

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN CRIME PREVENTION:
THE CASE OF RESIDENTIAL PATROLS AND GUARDS

by

TOBY G. RADASKY

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

ABSTRACT

As rising crime rates have evoked expressions of fear nationwide, citizens have become increasingly concerned with residential security measures. In response to this growing fear, one form of action undertaken by residents has been the formation of residential patrols and guards. This study examines, from an economic standpoint, who the participants are in such endeavors, and how participation varies among individuals of different economic levels. Specifically, it addresses three hypothesis posited by earlier sociological research: that persons of higher economic status are more likely to participate in formal voluntary organizations than are individuals of low- or middle-incomes; that persons of lower economic status are poor performers in organizations requiring instrumental action on the part of its participants; and that the activities in which individuals of higher incomes participate are often of natures different than those engaged in by lower income individuals.

The case of participation in residential patrols and guards calls these assumptions into question. By definition, the organization of either a patrol or an administrative mechanism to hire private guards constitutes an instrumental form of activity. The fact, then, that numerous residential groups in low-income settings have formed patrols, or in some instances have hired guards, demonstrates that "disadvantaged" citizens have conducted a significant amount of participation in constructive activity.

Also, evidence from a nationwide study of the incidence of residential patrols and guards indicates that within such activity, there appears to be differences among economic groups. That is, upper-income individuals have

displayed a proclivity toward forming associations to hire security guards, while low- and middle-income citizens have been more inclined to form resident-manned patrol groups. Interviews with these individuals, however, indicate that given the financial resources, many of them would opt for a form of security protection similar to that existing in upper-income areas--which usually is surveillance services provided by private guards.

The four case studies presented herein represent the exceptions, as well as the rules, to participation in residential patrol and guard activity. In Boston, Massachusetts, two sites were selected, one a middle- to upper-income neighborhood in which residents perform their own patrolling, and the second, a public housing project in which guards have been hired to perform surveillance duties. In contrast, an upper-income neighborhood was chosen in New Orleans and a public housing project selected in Baltimore where residents have, in the former case, contracted for private guard service, and in the latter, have executed their own surveillance activities.

Finally, suggestions are offered to practitioners involved in planning for residential security, in general, and for patrol and guard activity, in particular.

Thesis Supervisor: _____
Assistant Professor of Urban Studies and Planning (Visiting)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 Historical Perspective 1

 Variation in Activity 2

 Patrols and Citizen Participation Issues 4

 "Who Participates?". 5

II. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN CRIME PREVENTION 7

 Citizen Participation and Economic Status 7

 Chronology of Participation 11

 Citizen Participation in Crime Prevention 14

 The Case of Residential Patrols and Guards 16

 Theoretical Conclusions 23

 Description of the Case Studies 28

III. THE CASE STUDIES 31

 O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol Boston, Massachusetts 31

 Pembroke Gardens Monitors Baltimore, Maryland 43

 Belle Ville Security Guards New Orleans, Louisiana 52

 Casa Vista Security Guards Boston, Massachusetts 63

IV. ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE CASE STUDIES 77

 Question 1: What Measures Do Citizens Take to Combat Residential Crime? 77

 Question 2: How Does the Economic Status of a Residential Area Affect Its Approach to Curbing the Crime Problem? 81

Chapter

Question 3: How Does the Evidence Regarding Citizen Participation in Residential Patrols and Guards Correlate with Earlier Hypotheses Associating Voluntary Action with Individuals of High Incomes?	85
V. IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNERS	92
Planning for Crime Prevention	92
Advantages of Patrols	97
Commitment to Tackling the Crime Problem	98
Choosing Alternatives	100
Defensible Space Concepts	104
Police Protection	106
Organizational Techniques	108
Hired Security Guards	
Volunteer Patrols	
VI. FIELD METHODS AND PROCEDURES	118
Literature Search	120
Preliminary Interviews	120
Gathering Descriptive Information	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	129

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Distribution of Patrols by Neighborhood Characteristics	18
2.	Distribution of Patrol Activity by Income Levels	19
3.	Distribution of Patrols and Guards by Income Levels (Tabulated from Case Studies)	81
4.	Tabulated From National Survey by the Rand Corporation	82
5.	Distribution of Patrols and Guards (by Income Levels) According to Percentages of the RAND Survey Population	83

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Interest in residential security measures has increased steadily as crime rates have risen nationwide. Among the more common modes of crime prevention have been the implementation of physical security devices and architectural design principles, although recently, private group action to combat residential crime has become widespread. These collective activities take a variety of forms, but can be classified into three main types: citizen patrols in residential neighborhoods; tenant patrols in public housing or private apartment buildings; and private guard forces hired by neighborhood associations or groups.

Historical Perspective

Although these patrols and guards, per se, are often regarded as modern phenomena, they can be viewed as part of our nation's historical tradition of vigilantism and community self-help in the sphere of law enforcement. Richard Brown, in *The American Vigilante Tradition* (1969), noted that early self-help movements tended to develop in times when a community's perceived values, social structure,

property, and wealth were threatened. He cites two phases of American vigilantism: a first stage that occurred in the late 1700s and early 1800s when citizens in rowdy frontier towns organized to apprehend mischief makers and criminals, particularly horse thieves; and, a second stage of urban neovigilantism that began in the mid-1800s and mainly involved the persecution of racial and ethnic minorities. Brown aligned modern urban vigilantism with the former type of frontier vigilantism because of its goals of civil order and residential safety, and its disinclination to use violence.¹

Variation in Activity

More specifically, today's residential patrols and guards, which are found in suburban as well as urban settings nationwide, are viewed largely as performing a relatively simple and narrowly defined role: to deter criminal activity by their presence. Their function is to be that of a passive observer, one who watches for criminal or suspicious activity and alerts the police when they see it. The manner, however, in which this responsibility is executed varies considerably. In Jersey City, New Jersey, for example, tenants in public housing developments have organized a

¹Richard M. Brown, "The American Vigilante Tradition," in National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, Violence in America, vol. I (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 121-80.

lobby monitoring program whereby residents observe ingress into buildings by assuming stationary positions near entrance-way doors. All suspicious behavior or activity is reported to the police.

In New York's affluent Upper East Side, parents of private school students wear orange ponchos while they conduct foot patrols of streets near Central Park to deter narcotics dealers and youth gangs from harassing children travelling to and from school. In New Orleans, residents of several central city neighborhoods have contracted, through their respective community improvement associations, for private security guards to provide automobile and foot patrols in their areas.

