics will help determine if a particular type of crime prevention activity depends on certain community attributes.

In addition, CBO characteristics will also be identified. The CBO characteristics include: 1) the number of full-time paid staff, 2) number of volunteers, 3) year the CBO was established, and 4) the type of CBO (e.g., community action agency, neighborhood association, community development corporation, or others). In short, this study seeks to assess whether the type of crime prevention strategy initiated by funded CBOs are based on certain community and organizational characteristics.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Prior to the last twenty years, the responsibility was placed on the federal, state, and local government to attack such social ills as poverty and crime. These problems were flourishing throughout communities in the United States (National Crime Prevention Council, 1986). In response to public demand, crime prevention strategies were employed by the core criminal justice system (e.g., police, courts, and corrections) that expanded the means of formal social control (e.g., stiffer prison sentences, more arrests). However, even with more emphasis on lengthier prison terms and more arrests, the result has been a very limited effect on community crime rate (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1986; Rosenbaum, 1988, p. 323).

Since the late 1960's and early 1970's, there has existed a consistent, though somewhat conservative movement, to emphasize the need for citizen involvement in the criminal justice system. The degree of citizen involvement is directed at the community level. What develops is that community crime prevention places less dependence on formal means of social control to an increased reliance on community oriented,

informal social control (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1986; Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a; Podolefsky & Dubow, 1981; Rosenbaum, 1988). That is, the theoretical model of informal social control reflects a partial shift of crime prevention responsibility from the formal, core criminal justice system towards less formal, more peripheral involvement by communities to control their crime problem. Whatever the case, there has been an increased involvement in communities to control their own crime problems (Rosenbaum, 1988).

Theoretical Implications

The theoretical import of informal social control theory posits that in order for communities to control crime, great emphasis is placed on individuals and citizens groups to form voluntary associations. What develops is that voluntary CBOs become the primary means to exercise informal social control over the community (Rosenbaum, 1988). This normally consists of controlling citizens behavior by encouraging conformity through community educational programs, the development of neighborhood associations, or through such means as surveillance, warnings, and/or other methods used by the community to persuade conformity and community solidarity (Rosenbaum, 1988).

Although this study is not an attempt to test social control theory, we find that when viewed historically, the informal social control paradigm is quite germane to the topic

of community crime prevention. For example, the informal social control paradigm had its origins from the works of Travis Hirschi's theory of social control (Bartol & Bartol, 1989). Hirschi's social control theory posits that juvenile delinquency is the result of a bond formed between the individual and society (Siegel & Senna, 1988). Hirschi maintains that when the bond is broken or becomes extremely tenuous, that the constraints which were placed on the individual by society (such as attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief) are no longer enforceable and the individual is free to violate the law.

Such violations, when extending beyond the network of family control, begin to permeate the entire rubric of the community. In other words, unless the community begins to take some action to control aberrant behavior, it risks the possibility of losing its cohesiveness. To offset the potential lack of cohesiveness, the community becomes actively involved in controlling behavior which has traditionally been a familial responsibility of informal social control.

For example, the element of 'involvement' from Hirschi's model may be apparent when viewed within the context of community activism. That is, the extent of citizen involvement in community crime prevention has ranged from simply being active in reporting suspicious or actual offenses to the more proactive, community role of community-based crime prevention (Latessa & Allen, 1980; National Crime Prevention

Council, 1986, p. 9).

Aside from the fact that only a small minority of citizens are active in CBOs, citizens have proposed a wide variety of community crime prevention strategies (Rosenbaum, 1986). Two specific crime prevention strategies which this study focuses on are commonly referred to as primary and secondary preventative approaches to community crime (Lab, 1988, p. 11). In addition, we have further included discussion of a joint, comprehensive approach to community-based crime prevention.

Primary Prevention

Primary community-based crime prevention programs approach their collective anticrime activities on the belief that criminal behavior is caused by "social problems" (e.g., unemployment, poverty, homelessness, lack of education) (Rosenbaum, 1988). The apparent effect of the "causes of crime" strategies (or what is referred to as primary prevention) are activities that address a variety of social problems or "root causes" of crime. For example, primary prevention measures initiated by both CBOs and individual citizens consist of drug and delinquency prevention programs, recreation/sports programs, and educational and tutoring/mentorship programs, skills training, neighborhood beautification, and others programs designed to divert future criminal behavior (Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a; Lewis, Grant,

& Rosenbaum, 1988; Rosenbaum, 1988).

Lavrakas & Bennett (1988a) state that the primary approach attempts to address macro-structural forces such as population demographics, the economy, educational opportunity, employment, and various moral, religious, and cultural mores, that play a significant role in the level of criminality expected in a society (Currie, 1985). Moreover, micro-structural forces must also take into account the level of the individual and family which must be considered when analyzing crime prevention and criminality. These primary preventive measures are primarily directed at the plight of low-income, minority youth (Johnson, 1987; Lab, 1988; Lavrakas & Bennett, 1988a, p. 223).

Secondary Prevention

In contrast, the secondary preventive strategies (or more commonly referred to as opportunity reduction) incorporated throughout communities, or by individuals specifically, are measures aimed at reducing or minimizing the likelihood that some specific target--person, home, or community--will be victimized. The various opportunity reduction strategies include: neighborhood/block watch programs, security lighting around a neighborhood or community, security locks on homes and businesses, and citizen patrols, just to mention a few (Johnson, 1987; Lab, 1988; Lavrakas & Bennett, 1988a, p. 223; Troyer & Wright, 1985). These strategies are widely known as

"target hardening" because they are designed to eliminate the opportunity of criminals to commit criminal acts, thereby reducing the perceived threat of criminals and criminal activity (Bell & Bell, 1987, p. 47).

The need to reduce the opportunity to commit crime through control and design of the physical environment is an important part of community crime prevention. Moreover, this particular approach treats crime not as a symptom of other factors that must be corrected (such as an increase in educational programs, mentorship programs, and a redistribution of resources (e.g., economic and social)), but as an act that must be prevented. In other words, the environment needs to be structured so that the individual contemplating a criminal act begins to think that there is a good chance of being observed.

Comprehensive Community Crime Prevention

The fact that the two traditional strategies were mentioned separately should not be a testament to their mutual exclusivity. Rather, the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC, 1989) states that community-based crime prevention organizations, throughout the US (and Michigan specifically (NCPC, 1986)), initiate various community crime prevention strategies which incorporate the qualities of both the primary and secondary approaches.

Further, the NCPC (1989) indicates that community crime

prevention evaluations have produced evaluative evidence showing that opportunity reduction strategies reduce crime rate, lessen the fear of crime, and build stronger, more socially cohesive neighborhoods. Although comprehensive programs include both primary and secondary crime prevention strategies, the comprehensive approach has not been widely praised or initiated throughout communities and CBOs (NCPC, 1989). For example, the infrequent social problems (or causes of crime) approach may be due to the fact that few evaluations have produced little evidence as to the effectiveness of these types of community-based, causes of crime strategies (Rosenbaum, 1988, p. 352). Hence, the essence of the NCPC's thesis indicates that there exists many strategies to reduce crime and improve communities. While reduction of opportunities for crime is vital and essential, many communities, especially low-income, minority areas, are neglecting to move beyond immediate opportunity reduction approaches to strengthen their ability to deal with the problems that underlie the crime issue (NCPC, 1989).

Each of the three crime prevention approaches are developed and exhibited within a community surrounding (Johnson, 1987; Weiss, 1987; Podolefsky, 1983). Since the community is not the central unit of analysis in this study, we will briefly discuss the theoretical imports in the defining of community brought out by authors in their analyses of community crime prevention.

Attempts to clearly define community have plagued researchers dating as far back as the nineteenth century (Podolefsky, 1983). Contemporary researchers, through their inquiry into an operational meaning of community as it relates to community crime prevention, have pursued the defining of community under various dimensions. For example, community has been defined in terms of geographic dimensions, community as a social service delivery system (e.g., used as an intermediary between the family and the state bureaucratic structure), and through informal controls (e.g., a sense of solidarity derived from common culture and common social experiences) (Johnson, 1987). In other words, researchers tend to be consistent in the dimensions they examine. Various dimensions in the meaning of community are similar in the context that they focus on physical boundaries and group solidarity (Weiss, 1987), and continue to be characterized based on geographic locales, networks of social relationships, and a sense of solidarity (e.g., shared values and a collective conscience) (Podolefsky, 1983, p. 9). That is, communities may be viewed on a continuum, ranging from the simple geographical area to the more vast group solidarity (Weiss, 1987, p. 115).

Each of these dimensions of community is important in understanding the relationship between community crime prevention and the type of strategy initiated (Podolefsky, 1983). Community has been defined by various authors to try

and determine what motivates a person, or a community, in becoming active in crime prevention programs. Is it fear of crime? Or is it the type of strategy being implemented? Whatever the reason, the literature is inconsistent in its determination of what motivates a community to become active in crime prevention.

For example, Lavrakas and Herz (1982), and Skogan and Maxfield (1981) state that the motivational dynamics to become active in anticrime activities are not because of fear of crime, but rather to extend their community-based volunteerism. Moreover, the participation in community crime prevention activities at the neighborhood level is rarely based on fear of crime, but moreso from a desire to improve the quality of life in their neighborhoods (Lavrakas, 1985). However, in contrast to the above authors, Shernock (1986) states that communities have traditionally become active in crime prevention under a perception that the community is in fear of crime, thereby becoming more active in immediate secondary prevention.

Our focus, however, is not on the fear of crime issue, but rather the types of strategies initiated and whether citizens--the community--become more involved with specific types of strategies (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982). In other words, regardless of the way we define community, the fact remains that certain communities initiate particular types of crime prevention strategies. These varying strategies may result in

an uneven implementation of crime initiatives which may not take into account the dimensional differences between communities (Yin, 1986).

Trojanowicz, Trojanowicz, & Moss (1975, p. 127) suggest that the nature and character of the community must be examined in order to understand community crime prevention activity and the level of citizen involvement in CBOs. Additionally, Roehl and Cook (1984) further indicate that the level of community involvement is also related to characteristics of the community. Specifically, in moderate income communities, citizens were more likely to participate in community activities (p. 12). However, the inverse is that in deteriorating and low-income communities the level of community participation in crime prevention activities is significantly less (Shernock, 1986, p. 216).

The differences in communities and the type of crime prevention strategies employed do not necessarily suggest there exists some inequity. Rather, the differences in both the former and the latter simply require an analysis to focus on why there is variation (Podolefsky, 1983). For example, residents, especially in high crime areas may, at times, tend to assume that crime is an unavoidable condition of urban living thereby simply developing secondary prevention measures (e.g., opportunity reduction) to attack a crime problem (Lavrakas & Bennett, 1989). In other words, if the community agenda centers around opportunity reduction strategies other

crime prevention approaches will not be implemented (Johnson, 1987, p. 13). When, in reality, the community and CBOs may need to actually address some "root causes" of their respective crime problem--such as, skills training, tutoring, educational programs, and other programs targeted at the "root causes" of crime.

The community as a whole, and individual citizens specifically, have traditionally rallied around issues that either directly or indirectly affected their life situation. However, particular emphasis is placed on crime (Rosenbaum, 1988). Take for example, incidences where a community has a high rate of burglaries. Lindsay and McGillis' (1986) research indicates that more citizens are concerned about becoming victims of burglary as opposed to any other crime. This may explain, in part, why people are actively involved in opportunity reduction strategies (e.g., target hardening) as previously mentioned.

What results from such fears is that citizens come together to develop voluntary associations such as neighborhood watch programs and block clubs, to react and offset the increase and continuation of crime. Moreover, the collective responses initiated by CBOs are ordinarily targeted at a community with clearly defined geographical boundaries such as a residential area encompassing a block or neighborhood (Rosenbaum, 1988). However, regardless of the geographical specificity, research indicates that neighborhood

watch programs are not well adapted to high crime neighborhoods (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989).

Other factors which may influence the community to implementing certain types of community crime prevention strategies, if at all, or refrain from establishing a CBO may be attributable to a community's scarce resources (e.g., no community facility, funding, or volunteers) (Lavrakas & Bennett, 1989). Research suggests that high crime and low-income areas (predominately minority communities) typically have fewer CBOs and lower participation in organizations (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989; Skogan, 1989, p. 438). In addition, lower participation tends to occur in communities that are racially and ethnically heterogeneous (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989).

The economic and social inequality (e.g., disproportionately fewer resources) between communities is one way to initially begin identifying the extent of community crime and community-based crime prevention problems. For example, the 'resource poor' are typically those who suffer most from crime and are the least able, or are the least motivated, to 'resist' criminal victimization (Lavrakas & Bennett, 1989). Hence, this lack of motivation may, in part, explain why these types of communities are more frequently active in target hardening strategies (p. 222).

Opportunity reduction strategies are generally less expensive, less complex, and require few resources. That is,

when fewer resources exists in a community, residents are less likely to participate in community crime prevention functions. It is extremely difficult to bring people together when there is no place, no facility, where people can effectively congregate (Lavrakas & Bennett, 1989). Moreover, Shernock (1986, p. 216) also indicates the extraordinary difficulty of organizing and maintaining the involvement of low income groups in community crime prevention as opposed to middle income groups, particularly if the area is public housing or renters communities (Roehl & Cook, 1984, p. 8). Shernock further adds that economic differences are more salient than racial ones in terms of arousing community interest in crime prevention.

Skogan and Maxfield's (1981, p. 236) study found that blacks are more likely than others to report being active in crime prevention organizations when controlling for a rural or urban setting. However, in contrast, Shernock's (1986, pp. 215-216) findings indicate that whites are more involved in crime prevention activities in comparison to non-whites. Shernock explains the disparity in results between the two studies because he was studying a small town/rural area as opposed to an urban area studied by Skogan and Maxfield, where the rates of participation among blacks might be expected to be higher. Overall, the research has been contradictory when examining race as a factor in voluntary association with CBOs (Shernock, 1986, p. 218).

The problem of low-income, high crime communities not having a proportional number of CBOs, or being less active and participatory in community crime prevention, may be explained, in part, through the issue of the symbolic nature of space. In short, a community-based facility symbolizes a sense of permanence and ownership in the community and is paramount in getting people actively involved in community crime prevention--especially youth (Lavrakas & Bennett, 1989).

When communities have been organized around community issues such as crime, unemployment, plant closures, community and economic development, there is considerable evidence that many ongoing CBOs have crime prevention as a major purpose (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982). Yet it is postulated that most of these organizations were not originally formed for crime prevention reasons (Rosenbaum, 1988). Rather, neighborhood and community revitalization and stabilization are the general goals of CBOs as well. However, the exception is that "predominately black neighborhoods were somewhat more organized around crime than their counterpart" (Skogan, 1989, p. 453).

Generally speaking, most citizens have never participated in any form of organized, community-based crime prevention effort (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Rosenbaum, 1986). More specifically, it appears that only about 10 percent of the populace has actually participated in a formal crime prevention program (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982, p. 494). However,

this 10 percent figure should not be considered low, because a vast majority of communities are perceived to be rather safe and secure (p. 494).

The level of community participation may be based on the type of community-based crime prevention strategies initiated. For example, Bennett and Lavrakas (1989) conducted an evaluation of ten CBOs throughout 10 cities. Three of the 10 CBOs that focused almost exclusively on causes of crime strategies (specifically those involving youth) were found to have very low community participation (p. 355).

In contrast, opportunity reduction programs tended to have a higher level of participation than programs with an even emphasis on opportunity reduction and causes of crime strategies (p. 359). Yet, it is acknowledged that greater resources, both financial and human, may be necessary if CBOs are to implement effective comprehensive crime prevention strategies (Rosenbaum, Lewis, & Grant, 1986).

Some of the problems surrounding and influencing the selection of communities and community-based crime prevention organizations have been examined. However, there are specific manifestations that may affect various types of opportunity reduction strategies initiated. For example, Marx (1989) cautions that opportunity reduction strategies such as neighborhood watch, citizen patrols, and the like, may manifest an unintended and inherent suspicion towards one's neighbors with the potential of bringing about racial and

ethnic conflict. Podolefsky & Dubow (1981) warn that certain types of anticrime programs may even affect perceptions of crime in the community. For instance, Lavrakas & Herz (1982) state that community crime prevention activities develop into a CBOs' agenda, based on the perception of crime in a neighborhood.

Another factor that may need to be contemplated when considering community-based crime prevention strategies involves the issue of evaluation. The vast majority of crime prevention programs have not been subjected to any evaluation beyond simple description of the process used in establishing the intervention. Furthermore, the success of that process is measured in terms of the number of meetings held and the level of attendance (Lab, 1988; Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1986; Podolefsky & Dubow, 1981). Many studies in the area of citizen and community crime prevention have not found strong evidence that the community crime prevention efforts achieved their intended goals (i.e., reduced crime and fear of crime, changed attitudes) (Lavrakas & Bennett, 1988a, p. 222; National Crime Prevention Council, 1989, p. 488). Often, strategies which have been more comprehensive and "social problem" oriented, have been viewed as being less effective despite minor evidence to the contrary, and consequently reducing community involvement (Lab, 1988).

Some research suggests that when initiating various community crime prevention strategies, policy-makers and

practitioners may negligently fail to consider the resident opinions on priorities (Bell & Bell, 1987, p. 47; Lavrakas & Bennett, 1988a, p. 231). Hence, attempting to apply previous crime prevention models from other communities, possibly communities totally dissimilar, may result in the residents becoming critical and resentful, thereby resulting in either non-participation or an altering of the intended intervention (Lavrakas & Bennett, 1988a, p. 231).

Implications for the Study of Community Crime Prevention

At the present, we must ask ourselves what are some of the immediate and ultimate concerns that need to be addressed when communities and CBOs approach crime prevention. Thus, we have previously indicated that the neighborhoods which need crime prevention most are the ones most resistent to the implementation of crime prevention.

These "transitional" neighborhoods are not difficult to identify. There are many indicators of community and neighborhood deterioration--reduced/abandoned economic development initiatives, declining property values, both residential and commercial, commercial disinvestment (shutting down and/or closing various retail establishments), an increase in the number of abandoned buildings, a decrease in permanent home-owning families--and a rise in crime, just to mention a few (Roehl & Cook, 1984, p. 14). Each of these may have both immediate or delayed impact. The National Crime

Prevention Council (1989) states that unless we view crime prevention as a community-wide problem, rather than simply focusing on the immediate reduction of opportunity with the root causes remaining unresolved, there will be little long-term change.

In short, unless communities are provided external support from either public or private sources, the type of strategies initiated, if at all, may result in the uneven distribution of strategies (Lewis, Grant, & Rosenbaum, 1988; Roehl & Cook, 1984). Consider, for example, the disproportionate number of low-income communities that initiate opportunity reduction strategies in comparison to more affluent and middle income communities which implement more causes of crime (social problem) strategies. Hagan (1985) states that "the social location and distribution of different types of crime, and the strategies used in their control, can reveal a great deal about how a society is organized, and about whose interests its mode of organization serves" (p. 4).

Until the various levels of government or private foundations provide long-term resources (e.g., financial, technical assistance, and human), communities and CBOs may simply rely on ineffective self-help, resource depleted initiatives, which may only lead to enhancing community suspicion (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989, p. 355; Lavrakas, 1985; Marx, 1989; NCPC, 1989, p. 489).

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research design and methodology used to organize and analyze data in this study. Topics to be discussed consist of 1) brief history of the program under study, 2) the purpose of the research, 3) research questions under study, and 4) methodology of data collection.

Brief History of the Program

In 1988, Governor James Blanchard proposed in his "State of the State Address" the establishment of the Neighborhood Builders Alliance Program. This program was designed to provide support to self-help, CBOs throughout the State of Michigan. The primary purpose of the Neighborhood Builders Alliance Program (NBA) was to provide general funds to community-based, self-help organizations to undertake initiatives to improve the quality of life in their respective communities. The CBOs would be responsible for initiating various programs to improve community-based crime prevention, housing and neighborhood rehabilitation, employment and

training opportunities for chronically unemployed youths, and other initiatives designed to improve conditions in Michigan communities.

The organizational structure of the NBA is towards providing CBOs funds for existing and continuing programs or new and innovative programs, provided that the organizations have established track records (e.g., established over one year and previous success in past projects). Additionally, the procedures in applying for these grants are based on a competitive grant application process. CBOs are required to complete a two step application process: 1) pre-application and 2) general grant application.

Methodology of Data Collection

Sampling Procedure

The data for this study were derived from all organizations that were funded by the Neighborhood Builders Alliance (NBA) in 1988 (N=132). Of the 132 organizations funded, a total of 155 individual projects were initiated. These projects were classified into 1) basic and advanced housing development, 2) social services, 3) general physical neighborhood improvement, and 4) community crime prevention. However, the specific area this research addresses is community-based crime prevention. The other areas were collapsed into a non-crime prevention variable for comparative purposes.

Data for this study were derived from the total population of community-based organizations (CBOs) throughout Michigan that specifically applied and were funded to initiate community-based projects. Moreover, these organizations were required to be community-based, non-profit organizations prior to application.

While the sample of CBOs initiated a diversity of projects, it becomes extremely difficult to specifically isolate CBOs that are formed only for the purpose of crime prevention (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Rosenbaum, 1988; Skogan, 1989); nonetheless, for purposes of this research, we specifically identified projects which were considered to be primarily community crime prevention oriented.

This study required a multistage data collection strategy. First, a content analysis of the NBA files was conducted in order to extract antecedent responses by the CBO grant applicants concerning the type of crime prevention strategy initiated, if any. Secondly, a survey questionnaire was administered in order to extract data from CBO representatives who had the most knowledge of their particular project(s). Each of these methods will be discussed relative to the community crime prevention projects.

The data for this study were gathered from mid September of 1990 until late July of 1991. A survey questionnaire was used to gather information about the CBOs, the geographical area served, and the project. Out of the total of 132 CBOs

funded, 126 (95.4%) were successfully contacted (via telephone and mail). From the 126 that were contacted, 109 (82.5%) interviews were conducted and the respondents subsequently completed the survey questionnaires. However, the remaining 17 questionnaires that were not completed can be attributed to the following reasons: 1) 10 were not completed, 2) 2 refused to participate, 3) 3 were unable to be contacted, and 4) 2 subsequently became ineligible to apply for the grant.

In addition to the survey questionnaire, the 132 NBA grant application files were content analyzed. The 132 grant applications had 155 projects that were funded. The number of CBOs that specifically focused on community crime prevention was 51 (38.6%).