Not all patrols, however, are dedicated to cooperative co-existence with police. One of the most publicized patrols of an adversarial nature was formed in 1966 by Huey Newton and other members of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense. In Oakland, California the Panthers initiated "shot gun patrols . . . to observe police conduct, to prevent acts of police brutality, to inform blacks of their rights when dealing with the police, and 'to preserve the community from harm.'"² It is significant to note, however, that while patrol-type activities critical of police were

²Terry Ann Knopf, Youth Patrols: An Experiment in Community Participation (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, 1969).

found throughout the nation in the mid- and late 1960s, their numbers as well as their notoriety have faded since that time.

Patrols and Citizen Participation Issues

The formation of resident patrols and guards represents an important form of citizen participation in neighborhood affairs. Unlike other crime prevention activities, most of which require residents only to be more alert and sensitive to security measures as they go about their daily affairs, a patrol or guard activity demands active organizational support and personal commitment on a routine basis. In fact, these very characteristics make it a significant form of citizen participation when compared to any kind of organization or activity that incorporates, and lauds, voluntary action.

Obviously, in our democratic society, citizen participation is a highly valued activity, but it should be noted that individuals have had primary-group, kinship, and friendship associations over the centuries. Later, with the advent of industrialization and its resultant increase in societal complexity, voluntary associations and formal organizations came into being, boosting the number and diversity of associational groups. As societies have increased in scope and the expectations of disadvantaged people have risen, the potential, as well as the need has developed for

individuals to organize themselves on a large-scale basis through social movements. In more recent years, this need has manifested itself in such socio-political developments as the Civil Rights and Black Power movements, student activism, and the programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity (which popularized the concept of citizen activity in its slogan "maximum feasible participation").

In the specific case of residential patrols and guards, citizens have banded together of their own initiative in order to protect themselves and their homes. They have done so motivated by the belief that government has failed to provide effective law enforcement, although most citizens acknowledge that they would prefer improved police service to any personal involvement or expenditure of funds for private guards.

"Who Participates?"

Although the form and content of citizen participation differs in each context that it is used, academic purviews of voluntary activity have been consistently concerned with the types and rates of participant involvement. Such knowledge is important to change agents and community workers of various kinds because of the critical role citizen participation plays in maintaining the continued performance of associational structures. Ironically--as sociologists Kornhauser, Hausknecht, Foskett and others who have studied

voluntary associations have suggested--participation is unevenly distributed in the community, and those who have most to gain from such involvement, the poor, show the lowest rates of membership. That is, ranging from participation in publicly funded self-help programs to exercising political clout by show of collective action, members of low-income groups have not been able to fully capitalize on opportunities made available to them because of low levels of participation.

This research, however, investigates a facet of citizen activity in which members of all income levels participate. It discusses an area of citizen participation that challenges several of the generalizations previously dominating discussions of the demography of involvement in voluntary associations. Specifically focusing on class status and citizen participation, it addresses the question "Who Participates?" by suggesting that at least in the case of resident patrols and guards, the poor are as likely to become involved as middle- and upper-income residents. In actuality, the evidence surrounding the formation of citizen-manned patrols suggests that the volume of instrumental activity is markedly higher in low-income groups than in wealthier ones. The twist, however, lies in the fact that given additional financial resources, it is plausible that many low-income groups would opt for hired guards, as upper-income residents have done, instead of continuing to contribute their own efforts to safeguard their homes and communities.

CHAPTER II

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN CRIME PREVENTION

Citizen Participation and Economic Status

During his travels through the United States in the 1830s, Alexis de Tocqueville noted in his diary that in keeping with the professed American democratic tradition, citizens here displayed a proclivity toward forming voluntary, ad hoc organizations. "A nation of joiners" was the phrase used by the French writer to describe the volume of collective activity he observed.

Many social scientists have interpreted that kind of direct action as a manifestation of the democratic values implicit, and often heralded, in the American political and social traditions. But as evidenced in several sociological investigations spanning the mid-1950s through the 1960s, this kind of citizen participation in the United States was by no means universal. As Morris Axelrod succinctly summarized in his 1954 study: "Formal group membership and participation are not randomly distributed throughout the population, but are related to what are considered to be some basic and fundamental differentiating characteristics

in our society."¹ One of the most fundamental of those characteristics was income, he found. That is, the extent of an individual's involvement varies with his income, and higher incomes are associated with greater probabilities of membership and higher levels of activity.

By 1968, Hodge and Trieman were able to write, "The positive association between membership in voluntary organizations and socioeconomic status is one of the best documented relationships in the sociological literature (a standard reference is Wright and Hyman, 1958),"² although the authors noted that they were unaware of any investigations which sought to explain the connection between social status and membership in voluntary groups.

In the numerous sociological studies, voluntary associations have usually been defined as groups of people which have the following characteristics:

1. Continuity--the association persists over some discernible period of time.
2. Goals--the association is formed for specific, shared purposes.
3. Motivation--membership in the association is voluntary, the result of individual choice rather than compulsion.

¹Morris Axelrod, "Urban Structure and Social Participation," *American Sociological Review* 21 (February 1956): 13-18.

²Robert Hodge and Donald Treiman, "Social Participation and Social Status," *American Sociological Review* 33 (October 1968):722-41.

4. Structure--the association has developed some definition of member obligations and rights, some hierarchical configuration, and some patterns of organizational activity.³

The contexts of the research studies using this definition generalize from a wide range of types of voluntary associations, such as those related to occupations, professional associations, unions, church-related associations, neighborhood self-help groups, and associations organized under the influence of a sponsoring agency. Few studies, however, compare participation in these different types of associations, so that cross analyses of the findings are limited. In addition, participation is often defined simply as "membership" in voluntary associations. Few studies attempt to distinguish between different degrees of intensity of association participation.