Since the unit of analysis was the project, this enabled the projects to increase to 58, because 4 out of the 51 organizations had two or three crime prevention projects that were funded. Aside from the 58 crime prevention projects under study, there were an additional 64 non-crime prevention projects that were funded within the total 109 valid CBOs studied. This brings the total number of projects under study to 122. Therefore, within the sample of projects, crime prevention accounts for 47.5 percent, whereas the percentage of valid non-crime prevention projects is 52.5 percent.

Content Analysis Method

Content analysis as a methodological tool for the present study was quite germane, due to the fact that this study's recording units were words, paragraphs, and items located in NBA grant application files (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1981, p. 261). Specifically, the content analysis method has provided a systematic analysis in classifying large volumes of communication into a more operational package (Babbie, 1989; Hagan, 1989).

Once it was determined that a project was community crime prevention oriented, as defined throughout the literature (Bennett and Lavrakas, 1989; Skogan, 1989; Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a; Podolefsky & Dubow, 1981; Rosenbaum, 1987), the actual text of the files was then analyzed based on the specific words, paragraphs, and items used by the author of the Grant Application. When it was determined that the author intended the project(s) to be anticrime related, another determination was made to assess whether crime prevention was a major or minor part of the project.

In fact, the systematic analysis of the contents of the NBA files required that the files be objectively analyzed in terms of the type of project(s) that was focusing on community crime prevention. Therefore, the unit of analysis for this study is the community crime prevention project. Community crime prevention was conceptualized in terms of whether the project was considered a primary or secondary strategy.

The determination as to whether a project was community crime prevention oriented and, if so, was it a major or minor part of the project required that data only be extricated from the files that assured the greatest amount of information about a project. This was necessary because of the large number of grant application files located at the NBA. The three primary documents examined were Grant Agreements, Pre-Applications, and Grant Applications. Each document was divided into smaller, more manageable sections. In the case of Grant Agreements, data were collected as identified in 1) the number of projects funded, 2) the title of the project(s), and 3) the project work plan, specifically delineating project goals and objectives. The second document examined was the Pre-Application. This document provided information on the proposed project(s). The CBO grantee was required to briefly describe what the project(s) was to accomplish as well as how the project will affect the neighborhood.

The third document consisted of the Grant Application. This document was particularly pertinent to determining if a project addressed community crime prevention. Two subsections of the Grant Application were analyzed. First, the section titled "Project Profile" because it specifically cross referenced the project title(s) with the Grant Agreement and Pre-Application. This cross referencing was critical to assure that the correct number of projects were identified, and that the correct title corresponded to the "Project

Description" section. Secondly, the "Project Description" section of the Grant Application provided the most valuable information. This section specifically required that the applicant give a descriptive project title as well as a detailed explanation of the project. In other words, this section further required that the applicant clearly indicate how the proposed project would affect the community.

After examining each of these grant application documents, a determination was made as to which category the project(s) would be classified under. That is, a unique sheet focusing on specific categories of crime prevention activities was designed. Then, the researcher would determine the crime prevention activities to be checked, if applicable (see Appendix A).

In summary, each project was first categorized as to whether community crime prevention was a major part, a minor part, or no part of the project. Those projects identified as community crime prevention projects (major or minor) were then further categorized as to whether the crime prevention used a causes of crime approach, an opportunity reduction approach, or a comprehensive (both methods) approach.

Telephone Survey Method

In general, the survey component for this study focused on project type as well as community and organizational characteristics. In February, 1991, 12 CBOs (9%) were asked

to participate in a pretest interview. The purpose of this pretest was to assess questionnaire clarity. The respondents indicated strengths and weaknesses in the questionnaire which helped clarify questions for the final survey questionnaire.

Data extracted from both the telephone survey questionnaire and the content analysis of the grant applications were entered into SPSS/PC+ Information Analysis Computer System for analysis. The chi-square and discriminant analysis were the bivariate and multivariate statistical procedures utilized in this study.

Operationalization of Variables

Crime Prevention Strategies

A crime prevention initiative is defined as any project implemented by a community-based organization in order to develop community cohesion and reduce the community crime rate and fear of crime. The list of crime prevention projects may include the following: 1) Neighborhood/house clean-up and beautification 2) Tutoring/Mentorship 3) Educational programs 4) Recreational area/Sports programs 5) Skills training/Employment (Job Placement) 6) Leadership training 7) Neighborhood Watch Programs 8) Drug abuse prevention programs 9) Security lighting (Street lighting) 10) Security locks 11) Community organizing (Block Club) 12) Delinquency Prevention.

These types of projects were specifically identified based on the literature on community-based crime prevention.

Each of the specific anticrime activities can be categorized as a primary, secondary, or comprehensive strategy. The following operational definitions will more clearly categorize where a particular strategy belongs.

Causes of Crime (Primary) Strategies

Causes of crime strategies may also be referred to as primary prevention strategies. This may be defined as being "proactive and preventive.... It occurs prior to the onset of threat and strives to keep the potential for trouble from even developing" (Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a). This strategy may consist of educational programs, delinquency prevention programs, skills training and employment (job placement), and other programs designed to target a potential person, group, or community prior to actual offenses occurring. A particular strategy initiated by a CBO was assessed as to which category the strategy belongs (Bennett and Lavrakas, 1989; Lab, 1988; Podolefsky, 1983). This was accomplished through a content analysis of the available NBA records.

Opportunity Reduction (Secondary) Strategies

Opportunity reduction strategies may also be referred to as secondary prevention. These were defined as "proactive measures that prevent specific instances of, or opportunity for, potential threat from developing into instances of actual victimization. At this level of prevention the problem

already exists and measures are taken to strengthen the 'resistance' of certain individuals or targets from falling victim" (Lavrakas and Bennett, 1988a). This approach may consist of such measures as developing neighborhood watch programs, installing neighborhood security lighting and security locks, community organizing, citizen patrols, and other similar activities.

Comprehensive Strategy

Comprehensive strategies include projects which have crime prevention strategies from both causes of crime and opportunity reduction approaches. This consists of projects specifically identified from the content analysis as having both types of strategies.

Crime Prevention as a Major Part of Project

Specifically, when particular words such as "crime prevention" or "anticrime" were used, as well as terminology which would indicate that a project was designated as a crime prevention approach to the community, this would be considered a major part of the project. Such phrases as "we need to reduce crime in our community" would suffice to qualify as major.

Crime Prevention as a Minor Part of Project

When the text of the grant application did not clearly define its purpose as crime prevention. That is, when phrases such as "crime is a problem in the community" or "there are crack houses throughout our community." These were considered minor due to the fact that the specific purpose of the project(s) did not indicate say it was attempting to reduce crime in the community.

Community

The community was defined in terms of the predictor (independent) variables under study such as geographical area served, perceptions of crime, and racial composition of the community. These variables were operationalized based on the responses provided by the respondent to the survey questionnaire.

The geographical area served by CBOs consisted of 1) county or larger region; 2) area smaller than a county but larger than a municipality or other local government; 3) whole city, township or village; 4) city sub-area with more than 25,000 people; 5) city sub-area with fewer than 25,000 people but more than 5,000; and 6) city sub-area with fewer than 5,000). Perceptions of crime throughout the community are based on a 6 point scale where respondents indicated whether crime in the community was 1) extremely high; 2) high; 3) slightly above average; 4) about average; 5) slightly below

average; or 6) low. The third community variable asks for the highest racial group in the community. The responses consisted of 1) White; 2) African American; 3) Native American; 4) Hispanic; 5) Asian; 6) other.

Community-Based Organizations

The variables used to identify community-based organizational characteristics were obtained from the survey questionnaire. The questions asked for the number of full-time paid staff, the number of volunteers actively participating in projects the organization sponsors, the year the organization was established, and the type of organization initiating the project(s). The first three predictor variables were open-ended, thereby simply requiring a numerical response. However, the variable focusing on the organizational type required that the respondent indicate one of the following responses: 1) ambulance/fire or some other municipal organization; 2) business association; 3) community action agency; 4) community development corporation; 5) historic preservation organization; 6) housing development corporation; 7) human service agency; 8) Native American tribe; 9) neighborhood association; 10) religious organization; and 11) other.

Limitations

The major limitation of this study was that it only identified those CBOs that were funded for the first year of the NBA grant program. If this study could have examined the funded CBOs over a second or third year period, we would be more likely to identify project variance between CBOs with crime and non-crime prevention projects as well as CBOs with the various types of crime prevention strategies. Another limitation consists of the nonrepresentative sample of CBOs. If the sample was randomly selected, the inferences made would be more representative of the population of CBOs initiating community crime prevention projects. Finally, this study was a one-shot attempt at measuring certain variables differently. It is necessary to continue further research in this area in order to identify specific community and CBO characteristics that may influence the type of crime prevention projects that are initiated.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Presented in this chapter are the principal findings of the data from this study, which addresses two aspects of community crime prevention. The first examines the differences between community-based organizations (CBOs) initiating crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects. The distinctions between these projects was measured by examining the characteristics of the community and of the CBO respectively. Community characteristics such as the geographical area served by CBOs, perceptions of crime, and race are analyzed. In addition, characteristics of the CBOs included such measures as the number of full-time paid staff, number of volunteers, year the organization was established, and the specific organization type.

The second part, and though somewhat more critical aspect of this study, examines the relationship between the community and organizational variables, as mentioned, to the specific type of crime prevention strategy initiated. More specifically, this study examines whether community and CBO characteristics have a significant influence on a particular

type of crime prevention strategy. Both parts of this study measure community and organizational characteristics through the use of descriptive, cross-tabulation, chi-square (X^2) test of significance, and confirmatory discriminant analysis statistics. Furthermore, the statistical significance level was set at $p < 0.05$ for this study.

Crime Prevention and Non-crime Prevention Projects

Table 1 presents the variables for the community characteristics under study. The community variables consists of 1) race, 2) geographical area served by CBOs, and 3) perceptions of crime by the community.

Table 1: Characteristics of Communities Under Study

CHARACTERISTICS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE	CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE
RACE			
Caucasian	68	55.7	56.2
African American	47	38.5	95.0
Native American	1	.8	95.9
Hispanic	4	3.3	99.2
Other	1	.8	100.0
GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED			
County or Larger Region	33	27.0	27.0
Area Smaller than a County but Larger than a Municipality or Other Local Government	9	7.4	34.4
Whole City, Township, or Village	30	24.6	59.0
City Sub-area with 25,000 or More People	17	13.9	73.0
City Sub-area with Fewer than 25,000 People but with at Least 5,000 People	21	17.2	90.2
City Sub-area with Fewer than 5,000 People	12	9.8	100.0
PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME			
Extremely High	13	10.7	11.0
High	37	30.3	42.4
Slightly Above Average	28	23.0	66.1
About Average	18	14.8	81.4
Slightly Below Average	9	7.4	89.0
Low	13	10.7	100.0

The specific values associated with the variables, as indicated in Table 1, were collapsed to smaller, more manageable clusters. In short, the data were collapsed to assure that the responses were not disproportionately skewed.

For example, race was dichotomized into caucasian and minority categories, the latter being a collapsed category including African American, Native American, Hispanic, Asian, and other. In terms of the racial composition of the communities, the responses indicate that the valid percentage consists of 56.2 percent (N=68) being caucasian and 43.4 percent (N=53) being minority communities.

In addition to the variable of race being dichotomized, the responses to the geographical area and the perceptions of crime variables were further collapsed. For instance, the first two responses to the geographical variable consisted of 1) county or larger region and 2) area smaller than a county but larger than a municipality or other local government. These specific values were categorized as an area larger than a municipality. The combined percentages indicate that thirty-four percent (N=42) of the CBOs served a geographical area larger than a municipality (see Table 2).