Since the time when sociological concern with citizen participation first focused on associational memberships, the concept of citizen involvement has assumed much broader meanings. That is, as a result of major expansions in Federal social service programs which embodied principles of community involvement at the neighborhood level, participation is no longer viewed exclusively in terms of membership in civic groups, Parent-Teacher Associations, business clubs, or the like. Rather, the citizen participation

³John N. Edwards and Alan Booth, eds., Social Participation in Urban Society (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1973), pp. 9-11.

component mandated in recent federal programs has shifted the context of involvement from volunteerism in social organizations to increased representativeness and decentralization of administrative authority at the neighborhood level. As MIT professor Robert Hollister summarized:

The ideology of citizen participation has moved away from its initial emphasis upon the functions and objectives of improving programs, bettering individual participants, fulfilling democratic ideals, reducing alienation and increasing neighborhood integration and stability, toward greater endorsement of the goals of promoting the growth of low-income interest groups and equalizing the distribution of political power. . . . As a result of this strain, the concept has sprouted two somewhat separate notions, consumer participation and community control. . . . Consumer participation lives at home and takes care of its progenitor, citizen participation, while community control is the prodigal son.⁴

The Federal programs which were responsible for refocusing the definition of citizen participation, were also responsible for adding a new dimension to the sociologists' views of "who participates." Since many of the social programs requiring citizen involvement directly affected the lives of the urban poor, it was inevitable that a whole new class of "joiners" would arise.

Today, the case of residential patrols and guards represents an amalgam of the history of social participation in the United States. Because patrols can be found in residential settings of all income levels they depict

Robert Hollister, "From Consumer Participation to Community Control of Neighborhood Health Centers" (Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1970), p. 85.

the latest date on a "timeline of participation," that begins with a period in which voluntary activity was largely found among individuals of substantial economic means, proceeds through an era of what was often token participation by low income citizens in federally-sponsored programs, and culminates in the present where both the economically advantaged and disadvantaged are engaged in common modes of citizen participation.

Chronology of Participation

To better understand the development of low-income group participation, the following outline offers a brief account of the chronology of social and political events that shaped the current concepts of community participation and control in our society.

1949--Urban Renewal Act: This legislation called for a Workable Program which was to be designed with local citizen input. In most cities, however, this was carried out by creating blue-ribbon committees that were principally concerned with central business district slum clearance.

Mid-1950s--Urban Renewal Program Modified: Changes in the Urban Renewal Act as legislated in 1949 now required the creation of neighborhood-level groups to participate in the renewal process.

1950s--Advocacy Planning: With Paul Davidoff as its most vocal proponent, this planning method called attention to the special needs of ghetto populations in the

central city, and offered a rationale for a new kind of advocacy relationship between the professional and lay client.

1964--The Economic Opportunity Act: Title II of this anti-poverty legislation required a community action program "which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

1966--Demonstration Cities Act: This legislation mandated "widespread citizen participation" in the planning of a comprehensive program of community development--in contrast to what had become urban renewal's mode of relying upon neighborhood residents for information-giving and consultation purposes.

Since 1966, it appears that the effects of the federal programs have been to trigger a wide array of citizen-oriented activities at the local level. Cities have decentralized municipal services through greater field office operations, multi-service centers unifying delivery of services, neighborhood city halls, Mayor's office rumor complaint centers, and numerous other devices to bridge the gap between citizens and governmental institutions.

As citizen participation increasingly emerged in these contexts, reservations surfaced which called into question the inherent ability of low-income individuals to participate constructively in the federal and local programs that stipulated their active involvement. Building upon

the accepted sociological thesis that involvement in voluntary activities is negatively related to low income, individuals of such financial situations often were regarded as being incapable of engaging constructively in instrumental (rather than mere expressive) forms of participation. For example, in his book The Urban Villagers, Herbert Gans asserts that not only are lower-class people unable to actively become involved in renewal planning, but they also have an "inability to participate in formal organizations and in general community activity."⁵

William Kornhauser also addresses this topic in his article "Power and Participation in the Local Community," when he writes that democracy does not necessarily imply continuous participation in community affairs, that low-income people have fewer attachments to the community, hence fewer organizational ties and ultimately less incentive to support the rules according to which community affairs are generally conducted.⁶

James Q. Wilson extends both Gans's and Kornhauser's assertions in his book City Politics (written with Edward Banfield). Here, he constructs a dichotomy of people who are "public-regarding" and those who are "private-regarding."

⁵ Herbert Gans, The Urban Villagers (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962), p. 264.

⁶ William Kornhauser, "Power and Participation in the Local Community," Health Education Monographs No. 6 (Oakland, Calif.: Society of Public Health Education, 1959).

Public regarding, he writes, is an ethos most likely found "among citizens who rank high in income, education, or both" and who harbor a sense of obligation to a neighborhood as a whole; private regarding is the characteristic he uses to describe people of low income who "lack experience in and the skills for participation in organized endeavors." The latter class, Wilson asserts, "are usually the objects rather than the subjects of civic action: they are acted upon by others, but rarely do they themselves initiate action." Wilson adds, however, that it is not impossible to have people of low-incomes become organized, it is just that such organization usually occurs only under special circumstances and for special purposes.⁷

Citizen Participation in Crime Prevention

Citizen participation in crime prevention activities may qualify as one of the "special circumstances" to which Wilson refers. While most of the previously cited sources based their comments on urban planning endeavors, such as participation on urban renewal boards or in community action programs, the literature pertaining to citizen involvement in community crime prevention cites no barriers between effective participation and class status. In the view of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of

⁷James Q. Wilson, "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 39, No. 4 (November 1963):245, 247.

Violence, all citizens are capable of performing an important role in the fight against crime, and should be encouraged to do so. The Commission notes in its 1969 report:

Perhaps the most effective role against crime the individual can take is getting out and actively pursuing solutions with his neighbors. . . . In any respect, commitment and involvement are a solution--far better, more extensive, and beneficial to society than arming oneself and hiding behind locked doors waiting for them (the government, the police, the courts, the elected representatives) to do it all.⁸

In its "Report on Community Crime Prevention" (1973), the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals highlights the activities of dozens of citizen organizations that have volunteered their services to aid different aspects of the criminal justice system at all levels of government. "There are," the Commission emphasized, "as many viable approaches to community crime prevention as there are citizens who deplore the conditions that are known to cause crime."⁹

Although residential security patrols and guards are but one of numerous alternatives to participation in crime prevention, they represent one of the most fundamental kinds of participatory efforts. The nature of voluntary patrols is such that it requires on-going,

⁸National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, Staff Report: Law and Order Reconsidered (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 422.

⁹National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 48.

personal involvement in organization, implementation, and operation; without this level of commitment from each affiliate, a patrol cannot survive. The crucial element in maintaining a volunteer patrol, then, is not a reliance upon financial contributions, attendance at periodic membership meetings, or other expressions of marginal participation, but rather, upon the willingness of members to contribute both time and energy on a routine basis.