The third category under geographical area consisted of 3) whole city, township, or village. This category was not redefined. The responses to this category denoted that approximately twenty-five percent (N=30) of the CBOs provide service to a community the size of a whole city, township, or

village (see Table 2).

The three remaining geographic categories are defined as 4) city sub-area with more than 25,000 people, 5) city sub-area with fewer than 25,000 people but more than 5,000, and 6) city sub-area with fewer than 5,000 people. These last three categories were collapsed and redefined as a city sub-area. Interestingly, although not surprising, forty-one percent (N=50) of the CBO respondents indicated that the geographical area served is a city sub-area. This was to be expected since CBOs are traditionally formed to serve smaller communities and neighborhood areas.

Table 2: Characteristics of the Geographical Area Served

Geographical Area	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Area Larger than A Municipality	42	34.4	34.4
Whole City, Township, or Village	30	24.6	59.0
City Sub-Area	50	41.0	100.0

Note: Number of projects (N) equal 122.

Before comparing and distinguishing between crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects, we must further identify the CBO characteristics. The four CBO variables consists of 1) the number of full-time paid staff, 2) the number of volunteers, 3) year the CBO was established, and 4) the specific type of CBO.

Table 3 identifies the specific categories and ranges of each CBO variable. However, the fourth variable (e.g., type of CBO) has been collapsed into five categories: 1) Community Action Agency, 2) Community Development Corporation, 3) Human Service Agency, 4) Neighborhood Association/Block Club, and 5) Other. The category defined as 'other' consists of such CBOs as Municipal Service Organizations (e.g., ambulance, fire, etc.), Business Associations, Historical Preservation Organization, Housing Development Corporations, Native American Tribes, and Religious Organizations. The responses to such CBOs that were categorized as other were unequally dispersed and represented such small samples, thereby creating the need to collapse them into the category of other.

In brief, some findings of this section represent only a small part of the overall CBO characteristics. For instance, the greatest number of projects, consisting of both crime prevention and non-crime prevention, have no full-time paid staff. More specifically, 36 out of the 122 projects account for 29.5 percent of the projects that maintain no full-time paid staff, whereas the largest number of full-time paid

staff, ranging from 25 to 250, consists of 15 projects or 12.3 percent (see Table 3). However, the 29.5 percent of CBOs with no full-time paid staff should not be surprising. Since CBOs are more oriented towards local neighborhood needs (e.g., beautification), their main economic sustenance lies in the area of grants and donations. No hard, permanent funds are consistent enough to afford paying full-time staff. Hence, it is no wonder that the greatest percentage of projects CBOs initiate have no full-time paid staff.

In viewing the data on the number of volunteers, we can acknowledge that the numbers are relatively equally distributed with no apparent significant differences (see Table 3). Moreover, the frequency data appears to also reflect a rather consistent proportionality between such CBO variables as the year the CBO was established and the type of CBO. However, the only real noticeable difference between the type of CBO is brought out when comparing human service CBOs to their respective counterparts. Aside from the category of 'other' which holds 34.4 percent of various CBOs, the human service classification exhibits the next highest with 21.3 percent (N=26) within this category (see Table 3).

Table 3: Characteristics of Community-Based Organizations Under Study

CHARACTERISTICS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE	CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE
FULL-TIME PAID STAFF			
0	36	29.5	29.5
1-2	25	20.5	50.0
3-7	27	22.1	72.1
8-19	19	15.6	87.7
25-250	15	12.3	100.0
NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS*			
2-20	32	26.2	26.7
22-50	28	23.0	50.0
55-200	29	23.8	74.2
207-3492	31	25.4	100.0
YEAR ORGANIZATION ESTABLISHED*			
1884-1969	39	32.0	32.5
1970-1979	37	30.3	63.3
1980-1989	44	36.1	100.0
TYPE OF ORGANIZATION*			
Community Action Agency	13	10.7	10.8
Community Development Corporation	17	13.9	25.0
Human Service Agency	26	21.3	45.8
Neighborhood Association/ Block Club	22	18.0	65.0
Other	42	34.4	100.0

Note: * Missing data account for why some of the frequencies do not add up to 122 projects.

Now that we have briefly touched upon some of the overall characteristics of CBOs without distinguishing between crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects, we can move our attention to the first part of this study. That is, examining the relationship between community and CBO characteristics as they relate to CBOs initiating crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects.

Community Characteristics

Initially, we developed our analysis by dichotomizing CBOs that have and have not initiated crime prevention projects. From the 109 CBOs establishing crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects (N=122), the data indicate that 47.5 percent (N=58) of the projects are either primary, secondary, or comprehensive crime prevention in nature. In contrast, 52.5 percent (N=64) consists of non-crime prevention projects. Hence, it becomes obvious that from the 122 projects identified that the number of crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects are distributed relatively equally.

Further, upon examining geographical area served by CBOs, no significant differences appears to exist between CBOs initiating crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects. A chi-square (X^2) significance test was used to determine whether a relationship existed between the geographical area served by CBOs and crime prevention and non-crime prevention

projects (see Table 4). That is, the obtained $X^2 = 4.55$ was not significant.

Table 4: Number and Percentage of Community-Based Organizations Initiating Crime Prevention and Non-Crime Prevention Projects by Geographical Area Served

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA SERVED	CRIME PREVENTION (N=58)		NON-CRIME PREVENTION (N=64)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Area Larger than a Municipality	16	38.1	26	61.9
Whole City, Township, or Village	19	63.4	11	36.7
City Sub-Area	23	46.0	27	54.0

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 percent, due to rounding error. $X^2 = 4.55$, $p = .103$

Although there exists no statistically significant difference between the geographical area served by CBOs and the initiation of a crime or non-crime prevention project, the frequency in certain categories are noticeably different. For example, between the crime and non-crime prevention projects, from those that indicated they served an area larger than a municipality, 61.9 percent (N=26) were non-crime related projects. In contrast, 63.3 percent (N=19) of the CBOs that serve a geographical area such as a whole city, township, or village is attributable to CBOs that initiated crime prevention projects.

Another issue under study is the perception of crime throughout the community. Respondents were asked how do people in their organization and the community it serves perceive crime in their area. As indicated in Table 5, even though the responses were collapsed into the categories of 'high,' 'moderate,' and 'low,' no statistically significant relationship (at the 0.05 level) was found between the perception of crime in the community and the initiation of crime and non-crime activities.

Table 5: Number and Percentage of Community-Based Organizations Initiating Crime Prevention and Non-Crime Prevention Projects by Perception of Crime

PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME	CRIME PREVENTION (N=58)		NON-CRIME PREVENTION (N=64)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
High	28	54.0	22	44.0
Moderate	14	50.0	14	50.0
Low	14	35.0	26	65.0

Note: Frequency and percentages may not equal 100 percent, due to missing data. $X^2 = 4.025$, df = 2, p = .1336

However, it is still interesting to note that from those CBOs indicating that crime in the community is high, 54 percent (N=28) had initiated a crime prevention project. Whereas those CBOs perceiving community crime rate to be low, 65 percent (N=26) were CBOs that were instituting non-crime related activities (see Table 5). Unfortunately, since the

sample size in this study is relatively small, it becomes much more difficult to isolate a statistically significant relationship between such variables as the perception of crime and the initiation of a crime or non-crime related activity.

The third community variable under study is the issue of race. As indicated in Table 6, race is not statistically significant when differentiating between crime and non-crime related activities. Thus, there appears to be no relationship between race and the initiation of a crime and non-crime prevention program at the probability level of 0.05 (see Table 6).

Table 6: Number and Percentage of Community-Based Organizations Initiating Crime Prevention and Non-Crime Prevention Projects by Race

RACE	CRIME PREVENTION (N=58)		NON-CRIME PREVENTION (N=64)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Caucasian	31	45.6	37	54.4
Minority	26	49.0	27	50.9

Note: Frequency and percentages may not equal 100 percent, due to missing data. $X^2 = .1438$, df = 1, p = .7045

Reviewing Table 6 indicates that race, as dichotomized into caucasian and minority, is relatively proportionally distributed between CBOs with crime prevention and non-crime prevention activities. Although there exist no statistically significant relationship between race and the distinction

between crime and non-crime related projects, the percentages appear to reflect the fact that minorities account for a greater number of crime prevention projects. Moreover, it is interesting to note that Lavrakas & Herz's (1982) research further indicate that minorities, specifically African Americans, have a higher level of participation in crime prevention projects than caucasians. The high level of participation by minorities may reflect the fact that they account for a greater percentage of crime prevention projects in their communities (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Shernock, 1986).

In sum, as we examined responses to community characteristics, crime prevention projects were not found to differ significantly from non-crime prevention projects on those items concerning the geographical area served by CBOs, perceptions of crime by the community, or the racial composition of the community. Although the findings in this section are not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, one should not avoid the fact that noticeable differences may still exist in terms of the raw frequency and percentage responses. However, to further determine whether crime and non-crime prevention projects differ in certain characteristics, we can redirect our attention to various CBO characteristics.

Community-Based Organization Characteristics

The CBO characteristics are the next variables to be discussed. This section attempts to determine whether significant relationships exists between crime and non-crime related projects based on certain CBO characteristics. The following factors are examined: 1) number of full-time paid staff, 2) number of volunteers, 3) year the CBO was established, and 4) the type of CBO.

Table 7 provides the frequency and percentage of the number of full-time paid staff for projects that are both crime and non-crime related. As shown in Table 7, there does not appear to exist any noticeable difference between crime and non-crime related projects. However, it is interesting to note that CBOs which maintained full-time paid staff, ranging from 25 to 250, account for 60 percent (N=9) of the projects within this category that are crime prevention oriented.

A chi-square test of significance failed to reveal any significant difference between crime and non-crime prevention projects ($p = .6097$) (see Table 7). Thus, based on this data, it appears that the number of full-time paid staff is not a good predictor for crime prevention projects.

Table 7: Number and Percentage of Community-Based Organizations Initiating Crime Prevention and Non-Crime Prevention Projects by Number of Full-Time Paid Staff

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME PAID STAFF	CRIME PREVENTION (N=58)		NON-CRIME PREVENTION (N=64)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
0	15	41.7	21	58.3
1-2	10	40.0	15	60.0
3-7	15	45.5	12	44.4
8-19	9	47.4	10	52.6
25-250	9	60.0	6	40.0

Note: The percentages are calculated between participants and nonparticipants. Percentages, when calculated across, may not total 100 percent, due to rounding error. $X^2 = 2.6974$, df = 4, p = .6097

The number of volunteers that are active in projects initiated by CBOs was examined. Table 8 indicates that non-crime prevention projects have, by and large, a higher percentage of volunteers which range between 2 and 200, and which account for approximately 54 percent of the projects. However, from those CBOs which have active volunteers, ranging from 201 to 3500, crime prevention projects account for 51.6 percent in this range. Therefore, it would seem that a greater number of volunteers gravitate towards crime prevention projects.

Table 8: Number and Percentage of Community-Based Organizations Initiating Crime Prevention and Non-Crime Prevention Projects by Number of Volunteers

NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS	CRIME PREVENTION (N=58)		NON-CRIME PREVENTION (N=64)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
2-20	15	46.9	17	53.1
21-50	12	42.9	16	57.1
51-200	14	48.3	15	51.7
201-3500	16	51.6	15	48.4

Note: Frequencies and percentages may not be exact, due to missing data. A chi-square test of significance was performed to try and determine whether a relationship existed between the number of volunteers and crime and non-crime prevention projects ($X^2 = .4643$, df = 3, p = .9267).