Also, because participation in patrols can be found across all strata of society, they appear to represent a case that directly challenges previous theory regarding voluntary action and socioeconomic status.

The Case of Residential Patrols and Guards

The best--and perhaps only--state of the art investigation of citizen involvement in residential patrols and guards was conducted by the Rand Corporation in 1975.¹⁰ As the author was a participant in that research endeavor, she opted to apply to this study the definition of residential security patrols used in the Rand report. In order to qualify for inclusion, a group had to meet four criteria: first, there had to exist a specific patrol or surveillance routine; second, the routine had to be safety-oriented, aimed at preventing criminal acts; third, the activity had

¹⁰ Robert K. Yin et al., Patrolling the Neighborhood Beat: Residents and Residential Security (Washington, D.C.: The Rand Corporation, 1975).

to be directed primarily at residential rather than commercial areas; and fourth, the patrol or guard activity had to be administered by a citizens' or residents' organization or a public housing authority.

Adhering to this definition were some 226 citizen groups identified in sixteen urban sites throughout the country. Although individually, the groups represent a broad range of activities, they can be divided into three major types: private security guards who have been hired under the auspices of a neighborhood or building association; mobile pedestrian or automobile patrols conducted personally by residents; and, sedentary monitors who surveille building ingress and egress.

This last type of activity denotes an important application of the word "patrol." Although the term implies a mobile activity, in the context of neighborhood crime prevention efforts, many groups labelled tenant or resident patrols are, in fact, sedentary in nature. In such instances, surveillance activities are usually performed by monitors who assume a stationary position near a window or in a building lobby.

Of the 226 groups identified in the Rand survey, descriptive information was obtained for 106 of them. Contrary to much of the citizen participation literature previously cited, the Rand study showed that an almost equal number of patrols and guards were found in middle- and low-income residential settings (which included public housing

projects). A significant number of surveillance groups were also located in upper-income areas. The table below shows the distribution of patrols and guards according to race and general income levels, following the respondent's best guess about these characteristics. The parameters used to designate income levels were: Low--under \$10,000; Medium--\$10,000 to \$20,000; High--over \$20,000.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF PATROLS BY NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Neighborhood Description	General Income Level				Total
	High	Medium	Low	Mixed or Unknown	
Racially mixed ^a					
Public housing	0	0	52	0	52
All other	0	38	26	0	64
White					
Public housing	0	0	27	0	27
All other	20	25	8	0	53
Ethnically mixed ^b	4	14	5	0	23
Mixed or unknown	0	2	0	5	7
Total	24	79	118	5	226

^aInclusion in this category indicates an estimate that at least one-third of the residents in a given area are black.

^bInclusion in this category indicates an estimate that at least one-third of the residents in a given area are part of a white ethnic group.

Tabulating results from this distribution, the Rand study concluded that patrols can be found in areas of all

major income levels and in both white and black residential settings.

These figures, however, do not indicate in which areas patrol activities are carried out voluntarily by residents, and in which areas citizen organizations have enlisted private security guards to perform patrol functions. Such an analysis sheds a new perspective on participation by low-income individuals. Of the 106 patrol profiles accumulated, 39 low-income areas used their own residents (on either a voluntary or paid basis) for patrol activities, 38 middle-income areas did the same, and only two upper-income communities were patrolled by neighborhood residents. On the other hand, in the low-income areas, only six used hired guard services, while an even smaller number, five, contracted for private security in middle-income neighborhoods. Some sixteen upper-income areas, however, engaged for private security protection through their neighborhood or building associations.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF PATROL ACTIVITY BY INCOME LEVELS

Type of Patrol	General Income			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Volunteer or Paid Resident Patrol ^a	39	38	2	79
Hired Guard	6	5	16	27
Total	45	43	18	106

^aWhere combinations of volunteers and hired guards exist, the patrol was included only in the volunteer category.

In light of previous citizen participation and community organization literature, these figures show marked evidence that contrary to prior hypotheses, low-income individuals can become both organized and actively engaged in affairs pertinent to their community. (See Keyes, 1967, for similar conclusions.)

Not only do these data persuasively challenge previous research aligning participation with higher incomes, but they urge a reconsideration of additional theories claiming that people of low-income levels are not capable of engaging in instrumental forms of voluntary activity-- "instrumental" being defined as activities which have functional consequences for some segment of the community or society at-large, and in which participants derive gratification from the accomplishments of the ultimate goal and not the immediate situation. Drawn largely from case studies of neighborhood participation in OEO-related programs, urban sociologists in the mid-1960s concluded that while low-income groups could be organized to engage in expressive activity, such as demonstrations or rent strikes, they were poor performers in programs which mandated a self-help ethic in order to be successful.

By definition, a residential security patrol is a formal type of voluntary organization requiring instrumental participation in which the actors co-ordinate activities directed to an end beyond the immediate satisfaction of

participating members. Therefore, it becomes highly significant to note that so many anti-crime groups have been organized in low-income communities, and perhaps even more noteworthy, that a number of them have survived for several years.

The results of the Rand survey indicate that low-income residents have reacted to their crime problems in much the same manner as middle- and upper-income citizens, that is, by hiring or forming anti-crime patrols administered under the aegis of a neighborhood organization. If membership in voluntary organizations is positively related to income, then perhaps the organization of security patrols and guards is one type of activity that transcends monetary restrictions. On the other hand, in the case of resident-staffed patrols, it seems there is only minimal participation by dwellers in upper income areas. While the number of neighborhood associations contracting for private security guard service is plentiful, the volunteer element characterizing low- and middle-income efforts is noticeably absent. This situation raises a paradox when social participation theory is regarded in light of volunteer crime patrols. That is, although citizen participation literature regards volunteer activity as a middle-to-upper income phenomenon, and although OEO-related studies imply the limited capacity of disadvantaged individuals when they do become participants, the case of residential security patrols demonstrates that people of low-income status have, indeed,

widely engaged in voluntary activity; members of higher income brackets, while having coalesced around issues of neighborhood crime, have largely decided to transfer the routine crime prevention functions to hired guards.

A 1973 report commissioned by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice to survey crime prevention in the residential setting echoes these findings regarding neighborhood patrols. Most citizens would prefer improved police protection to participation in a citizen patrol or the hiring of guards, the report's researchers found, "yet in many areas, police service seems inadequate, and residents seek added protection. Their decision about what to do is guided primarily by their economic situation."¹¹ The results of that "situation" usually translates into the mobilization of patrols in low-income areas, and the hiring of security guards in middle- and upper-income areas. Another study of citizen patrols conducted by Gary Marx and Dane Archer concluded that support for them "is found disproportionately among lower status persons; middle-class people apparently more often effectively press the government for increased police protection or hire licensed private guards."¹²

¹¹Arnold Sagalyn et al., Residential Security, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Washington, D.C., December 1973), p. 43.

¹²Gary T. Marx and Dane Archer, Community Police: An Exploratory Inquiry (Cambridge: Harvard University-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, 1972), p. 75.

Theoretical Conclusions

In summary, then, the case of residential security patrols suggests at least two significant departures from previous hypotheses regarding citizen participation and class status. First, results from a national survey indicate that individuals of low-income levels are actively engaged in the operation and administration of residential patrols and guards, therefore disputing the notion that voluntary participation, as such, is largely confined to middle- and upper-income individuals. Second, participation in patrol activities discredits the concept that lower-class citizens, while capable of expressive activity, are poor performers in voluntary efforts requiring constructive and instrumental behavior. Rather, it shows that low-income individuals can take an active part in constructive activity designed not for immediate gratification or personal gain, but for benefits to the community at-large.

The case of residential patrols and guards addresses a third notion about citizen participation and class status that should be considered. That is, implicit in the concept of participation being a positive function of income is the notion that whatever actions are taken by high-income individuals to deal with a community problem, the approach taken by people of low-incomes to the same problem, will be different. While at first glance, the case of citizen patrols seems to uphold this concept--in that upper-income groups

hire guards and lower-income groups conduct their own patrolling--it should be noted that in the course of this investigation, and in that of the national survey undertaken by the Rand Corporation, it was discovered that given additional financial aide, low-income areas would have frequently opted for private security protection in lieu of the resident volunteer mode. Recalling the statement quoted from the 1973 LEAA study on residential crime, "the decision about what to do is guided primarily by (the) economic situation," it could be inferred that in the case of neighborhood security, reactions to solving the crime problem are often similar across all income levels. Differences in program design and implementation, however, result because of monetary constraints.

Recognition of this situation has even come in the form of legislation pending in the United States Congress. The proposed bill, H.R. 12262, initially submitted in 1971 by New York Representative Jonathan Bingham, calls for the distribution of funds to organized groups of citizens engaged in certain community crime prevention activities. Citing the need for such legislation, Congressman Bingham remarked in the Congressional Record of December 13, 1971:

The wealthy can hire guards or professional protection agencies to provide extra security for their homes and neighborhoods. But middle- and low-income citizens must do it themselves, and often incur considerable costs in scarce time and funds.¹³

¹³Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham, "Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act," Congressional Record 17, 92nd Congress (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971).

As currently written, Bingham's legislation would make residents' organizations involved in anticrime services eligible for federal grants that would reimburse them for time and expenses incurred, such as stipends, training, and certain equipment. Specifically, such services could include roving or stationary crime watch patrols, escorts for persons leaving or returning to their places of residence, and the reporting of criminal or suspicious activities to police and other residents. No funds, however, may be used for the purchase of chemical agents or other weapons, or to defray the cost of the use of motor vehicles. In addition, residents' organizations would be required under the act to coordinate their activities with the police, and to show evidence both of community support and respect for the constitutional rights of members of the community.

Bingham's remarks in the Congressional Record also address an important policy reason for having crime control funds disbursed directly at the neighborhood level. "Extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs . . . with regard to the implementation of the Safe Streets Act indicate that funding under that program is seriously clogged," he wrote, reminding legislators that at the time of his remarks, 92.1 percent of the funds appropriated for the year ending June 30, 1971 had not been received by local governments nationwide. Attributing this logjam to the intricate state planning processes required

by the Safe Streets Act, Bingham hailed his bill as one method by which the complicated planning procedures delaying safe street funds could be avoided.

The Congressman's bill was initially drafted in response to the perceived needs of several neighborhood patrols in his district. "Ideally, these neighborhoods would like to be able to hire security protection," said Greg Zorthium, a legislative aide to Representative Bingham, "but that not being the case, the next best thing is to provide them with supplemental funds to better carry out their goal of neighborhood crime prevention."¹⁴ Although the bill has never been reported from its committee, Bingham remains undaunted. He plans to resubmit his "Citizen Anti-crime Patrol Assistance Act" for the third time in the spring of 1976. "Mr. Bingham is thoroughly impressed with the responsible efforts of his constituents who participate in security patrols, and believes their efforts should be encouraged," Zorthium said. He added that "to the best of his knowledge," most of the patrols in the Congressman's Bronx district are in low-income neighborhoods.¹⁵

While numerous respondents in the Rand survey acknowledged that they would prefer to engage hired security guard service for their neighborhoods and apartment buildings,

¹⁴Greg Zorthium, Legislative Assistant to Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D.-N.Y.), Personal Interview, February 17, 1976.

¹⁵Ibid.

financial limitations mandated the formulation of volunteer patrols. Located, however, were at least six instances of low-income areas with hired security protection. In the city of New Orleans, for instance, two such communities were identified. One is a Turnkey development where the homeowners' association extracts a fee from each resident's monthly note in order to pay a private security firm. "When vandalism and burglary started getting bad, the residents decided to take precautions," explained community counselor and resident Mrs. Catherine Florent.

At a general meeting of the homeowners, we talked about starting our own volunteer patrols, but the majority of the residents didn't seem to have the time or the interest. Others were too afraid to get involved, so we decided to hire guards instead.¹⁶

A similar situation developed in a mid-town neighborhood of New Orleans that is characterized by its two-family frame houses and its large elderly population. "It's not a rich area," remarked Mrs. Marta Lamar, resident and vice president of the Uptown Civic Association, "but we realized we had to protect ourselves in the face of rising crime in the neighborhood. So we scrimp a bit, pay our security patrol, and hopefully feel a little safer." Mrs. Lamar acknowledged that a few months after the guards were hired, residents began to complain about the financial strain of maintaining the security service. She did not sound

¹⁶Mrs. Catherine Florent. Personal Interviews, New Orleans, Louisiana, August 7, 1975 and January 19, 1976.

optimistic when she said, "Unless something changes in the financial situations of the neighbors, I don't know whether we'll have enough support to renew the service when the security contract expires in the summer."¹⁷

These cases, along with the thrust of the Bingham bill, indicate that there might be a consensus across economic lines regarding the most agreeable method of providing neighborhood security; income limitations, however, may prohibit a common method of approaching the problem.