Reviewing Table 8 indicates that the greatest number of people feel the need to volunteer for crime prevention projects respectively, as opposed to the various types of non-

crime related projects. However, the chi-square statistical test revealed an alpha probability level greater than 0.05 (see Table 8).

Thus, it appears that no inferences can be drawn concerning the number of volunteers and the initiation of crime prevention projects. Yet, these findings are somewhat similar to Shernock's (1986) research. Shernock found no significant difference between people participating in crime prevention projects and people that were not involved in crime prevention projects.

To further attempt to identify factors which may affect the decision to implement crime and non-crime prevention projects, the year the CBO was established and the particular type of CBO were examined. Table 9 is a cross-tabulation between the year a CBO was established and whether the CBO initiates crime or non-crime related activities. No significant relationship was found between the year a CBO was established and the CBOs crime or non-crime related projects. However, CBOs that were established in 1969 or before tend to be less likely to establish crime projects (see Table 9).

This may lead one to conclude CBOs that initiated crime prevention projects probably did not come into existence until the early 1970's when the crime rate significantly increased. These data support that conclusion in that 56.8 percent of the CBOs that were established between 1970 and 1979 are focusing on crime prevention projects.

Table 9: Cross-tabulation of the Year the CBO was Established by Crime and Non-crime Prevention Projects

Year CBO Est.	Crime Prev.	Non-crime Prev.	Row Total
1969 or before	16 41.0	23 59.0	39 32.5
1970 to 1979	21 56.8	16 43.2	37 30.8
1980 to 1989	21 47.7	23 52.3	44 36.7
Column Total	58 48.3	62 51.7	120 100.0

Chi-Square	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
1.8918	2	.3883

NOTE: Frequency does not total 122 projects due to missing data.

The type of CBO was also examined. The data are illustrated in Table 10. By use of a chi-square significance test, there appears to be no statistically significant relationship at the $p < .05$ level. However, the percentages in Table 10 indicate that CBOs which classified themselves as community action agencies accounted for 61.5 percent of the non-crime related projects, whereas CBOs which categorized themselves as neighborhood associations accounted for 63.6 percent of the crime prevention projects.

Table 10: Cross-tabulation of the Type of CBO by Crime and Non-crime Prevention Projects

Type of CBO	Crime Prev.	Non-crime Prev.	Row Total
Community Action Agen.	5 38.5	8 61.5	13 10.8
Community Devel. Corp.	10 58.8	7 41.2	17 14.2
Human Service Agency	12 46.2	14 53.8	26 21.7
Neighborhood Assoc./ Block Club	14 63.6	8 36.4	22 18.3
Other	16 38.1	26 61.9	42 35.0
Column Total	58 48.3	62 51.7	120 100.0

Chi-Square	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
5.1056	4	.2766

NOTE: Frequency does not total 122 projects due to missing data.

From these results, one might speculate that community action agencies tend to encompass a much broader area thereby initiating a variety of projects. Therefore, less emphasis is placed on developing crime prevention projects because they encompass a vast geographical area. This is consistent with the findings relating type of project to geographic area served. On the other hand, it may also be speculated that neighborhood associations/block clubs focus on smaller geographical areas, thereby developing projects which tend to

be more oriented towards crime related issues.

To more thoroughly determine whether the previous community and CBO variables are valid measures to consider for distinguishing between the dichotomous criterion variables of crime and non-crime prevention projects, confirmatory discriminant analysis was utilized.

Discriminant analysis was utilized to determine whether the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers for projects can successfully predict group membership into either the category of CBOs that initiate crime prevention projects or CBOs with non-crime prevention projects. Out of the 122 projects under study, 120 unweighted cases will be used in this analysis because two cases had at least one missing discriminating variable.

The descriptive information from the discriminant analysis indicates that CBOs with crime prevention projects have group means of 18.57 for the number of full-time paid staff and 257.42 for the number of volunteers respectively. In addition, the standard deviation for both predictor variables were 42.17 for the number of full-time staff and 548.0 for the number of volunteers, while the CBOs with non-crime preventions projects had group means of 8.69 (SD = 19.83) for the number of full-time paid staff and 172.03 (SD = 302.05) for the number of volunteers for the non-crime projects.

The two-group discriminant analysis involving the two predictor variables of the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers yielded a nonstatistically significant F ratios (see Table 11).

Table 11: F test of the Discriminant Function Analysis for Predicted Group Membership between Crime Prevention and Non-crime Prevention Projects.

Predictor Variables	F ratio	Significance
Full-time Paid Staff	2.78	.0981
Number of Volunteers	1.14	.2867

Note: The F test was employed to determine the level of significance for the discriminant equation. The equation was not significant at the 0.05 level. Degrees of Freedom were equal to 1 and 118.

In addition, the classification results yield the percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified at 53.33 percent (see Table 12). Hence, it appears that the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers are not good predictors of whether a CBO is more oriented towards crime prevention or non-crime prevention. However, Table 12 indicates that 79.4 percent of the cases that are considered non-crime prevention are correctly classified per the predictor variables. Therefore, one may speculate that the predictor variables are better predictors for non-crime prevention projects.

Table 12: Prediction Results of the Confirmatory Discriminant Analysis using Crime Prevention and Non-crime Prevention Projects.

		Predicted Group Membership	
Criterion Variables	No. of Cases	Group 1 Crime Prevention	Group 2 Non-crime Prevention
Crime Prev.	57	14 (24.6%)	43 (75.4%)
Non-crime Pre.	63	13 (20.6%)	50 (79.4%)

Note: Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 53.33% A discriminant analysis was employed predicting crime prevention projects and non-crime prevention projects as dichotomous variable by 2 different, continuous variables: 1) Full-time paid staff, 2) Number of volunteers.

Finally, this section has attempted to focused upon independent variable such as 1) geographical area served by CBOs, 2) perceptions of crime by the community, 3) racial composition of the community, 4) the number of full-time paid staff, 5) the number of volunteers, 6) the year the CBO was established, and 7) the specific type of CBO. None of these factors were statistically significant in terms of their relationship to either crime or non-crime prevention projects. Rather, the only real noticeable differences were found in observing the percentage differences that would lend themselves to distinguishing between crime and non-crime prevention projects. Thus, it continues to be difficult to find factors that distinguishes between crime and non-crime prevention projects.

Community Crime Prevention Strategies: Primary, Secondary, and Comprehensive

This section of the analysis focuses more specifically on the types of crime prevention strategies, whereas the previous section primarily addressed the differences in community and CBO characteristics. This section examines the specific types of crime prevention strategies initiated throughout communities in general and CBOs specifically. In addition, the various types of community crime prevention activities such as primary, secondary, and comprehensive, are analyzed in terms of their relationship to community and CBO characteristics.

Table 13 provides a clear picture of the frequencies and percentages of the various community-based crime prevention activities. Out of the 122 projects under study, 58 (47.5%) are crime prevention. The primary prevention strategies account for 30.3 percent of the total 122 projects, whereas those activities classified as secondary prevention account for 11.5 percent and comprehensive preventative strategies consist of 5.7 percent.

Table 13: Crime Prevention Strategies Initiated by Community-Based Organizations

ACTIVITY	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
PRIMARY PREVENTION	37	30.3
Drug Abuse Prevention	7	5.7
Delinquency Prevention	6	4.9
Recreation/Sports Program	7	5.7
Tutoring/Mentorship	9	7.9
Educational Program	10	8.1
Leadership Training	1	.8
Skills Training	6	4.9
Neighborhood Cleanup/ Beautification	19	15.6
Other	24	19.6
SECONDARY PREVENTION	14	11.5
Neighborhood Watch	7	5.7
Security Lighting	9	7.4
Security Locks	5	4.1
Citizen Patrols	3	2.5
Community Organizing	2	1.6
Other	10	8.1
COMPREHENSIVE	7	5.7

NOTE: The specific crime prevention activity will not equal the major category the activity falls within. This is due to the fact that individual activities were either unique to one project or multiple activities existed within one or more projects initiated by a CBO grantee. More specifically, a project may have had a combination of crime prevention activities that were either a primary or secondary strategy. Hence, the activities are not necessarily mutually exclusive, except for the three general crime prevention strategies.

per

sec

com

to

att

dir

(Na

Alt

fin

pri

for

are

tha

str

inc

cha

typ

In terms of the 58 crime prevention projects, 63.8 percent (N=37) were primary, 24.1 percent (N=14) utilized a secondary approach, while 12.1 percent (N=7) implemented comprehensive crime prevention strategies. It's interesting to note that some of the literature indicated that little attention, through both evaluation and initiation, was directed towards primary and comprehensive strategies (National Crime Prevention Council, 1989; Rosenbaum, 1988). Although, in terms of this study, the literature and these findings appear inconsistent with one another. That is, the primary prevention strategies noted in this research account for 63.8 percent of the total crime projects. These findings are inconsistent with past research, which tends to indicate that secondary crime prevention strategies are more prevalent.

To obtain a more thorough understanding of the type of strategies initiated, community and CBO characteristics were included. The following data represent community and CBO characteristics that may influence the initiation of various types of crime prevention strategies.

Community Characteristics

Table 14 shows the results of a cross-tabulation of the geographical area served by CBOs and the specific types of crime prevention initiatives. These data indicate no significant relationship ($X^2 = 4.4830$).

Yet there exists some observed percentage differences within and between strategies. Note, for instance, that 27.6 percent (N=16) of the CBO respondents identified an area larger than a municipality. Within this group, 81.3 percent (N=13) where involved in primary crime prevention strategies. At the same time, 36.8 percent (N=7) fell within the categories of both 'whole city, township, or village' and secondary crime prevention. Although not significant, these percentages seem to reflect a noticeable difference between primary and secondary strategies in terms of the geographical area served.

Table 14: Cross-Tabulation of Geographic Area Served by Project Classification

Geographical Area Served	Primary	Secondary	Comprehensive	Row Total
Larger than a Municipality	13 81.3	2 12.5	1 6.3	16 27.6
Whole City, Township, or Village	9 47.4	7 36.8	3 15.8	19 32.8
City Sub-area	15 65.2	5 21.7	3 13.0	23 39.7
Column Total	37 63.8	14 21.7	7 12.1	58 100.0

Chi-Square	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.<5
4.48306	4	.3446	1.931	5 of 9 (55.6%)

Note: Data not significant at the 0.05 alpha level.

These findings appear somewhat dissimilar to Lavrakas & Herz's (1982) research which suggests CBOs respond to the salient issues of crime at a much smaller level such as the suburbs as opposed to a larger area of the city. However, the difference between the present study and Lavrakas & Herz's research may be attributable to how variables were operationalized between both studies, as well as the specific population chosen for this research.

The perception of crime in the community is another characteristic this study examined. Here an attempt is made to determine whether the type of crime prevention strategy is dependent on the community's perception of crime throughout

their neighborhood.

Table 15 presents the findings of a cross-tabulation of the perception of crime by the community and project classification. A chi-square test of significance indicates an alpha level greater than 0.05 ($p = .1202$). That is, no significant relationship exists between perceptions of crime and project classification. However, when controlling for race, the data indicated that when the caucasian community perceives crime as high, they are more like to initiate secondary strategies. On the other hand, when the minority community perceives crime as high, they, however, are more apt to initiate a primary preventive strategy (table not available). Moreover, these data are not significant at an alpha level less than 0.05.