Description of the Case Studies

In light of this general discussion regarding citizen participation in relation to economic status and crime prevention, four case studies of residential patrols and guards have been researched which address the major issues cited. Specifically, the cases demonstrate that low-income residents can be mobilized to participate in instrumental activities geared toward crime prevention; given the financial resources, however, they are likely to opt for alternatives similar to those pursued by upper-income individuals. On the other hand, there are wealthy areas whose residents, by virtue of their ideological views, prefer to engage in self-help modes of crime prevention that are more likely to be found in low- or middle-income settings.

¹⁷Mrs. Marta Lamar, Personal Interview, New Orleans, Louisiana, January 18, 1976.

Of the four case study sites, two are located in the same inner-city Boston district, and are situated approximately five blocks apart. The other two sites are located in the cities of Baltimore and New Orleans, respectively.

The first case study, "Casa Vista," focuses on a Boston public housing project for the elderly which initially administered a security program combining the use of volunteer resident monitors with hired, professional security guards. At present, the volunteer surveillance component of the security package has been temporarily suspended and residents are currently involved in planning efforts to reorganize the activity.

The second Boston site, the "O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol," exemplifies a completely voluntary activity undertaken by the residents of a middle- to upper-income area, most of whom are homeowners. The O'Brien neighborhood group boasts some forty-five volunteers who maintain a mobile foot patrol that operates six nights a week, year-round.

In Baltimore, another housing project for the elderly was chosen as a research site. Like Casa Vista, the security package at "Pembroke Gardens" combines a professional guard service which is supplemented by a resident monitoring system. Unlike the Casa Vista experience, however, the citizen volunteer program at this project has been able to maintain its vitality and effectiveness.

Finally, an upper-income neighborhood in New Orleans was selected as an example of an area which has opted to

hire private security guards. Because of its economic and architectural characteristics, as well as its location as a central city neighborhood, "Belle Ville" is in several respects a district comparable to the O'Brien area. Its residents, however, have chosen to invest their money, rather than their time and personal effort, into making the neighborhood a safer place to live.

These four particular sites were selected because their experiences call into question widely held assumptions regarding class status and citizen participation in voluntary activities and in neighborhood crime control. The most significant questions to be addressed by these case studies will be:

1. What measures do citizens take to combat residential crime?
2. How does the economic status of a residential area affect its approach to curbing the crime problem?
3. How does the evidence regarding citizen participation in residential patrols and guards correlate with earlier hypotheses associating voluntary action with individuals of high incomes?

These questions will be addressed in the section following the description of the four case study sites.

CHAPTER III

THE CASE STUDIES

O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol

Boston, Massachusetts

The O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol surveilles a four-block area in the northern section of Boston's multi-ethnic district, Delmar Bay. In contrast to the larger community, which is composed of large numbers of black, white, Chinese, Hispanic and Middle Eastern people, the O'Brien area is almost exclusively white. Neighborhood residents estimate the mean income to be between \$15,000 to \$20,000, while the 1970 census records at least 16 percent of the greater O'Brien area earning over \$20,000 yearly. Most of the residents in the O'Brien neighborhood are homeowners who have invested considerable amounts of time and money into the renovation of architecturally noteworthy townhouses. The neighborhood, nevertheless, is threatened with the same crime problems plaguing adjacent areas: narcotics sales, muggings, burglaries, and car thefts all abound nearby.

Origin of Patrol

J. B. Compton, an artist and graphic designer who has lived in the neighborhood for nine years and who is a

patrol member, has had several personal experiences with crime since moving to the O'Brien area. He has been a victim of what he described as a "spectacular" burglary in which his house was "virtually cleaned out." In addition, his car has been vandalized several times and tools have been stolen from his backyard on three occasions. "Replacing all these things, along with paying high insurance rates, has probably made my cost of living double what it would be in the suburbs," Compton said, "but I appreciate the other advantages of living in the inner-city."

Compton's experiences are not unique in the O'Brien neighborhood. In the fall of 1973, a rash of housebreaks and muggings swept through a four-block section of the area, and a group of alarmed citizens met to discuss means of stemming the crime wave. That neighbors approached the problem in a collective manner was not unusual as this small enclave was already a particularly organized community. Other matters around which residents had previously banded together included the petitioning of city hall for improved street lighting; the contribution of both funds and labor to repair local alley fences; and the organization of a tree-planting campaign to beautify the neighborhood.

In the community-at-large, residents have expressed their political and social concerns by serving on the boards or participating in the activities of neighborhood settlement houses, health centers, urban renewal committees and detoxification clinics. Several residents are also active

members of the Delmar Historical Society, the political Ward Committee, and the O'Brien neighborhood improvement association.

Thus, in response to the threatening crime problem, it was not unusual that a neighborhood-wide meeting was organized. Here, according to David High, a community leader, residents first decided to request additional police patrols in the area, and then discussed measures by which individuals could increase their own "security consciousness." This resulted in many homeowners purchasing lights for the fronts and backs of houses and installing burglar alarms and strong locks inside. It also resulted in a community pledge to make special efforts to observe street activity as often as possible and report any suspicious behavior to the police. "This actually wasn't a difficult thing to get organized," High claimed, "because we've got a neighborhood where most everyone knows each other and a spirit of unity already exists."

For the police's part, they were apparently slow to act on the neighborhood's request for additional coverage. Challenging the police assertion that the neighborhood was receiving increased protection, a group of O'Brien residents assumed a street vigil to tabulate the number of patrolmen and cars covering the area. Their results contradicted police statements. "When we proved that we were getting no response from the police, we decided to see if we could

stop crime on the streets ourselves," High recalled. With that mandate, about four residents volunteered to plan the details of the O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol. When the plan was proposed before another general neighborhood meeting, some fifteen to twenty people immediately volunteered to participate. Recruitment at this time was by word of mouth. Eventually, patrol volunteers numbered about forty-five. "It was not without some difficulty that we ultimately gained neighborhood support," said High. "Initially, we were charged with being vigilantes and racists, people who were out with guns trying to preserve a lily-white street. These charges have now diminished, but in the beginning we had to be firm in our commitment to stay out on the street."