Tabl

Pe
of

HI

M

I

-

-

.

.

]

]

]

p

p

p

h

co

wh

sec

She

Table 15: Cross-Tabulation of Perception of Crime by Project Classification

Perceptions of Crime	Primary	Secondary	Comprehensive	Row Total
HIGH	16 57.1	10 35.7	2 7.1	28 50.0
MODERATE	9 64.3	1 7.1	4 28.6	14 25.0
LOW	10 71.4	3 21.4	1 7.1	14 25.0
Column Total	35 62.5	14 25.0	7 12.5	56 100.0

Chi-Square	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.<5
7.31429	4	.1202	1.750	5 of 9 (55.6%)

Note: N will not equal 58 due to missing data.

Although the overall findings were not significant, 50 percent (N=28) of the respondents which initiate crime prevention projects perceived crime in their community as high. From those projects which were classified as primary prevention, 71.4 percent (N=10) perceived crime as low. 35.7 percent (N=10) of the CBOs that were initiating secondary prevention projects perceived their community crime rate to be high (see Table 15). These finding are, more or less, consistent with the literature that states that communities which tend to perceive crime as high are more like to initiate secondary prevention strategies (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Shernock, 1986).

The racial composition of the community was another characteristic analyzed. As stated previously, race was dichotomized to consist of caucasian and minority. These predictor variables were used to assess whether a type of crime prevention strategy initiated by CBOs is dependent on the racial composition of the community.

Lavrakas & Herz (1982) indicate that minorities (specifically African Americans), are more apt to employ certain opportunity reduction strategies. However, the findings in this study do not support such a conclusion (possibly due to dissimilar measuring techniques). That is, as indicated in Table 16, there exists no significant relationship. Rather, these findings suggest primary and secondary prevention programs are relatively equally distributed between both types of racial communities and the type of strategy instituted.

The only real noticeable exceptions exist when viewing the marginal percentage differences. Although caucasian communities tend to show a higher percentage in primary and secondary strategies, minority communities are almost three times more likely to have a comprehensive strategy (see Table 16). Yet, these differences were not significant.

Table 16: Cross-Tabulation of Racial Composition of the Community by Project Classification

RACE	Primary	Secondary	Comprehensive	Row Total
CAUCASIAN	20 64.5	9 29.0	2 6.5	31 54.4
MINORITY	16 61.5	5 19.2	5 19.2	26 45.6
Column Total	36 63.2	14 24.6	7 12.3	57 100.0

Chi-Square	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.<5
2.45330	2	.2933	3.193	2 of 6 (33.3%)

Note: N will not equal 58 due to missing data.

Community-Based Organization Characteristics

This last section focuses on CBO characteristics. The first CBO characteristic examined is the number of full-time paid staff. The approach used to analyze the relationship between the number of full-time paid staff and the type of crime prevention activity consists of a cross-tabulation and a chi-square significance test. The results were not significant at the 0.05 alpha level (see Table 17).

However, the percentages from the observed data in the cross-tabulation appear to indicate, for the most part, that primary prevention strategies account for the greatest number of full-time staff. More specifically, from the respondents who indicated they have between 0 to 7 paid staff, the data show that almost 68 percent fall within the category of CBOs that are involved in primary prevention strategies (see Table 17).

Table 17: Cross-Tabulation of Full-Time Paid Staff by Project Classification

Full-time Paid Staff	Primary	Secondary	Comprehensive	Row Total
0	10 66.7	3 20.0	2 13.3	15 25.9
1 to 2	7 70.0	1 10.1	2 20.0	10 17.2
3 to 7	10 66.7	4 26.4	1 6.7	15 25.9
8 to 19	4 44.4	4 44.4	1 11.1	9 15.5
25 to 250	6 66.7	2 22.2	1 11.1	9 15.5
Column Total	37 63.8	14 24.1	7 12.1	58 100.0

Chi-Square	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.<5
4.08190	8	.8497	1.086	10 of 15 (66.7%)

The second CBO characteristic to consider involves the number of volunteers that are active in projects initiated by community organizations. Table 18 illustrates a cross-tabulation of the number of volunteers by project classification. A chi-square significance test was used to determine if a relationship exists between the number of volunteers and the type of crime prevention strategy initiated by CBOs. The data yields an alpha level of .5152 thereby indicating a nonstatistically significant relationship (see Table 18).

Table 18: Cross-Tabulation of Number of Volunteers by Project Classification

Number of Volunteers	Primary	Secondary	Comprehensive	Row Total
2 to 20	9 60.0	5 33.3	1 6.7	15 26.3
21 to 50	8 66.7	2 16.7	2 16.7	12 21.1
51 to 200	11 78.6	1 7.1	2 14.2	14 24.6
201 to 3500	8 50.0	6 37.5	2 12.5	16 28.1
Column Total	36 63.2	14 24.6	7 12.3	57 100.0

Chi-Square	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.<5
5.22608	6	.5152	1.474	8 of 12 (66.7%)

Note: N will not equal 58 due to missing data.

However, aside from the significance level indicated in Table 18, the percentages continue to appear to be overly represented for those CBOs that initiate primary preventive strategies. These data, although not designed to challenge the validity of some researchers per se, indirectly contradict Bennett & Lavrakas' (1989) research that indicated volunteers are more likely to be active in opportunity reduction (secondary) strategies.

The third area under study examines the year a CBO was established by project classification. The literature in this particular area is rather scarce. Therefore, it becomes difficult to assess whether the findings in the present study are consistent or, for that matter, inconsistent with those authors whose examining this type of phenomena. Whatever the case, these findings are reflected in Table 19.

To test if a relationship exists between the forementioned variables, a chi-square significance test was conducted. The findings were not significant at the 0.05 alpha level. Moreover, further analysis of the cross-tabulation reveals that CBOs that initiated primary prevention strategies tend to have been established before CBOs that were conducting secondary strategies. However, note that these findings become rather difficult to analyze, especially since CBOs that have conducted primary strategies are, again, overly represented in the category of primary.

Table 19: Cross-Tabulation of Year of Organization's Establishment by Project Classification

Year of Establishment	Primary	Secondary	Comprehensive	Row Total
1969 or Earlier	11 68.8	3 18.8	2 12.5	16 27.6
1970-1979	12 57.1	8 38.1	1 4.8	21 36.2
1980-1989	14 66.7	3 14.3	4 19.0	21 36.2
Column Total	37 63.8	14 24.1	7 12.1	58 100.0

Chi-Square	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.<5
4.74502	4	.3145	1.931	4 of 9 (44.4%)

The last CBO characteristic to be examined centers around the type of CBO. To determine whether a relationship existed between the type of CBO and the type of crime prevention program, a chi-square statistical significance test was performed (see Table 20). No statistically significant findings were obtained at or below an alpha level of 0.05. Rather, the only real noticeable differences lie in the proportional responses indicated by each cell. For instance, aside from the category of 'other,' CBOs who classified themselves as human service agencies tended to be most likely to initiate primary prevention activities. This is not surprising since most human service agencies tend to address long-term social problems.

Table 20: Cross-Tabulation of Type of Organization by Project Classification

Type of Organization	Primary	Secondary	Comprehensive	Row Total
Community Action Agency	3 60.0	2 40.0	___	5 8.8
Community Development Corporation	3 30.0	5 50.0	2 20.0	10 17.5
Human Service Agency	9 75.0	1 8.3	2 16.7	12 21.1
Neighborhood Association	9 64.3	3 21.4	2 14.3	14 24.6
Other	13 81.3	2 12.5	1 6.3	16 28.1
Column Total	37 64.9	13 22.8	7 12.3	57 100.0

Chi-Square	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.<5
10.29953	8	.2446	.614	11 of 15 (73.3%)

Note: N will not equal 58 due to missing data.

The use of various statistical techniques were employed throughout this chapter. They consisted of such statistics as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations, cross-tabulations, chi-square significance test, and confirmatory discriminant analysis. The more sophisticated statistical approach used to analyze the relationship between certain CBO characteristics as they relate to crime and non-crime prevention strategies was the confirmatory discriminant analysis. That is, a discriminant function was employed to

try and assess the level of predictability between the predictor and criterion variables. The results yielded a prediction classification of 53.33 percent.

The final part of this chapter utilized discriminant analysis to try and predict if a relationship exists between the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers as they relate to primary, secondary, and comprehensive crime prevention activities. Specifically, in this analysis, the dependent variable was the types of crime prevention strategy, while the independent or discriminating variables were two CBO characteristics (e.g., number of full-time paid staff and number of volunteers).

The discriminant analysis consists of two parts. First, this analysis focused on a two-group discriminant function analysis. Specifically, the discriminant analysis attempted to predict group membership into either a primary or secondary crime prevention strategy depending on the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers. Secondly, because the criterion variable has three constituent categories (e.g., primary, secondary, and comprehensive), a multiple discriminant function analysis was used to assess the relationship with the predictor variables mentioned.

The initial processing of cases by the SPSS/PC+ program indicated that from the 51 cases that are either primary or secondary prevention strategies, 1 case was eliminated from analysis because of at least one missing discriminating

variable. Therefore, 50 unweighted cases were be used in the analysis.

The descriptive information from the discriminant analysis indicates that CBOs with primary prevention strategies have a group mean of 15.47 for the number of full-time paid staff with a standard deviation of 30.32. The number of volunteers have a mean of 217.88 with a standard deviation of 584.60. On the other hand, CBOs that tend to institute secondary community crime prevention strategies have a group mean of 30.32 for the number of full-time paid staff and a standard deviation of 30.36. Moreover, the number of volunteers have a group mean of 398.78 and a standard deviation of 569.95 respectively.

Table 21 yields the results of an F ratio of the variances between group 1 (primary) and group 2 (secondary) with respect to the number of full-time paid employees and the number of volunteers. The results of Table 21 indicate a nonstatistically significant F ratio at an alpha level of 0.05 for both predictor variables. That is, it appears that the number of full-time staff and the number of volunteers do not discriminate between primary or secondary crime prevention projects.

Table 21: F test of the Discriminant Function for Predicted Group Membership between Primary and Secondary Crime Prevention Strategies.

Predictor Variables	F ratio	Significance
Full-time Paid Staff	.0100	.9207
Number of Volunteers	.9783	.3278

Note: The F test was employed to determine the level of significance for the discriminant equation. The equation was not significant at the 0.05 level. Degrees of Freedom are 1 and 48.

Nonetheless, when the two discriminant functions were applied to the raw data, 72.00 percent of the cases were correctly classified into the groups to which they were originally assigned by the type of strategy initiated (see Table 22). More specifically, the data appear to indicate that the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers are modest predictors for the type of crime prevention strategy initiated (see Table 22). That is, 88.9 percent (N=32) of those projects that were predicted to be a primary prevention strategy were actually classified as a primary prevention project. On the other hand, only 28.6 percent (N=4) of the secondary crime prevention projects were correctly classified based on the predictor variables.

Table 22: Prediction Results of the Confirmatory Discriminant Function Analysis using Primary and Secondary Crime Prevention Strategies.

		Predicted Group Membership	
Criterion Variables	No. of Cases	Group 1 Primary	Group 2 Secondary
Primary	36	32 (88.9%)	4 (11.1%)
Secondary	14	10 (71.4%)	4 (28.6%)

Note: Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 72.00% A discriminant analysis was employed predicting primary and secondary crime prevention strategies as dichotomous variable by 2 different, continuous variables: 1) Full-time paid staff and 2) Number of volunteers.

The second part of the discriminant analysis is addressing whether the predictor variables of the CBO characteristics discriminate between the three major categories of the crime prevention strategies. Aside from the group means previously indicated of the primary and secondary strategies, the comprehensive strategy reflects group means of 38.57 (SD = 93.22) for the number of full-time paid staff and 178.00 (SD = 205.89) for the number of volunteers actively involved in crime prevention projects.

Not unlike the previous data, the following results (see Table 23) do not seem to show that the predictor variables discriminate between the three crime prevention strategies.

Table 23: F test of the Discriminant Function for Predicted Group Membership between Primary, Secondary, and Comprehensive Crime Prevention Strategies.

Predictor Variables	F-ratio	Significance
Full-time Paid Staff	.9224	.4037
Number of Volunteers	.6244	.5394

Note: The F test was employed to determine the level of significance for the discriminant equation. The equation was not significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 24 indicates that out of the 57 projects analyzed, the discriminant function resulted in 56.14 percent (N=32) of the "grouped" cases being correctly classified. Again, the results tend to show a rather high percentage of groups being classified correctly as primary prevention. On the other hand, only 1 case (14.3%) focusing on a comprehensive approach was correctly classified. In comparison to the two-group discriminant analysis, the multiple discriminant analysis also indicated an exact prediction of secondary projects (28.6%, N=4).

Table 24: Prediction Results of the Confirmatory Discriminant Function Analysis using Primary, Secondary, and Comprehensive Crime Prevention Strategies.

		Predicted Group Membership		
Criterion Variables	No. of Cases	Group 1 Primary	Group 2 Secondary	Group 3 Comprehensive
Primary	36	27 (75.0%)	4 (11.1%)	5 (13.9%)
Secondary	14	9 (64.3%)	4 (28.6%)	1 (7.1%)
Comprehensive	7	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)

Note: Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 56.14% A discriminant analysis was employed predicting primary, secondary, and comprehensive crime prevention strategies as multiple discriminant variable by 2 different, continuous variables: 1) Full-time paid staff and 2) Number of volunteers.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, an analysis of the data was conducted to try and determine whether a relationship existed between community and CBO characteristics as they relate to the initiation of a crime or non-crime related project. In addition, community and CBO characteristics were further analyzed in terms of their relationship with the specific type of crime prevention strategy. Moreover, based on the measures and statistics used, the data throughout this study yielded no statistically significant findings. The summary of the findings and conclusions are presented in Chapter V of this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This study is the product of a descriptive analysis of data that attempted to address community and CBO characteristics as related to community-based crime prevention. Specifically, this study consisted of two levels. First, the purpose of this research was to identify the community and CBO characteristics that may distinguish between those CBOs that do and do not initiate a crime prevention project. Secondly, this study focused on CBOs that specifically initiated crime prevention projects. That is, the particular types of crime prevention strategies consisted of primary, secondary, and comprehensive community oriented approaches to crime prevention. These strategies were examined in terms of their relationship to community and CBO characteristics.

Community characteristics included such independent variables as the size of the geographical area served by CBOs, perceptions of crime by the community, and the racial composition of the community. In addition, CBO

characteristics consisted of such independent variables as the number of full-time paid staff; number of volunteers; year the CBO was established; and the type of CBO. In essence, this study assessed whether the type of crime prevention strategy initiated by funded CBOs is based on certain community and organizational characteristics.

Literature Review

The literature review focused on a great deal of research that seemed to have its origins from more of an applied ethos. That is, the nature of previous research tended to address community and CBO characteristics that influence whether a CBO is or is not going to initiate a community-based crime prevention strategy. The literature of this study was divided into two major sections.

The first section specifically addressed community characteristics. Characteristics such as the geographical area served, perceptions of crime, and the racial composition of the community were examined. The second major section the literature focused on was CBO characteristics. Specifically, the number of full-time paid staff, the number of volunteers, year the CBO was established, and the type of CBO.

Both the community and CBO characteristics were analyzed by previous authors (as well as the present study) in terms of the characteristics that were related to the initiation of crime and non-crime prevention projects. In addition, the

literature began focusing only on CBO that initiated various types of community crime prevention strategies.

The literature identified that CBOs traditionally initiate two types of community crime prevention strategies: 1) primary (causes of crime) and 2) secondary (opportunity reduction) approaches. In addition, some CBOs have combined the strategies to provide a more comprehensive approach to community crime prevention. That is, CBOs develop programs that may not necessarily be considered mutually exclusive from one another; rather, the strategies are joint attempts to attack social ill in the community (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989; Lab, 1988; Rosenbaum, 1988; among others).

Each of these crime prevention strategies have their origin grounded in social control theory. More specifically, community-based crime prevention is oriented towards "informal" social control. That is, the community becomes the major impetus in motivating people to become involved in anticrime activities. However, when discussing informal social control one has to consider this theory in terms of how community is defined (Johnson, 1987; Podolefsky, 1983) 1983; Weiss, 1987).

As indicated, consistent throughout the literature was the uncertain and nebulous quality of defining community. That is, community has been defined in terms of geographical boundaries, networks of social relationships, and a sense of community cohesion and solidarity (e.g., shared values and a

collective conscience) (Johnson, 1987; Podolefsky, 1983) 1983; Weiss, 1987). When the community is used as the foundation to begin crime prevention such nebulous and illusory qualities must be considered.

In terms of community-based crime prevention strategies, community has traditionally been defined based on the geographical area served by a CBO, perceptions of crime, and the racial composition of the community (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989; Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Podolefsky, 1983; Rosenbaum, 1988; Shernock, 1986). For instance, Rosenbaum (1988) maintains that the collective responses initiated by CBOs are ordinarily targeted to a community with clearly defined geographical boundaries such as a residential areas encompassing a block or neighborhood (Rosenbaum, 1988). This appears to suggest that community-based crime prevention is more oriented towards smaller, more manageable geographical boundaries.

What motivates communities to initiate crime prevention strategies appears to simply be part of a CBOs overall agenda (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982). Furthermore, Podolefsky & Dubow (1981) state that certain types of anticrime programs may even affect perceptions of crime in the community. In addition to what has already been stated, the racial composition of the community is a factor which may influence the development of a community crime prevention program. More specifically, some researchers suggest that communities which are predominantly

minority (such as the African American community) tend to initiate secondary strategies more readily as opposed to primary prevention projects (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982). This phenomena may be based on the fact that minority communities tend to have fewer CBOs and maintain lower participation in organizations (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989; Skogan, 1989).

Other factors which were not addressed throughout the literature involved the year a CBO was established and the particular type of CBO. This area is exploratory in nature and is without much research support.

Methodology

This study analyzed 122 projects that were both crime and non-crime prevention oriented. However, the focus of the research was on the 58 projects designated as community crime prevention. No representative sampling techniques were employed in this research. Rather, the population under study were those CBOs that applied and were awarded a grant from the Michigan Neighborhood Builders Alliance (NBA). The dependent variables consisted of those projects which were classified as a crime prevention projects (N=58) (e.g., primary, secondary, and comprehensive) and projects which were not classified as crime prevention (N=64). The independent variables were the community and CBO characteristics.

Two data collection methodologies were utilized. First, a survey questionnaire was mailed out to all recipients of the

NBA grant. After a week, all recipients were contacted by phone and were asked to respond to the survey. Secondly, a content analysis of the NBA grant application files was conducted. The data for the dependent variables came from the content analysis method and the data for the independent variables was extracted from the survey questionnaire. This research was descriptive and exploratory in nature and was not an attempt to test research or theory.

Major Findings

The analysis section of this study was divided into two major areas consisting of: 1) crime prevention and non-crime prevention projects and 2) the specific types of crime prevention strategies initiated. The final section will address the limitations of the study.

Part I

The first section to discuss consist of community and CBO characteristics as they related to crime and non-crime prevention projects. In regard to the geographical area served by CBOs, the data was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, although the frequency in certain categories are noticeably different. For example, 61.9 percent (N=26) served an area larger than a municipality and was not a crime related project. In contrast, 63.3 percent (N=19) of the CBOs that serve a geographical area such as a whole city, township, or village were predominantly CBOs that initiated crime

prevention projects. Given the geographical area, one may speculate that projects which tend to be crime oriented are directed at a smaller region of the community.

In regard to the perceptions of crime variable, it was interesting to note that from those CBOs indicating that crime in the community is high, 54 percent (N=28) had initiated a crime prevention project. Among those CBOs perceiving community crime rate to be low, 65 percent (N=26) were instituting non-crime related activities.

These findings do not seem surprising due to the fact that when a CBO implements a community crime prevention project, it tends to be under the assumption that crime is somewhat of a problem in the community. On the other hand, Podolefsky & Dubow (1981) state that a certain type of crime prevention project may negatively affect perceptions of crime in the community. However, for purposes of this study, we may speculate that perceptions of crime changed between crime and non-crime prevention programs, especially if a program has been in effect for three years before an examination of perceptions.

The racial composition of the community is another factor under study. For example, race, as dichotomized into caucasian and minority, is relatively proportionally distributed between CBOs with crime prevention and non-crime prevention activities. Aside from the fact that there does not exist a statistical relationship between race and crime

and non-crime prevention projects, the percentages appear to reflect the fact that minorities account for a greater number of crime prevention projects.

These findings appear to be consistent with Lavrakas & Herz's (1982) research. They maintain that minorities, specifically African Americans, have a higher level of participation in crime prevention projects than caucasians. The high level of participation by minorities may reflect the fact that they account for a greater percentage of crime prevention projects in their communities (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Shernock, 1986). However, other research seems to be somewhat unclear in the level of participation between various racial groups (Shernock, 1986).

In terms of the number of full-time paid staff by CBOs, there does not appear to exist any noticeable difference between crime and non-crime related projects. However, it is interesting to note that CBOs which maintain full-time paid staff, ranging from 25 to 250, account for 60 percent (N=9) of the projects within this category that are crime prevention oriented. On the other hand, CBOs with non-crime related projects accounted for 60 percent that indicated 1 to 2 full-time paid staff. Again, these results are not statistically significant and appear to be rather skewed.

The data for the number of volunteers that are active in projects initiated by CBOs indicate that non-crime prevention projects have, for the most part, a higher percentage of

volunteers. The number ranges from 2 to 200 thereby accounting for approximately 54 percent of the projects which fall within that range. However, from those CBOs which have volunteers ranging from 201 to 3500, crime prevention projects account for 51.6 percent in this range. Therefore, it would seem that a greater number of volunteers gravitate towards crime prevention projects.

The next CBO characteristic examined involves the age of the CBO. A question asked was whether age of a CBO is significant in distinguishing crime and non-crime related projects. Unfortunately, the findings were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. However, a greater percentage of CBOs (59.0%) that initiated non-crime related projects tend to have been established in 1969 or before.

As stated earlier, one may speculate that CBOs that initiated crime prevention projects probably did not come into existence until the early 1970's when the crime rate was reported as significantly increasing. Further, this speculation may be due to the fact that 56.8 percent of the CBOs that were established between 1970 and 1979 are focusing on crime prevention projects. Regardless of the nonsignificant findings, age of an organization should be of interests to examine in future research.