The original goal of the patrol was to make this two-block area safer for its residents, and that goal remains today. An independent organization, the patrol performs no non-crime related functions, although as previously mentioned, many of the patrol participants belong to the larger O'Brien Neighborhood Association which sponsors many social, political, and service-oriented activities.

Patrol Operations

Presently, the O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol operates from 9:00 P.M. to 1:00 A.M. every night of the week but Friday. Each four-hour shift is manned by two volunteers from the neighborhood. Volunteers usually patrol once every two weeks with the same partner. When the patrol originally

started, the shift ran from 10:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M., but was soon changed to 8:00 P.M. until midnight. The current hours, High said, were inaugurated in the summer of 1975 and are still in effect.

The most important instruction to all O'Brien patrol participants is to remain visible. "Visibility," explained High, "makes residents feel secure and also deters potential criminals." In that light, the main activities of the patrol include walking and standing around the two-block area so that neighbors know the patrol is on duty; talking to or greeting residents as they approach their homes; escorting people into their homes or around the block, if requested; and periodically checking the back alleys of the streets covered by the patrol.

Patrol member Compton does not feel that his activities are dangerous. "You have to be careful because you don't know if a passerby is armed or not," he said, "but a little common sense eliminates most of the danger in this work." Compton added that he would not prefer to have hired guards patrol the neighborhood because he feels that their lack of commitment to and familiarity with the area would reduce their effectiveness.

If a patrol member witnesses a crime, his instructions are to call the police, blow his whistle, and, if at all possible, not to become involved in a confrontation. "We will confront a criminal if we have to," High said, "but we try not to. So far, we haven't had to do that because

our whistle campaign has been so successful. Our neighborhood's show of force has successfully intervened in several incidents." The whistle campaign referred to by High is an integral part not only of the patrol but also of the neighborhood's total crime prevention effort. All residents, whether on patrol or not, carry tin whistles which they blow if they become involved in an incident. Upon hearing the sound of a whistle, all neighbors are instructed to call the police immediately and then go outside to lend assistance to the victim. If a resident is inside his home and needs assistance, he should telephone the police or any neighbor involved in the patrol. "We want our neighbors to know they can call on us at any time," High explained. According to High, at least five or six muggings and several auto thefts have been broken up by residents responding to the call of a whistle. "Response to whistle calls has been fantastic, even late at night," High said.

The inexpensive whistles are essentially the only equipment used by patrol personnel. The participants wear no special uniforms or badges and do not carry weapons. Money for the purchase of a walkie-talkie was collected communally among patrol members several months ago, but apparently the inferior quality of the radio has limited its usefulness, and few participants now carry it. High remarked, however, that he would like to see the patrol acquire a good walkie-talkie set and to have area residents

purchase claxon horns, which are easier to use than whistles and emit louder sounds.

Organizational Structure and Activities

Current membership in the security operations hovers around forty-five, and all of the patrol volunteers are white, adult males. A woman, however, runs a base station from her home, and several other female residents of the neighborhood assist with distributing fliers or performing other administrative chores. The woman who heads the base station is responsible for shift scheduling, finding substitutes for absentees, keeping written records of patrol-related incidents, and calling the occasional meetings for patrol members. As the base station operator, she also monitors the walkie-talkie if a volunteer decides to use it on patrol, and she always remains near her telephone in order to receive any emergency calls. In addition, the base station operator is in close communication with the local police. She follows up on patrol requests to summon the police and, as a representative of the neighborhood, frequently presents local police with security-related requests and demands.

According to High, the patrol has no specific officers or leadership positions, except for the base station administrator. "Several of the more active volunteers have emerged, through their involvement, as patrol spokesmen," High explained, "but none has titles of any sort." As one of those

"spokesmen," High estimated that he spends about twelve hours per month on patrol efforts. Decisions, he added, are usually made by the base station operator or are decided in meetings of the entire patrol. Compton emphatically asserted that all patrol volunteers can have a voice in running the operation. "There are no real patrol leaders," he said, "and we usually have open meetings where people can criticize, make suggestions, or just talk out their problems."

During the past two years, recruitment for the patrol has been minimal. The membership total of forty-five has apparently remained constant since the patrol's formation, so no extensive recruiting has been necessary. According to Compton, in order to join the patrol, all one must do is express an interest in getting involved. The only "dues" are the hours one pledges to patrol. Compton usually patrols twice each month for a total of approximately eight hours. "The patrol certainly can be a burden," he remarked, "but I try to work out my schedule accordingly." Each patrol member is expected to be "level-headed and willing to participate." Each novice is trained by a veteran volunteer who accompanies him on his first few patrol shifts. No written rules or behavioral guidelines exist. "The general tone for our patrol activities was set in our planning discussions," said High, "and we all have a sense of what we should or should not do. Foremost is an understanding of being careful for our personal self and of getting involved only

in absolute emergencies." Since the patrol has been in existence, no members have been disciplined or discharged for acting with poor judgment.

Another member, Bradford Cunningham, joined the O'Brien patrol a little over one year ago. He heard about the patrol through the neighborhood "grapevine," he said. According to Cunningham, most patrol members have joined because they are committed to making the area a safe, enjoyable place to live, although some residents have chosen not to participate because they feel the job is dangerous or they are in poor health, or they disagree philosophically with the concept of a neighborhood patrol. "Others, particularly renters, just aren't interested," added Compton. "There's a real gap in participation between those who own property and those who don't," he said. When asked what members gain from participation in the patrol, Compton replied that more acquaintanceships are made with neighbors and a heightened sense of community spirit develops. "The greatest rewards, however, are negative ones," he replied, "such as everyone in my family simply being safe. When things are quiet, when nothing is happening, that's our best reward."

The O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol is supported entirely by funds contributed by participants. Each member spends between \$5.00 and \$10.00 per year to purchase whistles, repair fences in the alleys, and buy administrative supplies for the base station operator.

Outcomes

While the nature of patrol activity has not changed since the patrol's inception, the level of activity has varied. As previously noted, the patrol operated seven nights per week until the summer of 1975, when it cut back to a six-night scheduling (every night but Friday). High said that the reduction in coverage was necessitated by the loss of some patrol volunteers, but, he hastily added, "Our commitment to maintaining an on-going patrol effort is much more important than our being out every night. As long as criminals see a lot of people out on the street most of the time, they stay away."