Another interesting area was the distinguishing between the types of CBOs that initiated crime and non-crime prevention projects. For instance, 61.5 percent of the

respondents of non-crime related projects classified their CBO as a community action agency, whereas CBOs which categorized themselves as neighborhood associations/block clubs accounted for 63.6 percent of the projects which are crime prevention oriented.

Even though the results are not statistically significant, we can speculate that community action agencies tend to encompass a much broader area, thereby initiating a variety of projects. That is, less emphasis is placed on developing crime prevention projects because they encompass a vast geographical area. On the other hand, it may also be postulated that neighborhood associations/block clubs focus on smaller geographical areas, thereby developing projects which tend to be more oriented towards crime related issues. Speculation aside, these areas are valid issues to address when considering the type of CBO and the various task's the organization initiates.

The last part of this section addresses the findings of a confirmatory discriminant analysis between the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers as they relate to crime and non-crime prevention projects. The data appear to indicate that the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers are not good predictors of whether a CBO is more oriented towards crime prevention or non-crime prevention. However, 79.4 percent of the cases that are considered non-crime prevention are correctly classified per

the predictor variables. Therefore, we may speculate that the predictor variables used within this section of the study that attempts to discriminate between crime and non-crime prevention projects are better predictors for non-crime prevention projects.

Part II

The second major area of our findings focuses on the projects that were specifically identified as being crime prevention oriented. More specifically, this section summarizes the major finds of the community and CBO characteristics that were examined in terms of primary, secondary, and comprehensive crime prevention strategies.

The first section consists of community characteristics. Although not statistically significant, the data indicate that CBOs which initiate primary crime prevention projects tend to encompass areas larger than a municipality, while secondary prevention strategies were more common for an area such as a whole city, township, or village.

Another area of consideration involves perceptions of crime by the community. The findings indicate that from the projects which were classified as primary prevention, the community tended to perceive the crime rate as low. CBOs that were initiating secondary prevention projects were more apt to perceive the crime rate to be high. These findings are consistent with previous research. That is, minorities are more likely to perceive crime as high as well as initiate

secondary prevention strategies (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982). This brings us to our third community characteristic under study--race.

Based on the data, the racial composition of the community tends to be relatively equally distributed between both the caucasian and minority communities and the type of strategy instituted. However, caucasian communities tend to show a higher percentage in primary and secondary strategies, whereas minority communities are almost three times more likely to have a comprehensive strategy. This may be based on the fact that minorities, since the early 1960's, have tended to rely on various strategies to help attack social problems in their area (Lavrakas & Herz, 1982).

The second section of Part II of these summary findings address CBO characteristics as they relate to the type of crime prevention project initiated. For instance, CBOs which initiate primary prevention strategies tend to account for the greatest number of full-time paid staff. In addition, based on the raw frequencies and percentages, CBOs that tend to initiate primary prevention strategies appear to employ between 25 to 250 employees.

In regard to the number of volunteers that are actively involved in projects CBOs sponsor, primary crime prevention projects are overly represented in comparison to secondary and comprehensive projects. More specifically, from CBOs which have volunteers ranging from 2 to 200, primary prevention

projects account for over two-thirds (68.4%) the number of volunteers in comparison to CBOs which have initiated secondary or comprehensive programs. In addition, these data, although not designed to challenge the validity of some researchers per se, indirectly contradict Bennett & Lavrakas' (1989) research that indicates volunteers are more likely to be active in opportunity reduction (secondary) strategies.

The third CBO characteristic under study focuses on the year the CBO was established. The data indicate that CBOs which initiate primary prevention strategies tend to have been established before CBOs that were conducting secondary strategies. To stretch an assumption, one may speculate that CBOs which have been conducting primary prevention projects have been consistent throughout the years and have not fluctuated in terms of changes of their perceived crime level. CBOs that are more likely to address secondary prevention approaches may have been less well established and have tended to shift strategies based on perceived changes in society.

The last CBO characteristic within this section examines the type of CBO as it relates to a particular crime prevention strategy. For example, CBOs that focused on primary crime prevention tended to classify themselves as human service agencies; although this is not surprising since most human service agencies tend to address long-term social problems.

The conclusion of this section examines the relationship between the number of full-time paid staff and the number of

volunteers as they relate to the various types of crime prevention activities. A discriminant analysis was employed which classified 72.00 percent of the cases correctly. That is, the data appear to indicate that the number of full-time paid staff and the number of volunteers are modest predictors for the type of crime prevention strategy initiated.

Conclusion

Because the issue of community-based crime prevention is a relatively new and unchartered areas, it will become essential to traverse the multitude of issues. This will require expanding the limits of the traditional criminal justice system model of police, courts, and corrections, to include further research into the area of community-based crime prevention as it relates to community, education, industry, and government.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

CONTENT ANALYSIS SHEET

NBA ID#_____

I. **COMMUNITY CRIME PREVENTION/REDUCTION STRATEGIES:**

_____MAJOR PART OF PROJECT(S)

_____MINOR PART OF PROJECT(S)

_____NOT APPLICABLE (NO PART OF PROJECT(S))

II. IF CRIME PREVENTION IS A MAJOR OR MINOR PART OF PROJECT, WHICH ACTIVITIES DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE?

CAUSES OF CRIME STRATEGIES /// OPPORTUNITY-REDUCTION STRATEGIES

_____DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

_____DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

_____RECREATION/SPORTS PROG

_____TUTORING/MENTORSHIP

_____EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM (POLICE TALK TO YOUTH/ PARENTS/COMMUNITY CENTER/ETC.)

_____LEADERSHIP TRAINING

_____SKILLS TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT COUNSELING/ JOB PLACEMENT

_____CLEAN-UP/NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION

_____OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY_____

_____NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH

_____SECURITY LIGHTING

_____SECURITY LOCKS

_____CITIZEN PATROLS

_____COMMUNITY ORGANIZING (BLOCK CLUBS, ETC.)

_____ELIMINATE DRUG HOUSES

_____CRIME STOPPERS

_____OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY _____

III. CATEGORIZE PROJECT(S) AS:

_____CAUSES OF CRIME (SOCIAL PROBLEMS APPROACH)

_____OPPORTUNITY REDUCTION APPROACH

_____BOTH (CAUSES/OPPORTUNITY REDUCTION)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babbie, E. R. (1989). The practice of social research. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bartol, C. R. & Bartol, A. M. (1989). Juvenile Delinquency: a systems approach. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Bell, M. M. & Bell, M. M. (1987). Crime Control: deterrence and target hardening. In Johnson, E. H. (Ed.), Handbook on Crime and Delinquency Prevention. New York: Greenwood Press.

Bennett, S. F. & Lavrakas, P. J. (1989). Community-based crime prevention: an assessment of the Eisenhower Foundation's neighborhood program. Crime & Delinquency, 35(3), 345-364.

Currie, E. (1985). Confronting Crime. New York: Pantheon Books.

Garofalo, J. & McLeod, M. (1989). The structure and operations of neighborhood watch programs in the United States. Crime & Delinquency, 35(3), 326-344.

Gregory, W. C. (1989). The crisis in the michigan criminal justice system: causes, consequences, and options. House Fiscal Agency. Lansing, Michigan.

Hagan, J. (1985). Modern criminology: crime, criminal behavior, and its control. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hagan, F. E. (1989). Research methods in criminal justice and criminology. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Johnson, E. H. (Ed.). (1987). Introduction: the "What," "How," "Who," and "Where" of prevention. Handbook on Crime and Delinquency Prevention. New York: Greenwood Press.

Lab, S. P. (1988). Approaches, practices and evaluations. New York: Anderson.

Latessa, E. J. & Allen, H. E. (1980). Using citizens to prevent crime: an example of deterrence and community involvement. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 8(1), 69-74.

Lavrakas, P. J. & Herz, E. J. (1982). Citizen participation in neighborhood crime prevention. Criminology, 20(3), (4), 479-498.

Lavrakas, P. J. (1985). Citizen self-help and neighborhood crime prevention policy. In Curtis, L. (Ed.), American Violence and Public Policy. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lavrakas, P. J. & Bennett, S. F. (1988a). Thinking about the implementation of citizen and community anti-crime measures. In Hope, T. & Shaw, M. (Eds.), Communities and Crime Reduction. London: her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Lavrakas, P. J. & Bennett, S. F. (1989). A process and impact evaluation of the 1983-1986 neighborhood anti-crime self-help program: summary report. Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University.

Lewis, D.A., Grant, J. A. & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988). The social construction of reform: crime prevention and community organizations. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Lindsay, B. & McGillis, D. (1986). Citywide community crime prevention: an assessment of the Seattle program. In Rosenbaum, D. P. (Ed.), Community Crime Prevention: does It Work? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lurigio, A. J. & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1986). Evaluation research in community crime prevention: a critical look at the field. In Rosenbaum, D. P. (Ed.), Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Marx, G. T. (1989). Commentary: some trends and issues in citizen involvement in the law enforcement process. Crime & Delinquency, 35(3), 500-519.

Michigan Department of Management and Budget. (1991). Michigan population in 1990: a decade of struggle. VII(1), 1-11.

Michigan Department of State Police. (1988). Uniform Crime Report. East Lansing, Michigan.

Nachmias, D. & Nachmias, C. (1981). Research methods in the social sciences. New York: St. Martin's Press.

National Crime Prevention Council. (1985). Making a difference: young people in community crime prevention. Washington, D.C.

National Crime Prevention Council. (1986). Preventing crime in urban communities. Washington, D.C.

National Crime Prevention Council. (1989). The success of community crime prevention. In the Canadian Journal of Criminology, 31(4), 487-506.

Podolefsky, A. & Dubow, F. (1981). Strategies for community crime prevention: collective responses to crime in urban america. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Podolefsky, A. (1983). Case studies in community crime prevention. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Roehl, J. A. & Cook, R. F. (1984). Evaluation of the urban crime prevention program. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (Ed.). (1986). Community crime prevention: does it work? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Rosenbaum, D. P., Lewis, D. A. & Grant, J. A. (1986). Neighborhood-based crime prevention: assessing the efficacy of community organizing in Chicago. In Rosenbaum, D. P. (Ed.), Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (1987). The theory and research behind neighborhood watch: is it a sound fear and crime reduction strategy? Crime & Delinquency, 35(3), 103-134.

Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988). Community crime prevention: a review and synthesis of the literature. Justice Quarterly, 5(3), 323-395.

Shernock, S. K. (1986). A profile of the citizen crimeprevention activist. Journal of Criminal Justice, 14, 211-228.

Siegel, L. J. & Senna, J. J. (1988). Juvenile Delinquency: theory, practice, and law. New York: West Publishing.

Skogan, W. G. & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). Coping with crime: individual and neighborhood reactions. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Skogan, W. G. (1989). Communities, crime, and neighborhood organizations. Crime & Delinquency, 35(3), 437-457.

Trojanowicz, R. C., Trojanowicz, J. M., & Moss, F. M. (1975). Community-based crime prevention. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.

Troyer, R. J. & Wright, R. D. (1985). Community response to crime: two middle-class anti-crime patrols. Journal of Criminal Justice, 13, 227-241.

Weiss, R. T. (1987). The Community and Prevention. In Johnson, E. H. (Ed.), Handbook on Crime and Delinquency Prevention. New York: Greenwood Press.

Yin, R. K. (1986). Community crime prevention: a synthesis of eleven evaluations. In Rosenbaum, D. P. (Ed.), Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.