High admitted, however, that regular attendance is beginning to become a problem, and that the patrol's more active members are thinking of initiating a recruiting drive. They are also considering reducing patrol activity to fifteen days a month instead of the full thirty. "If this happens, we'll stagger the shifts so that criminals will not be able to tell when people will be out," High explained.

Despite incipient attendance problems, the patrol currently is operating at a full level of activity, but, "people are getting bored because things are so quiet," High said. When the patrol first began, participants intervened in several muggings and attempted car robberies and turned away countless suspicious looking loiterers. Now, people are beginning to lose interest because there is very little activity on the streets.

In general, the patrol seems to be widely supported by residents. "We get tons of feedback from neighbors who personally thank us for making the area safer," High said. Compton also feels that most residents have a positive opinion of the patrol, but, he added, "I have no idea what the local police think about the group. Because our direct contact is so minimal, I sometimes get the feeling they don't care that we exist."

Officer Jon Lindh's views about the police's relationship with the patrol differ from Compton's. Lindh said that he has been in contact several times with members of the O'Brien Patrol. "As far as citizen patrols go, they behave themselves pretty well," he said, adding that he is unaware of any police complaints regarding the patrol's behavior or activities. Lindh acknowledged, however, that contact between police and patrol members is minimal. Although sector car patrolmen occasionally stop to chat briefly with a patrol member, but that is the exception rather than the rule. On the other hand, patrol members have gone to the district station numerous times over the past years to talk with the captain or to present a list of grievances about things happening in the neighborhood.

In discussing the patrol's accomplishments, Officer Lindh said that they have been primarily twofold: the patrol has fostered a sense of community awareness and concern and has also kept the police informed of neighborhood

happenings. In general, however, he does not think the concept of citizen patrols should be supported because "these people can't take the place of police. They usually don't know what to look for or how to handle a serious problem." Basic crime reporting, he added, "was a good thing. We encourage people to do that."

In patrol member Grady's estimation, the success of the patrol has far exceeded his original expectations. There has been a visible reduction in the neighborhood's crime rate, he contends, and increased community cohesion has accompanied the concern about security. In discerning the effect the patrol has had on reducing crime in the neighborhood, High maintains that "boredom is success." "There have been no housebreaks, muggings, or other criminal activity in the last eight or nine months," he said, "and there is no telling how many potential criminals we have deterred. Regarding crime displacement, local policeman Bill Conrad feels that the patrol's presence on the streets has probably induced some criminals to victimize other neighborhoods instead of the O'Brien area. He emphasized, however, that no crime statistics exist to verify his statement.

Residents, in the meantime, are still concerned about security in their community, and have participated in other crime prevention programs, such as inscribing their social security numbers upon items of value, attending neighborhood-organized security information meetings, and installing home and automobile alarm systems. Individuals

are still encouraged to engage in crime reporting and street-watching, activities which High describes as essential to maintaining the security of the area as a whole. "A community must be organized to implement a successful patrol," High continued, "but a patrol can't do it alone. Individually, residents have to help by acting in a security conscious manner, and by being aware of the importance of street-watching and crime reporting."

Pembroke Gardens Monitors

Baltimore, Maryland

A modern high-rise public housing project for the elderly, Pembroke Gardens is situated near downtown Baltimore and houses some 220 senior citizens. Although a majority of the residents are black, almost 40 percent of the tenant population is white. All residents, of course, must subscribe to Baltimore Housing Authority income limitations in order to be eligible for the low-income housing units.

Pembroke Gardens was designed to accommodate the needs and concerns of senior citizens. In the initial stages of planning for the building, serious consideration was given to the problem of security. As a result, the building was designed to maximize security and minimize unauthorized entry. It has only one main entrance, which is locked every day at 4:30 P.M., and four video televisions, located in the lobby, were installed to monitor the underground parking garage and the exit doors leading from the

interior stairwells. High-intensity lighting illuminates the property surrounding the building.

In addition, the Baltimore Housing Authority decided to promote a lobby surveillance program which had been originally tested in several of its projects for the elderly in 1972. By soliciting resident volunteers to act as lobby monitors and by hiring private security guards to patrol the complex, the Housing Authority hoped to foster a safe environment at Pembroke Gardens.

Origin of Patrol

The first resident monitors at Pembroke Gardens appeared for duty in 1973, shortly after the building opened for occupancy. According to Gerald Halprin, security coordinator for the Baltimore Housing Authority, the purpose of the resident monitoring program is twofold: to maximize security precautions in the building, and to provide an activity that helps occupy the time of senior citizens. To date, these goals remain largely unchanged.

Crime at Pembroke Gardens appears to be practically non-existent, according to building manager Larry Brown, who said that there have been no criminal incidents within the building since it opened. The volunteer monitoring system continues; however, in order to provide preventive security measures for the residents. On the other hand, the neighborhood in which the building is situated is not crime-free. Purse snatching and burglaries were the most frequent crimes

cited by Brown, but he also mentioned that bank robberies have occurred in the area.

At present, all eight of Baltimore's housing projects for the elderly use tenant volunteers as part of a lobby monitoring system, and Halprin said that the program is considered an integral part of the Housing Authority's policy for housing for the elderly. "Unless the time comes when we have funds for 24-hour private security guards, we will continue to encourage this approach," he said.

Patrol Operations

The resident volunteer force at Pembroke Gardens presently totals eleven men and women, all of whom are senior citizens. Brown indicated that this is an average representation for any given time, although in the past participants have numbered as many as eighteen or as few as seven. There is no official group leader among the volunteers; rather, they turn to Larry Brown for information, assistance, or solutions to problems. Brown estimated that he spends about five hours per week dealing with affairs pertaining to the monitoring program.

The monitors, themselves, contribute a considerable time investment to the program. They conduct a year-round operation which provides surveillance coverage from 8:30 A.M. until 4:30 P.M., Monday through Friday. Individual monitors usually work at least one two-hour shift every week, but

Brown said that each volunteer generally handles two shifts per sitting and often mans the monitor desk two or more times each week.

Earl Thompson, a resident monitor of two months' experience, works at the front desk twice a week and usually undertakes two shifts each time. While he is dismayed by the fact that the volunteers receive no pay for their efforts, he says he is glad he joined the monitoring program. "It gives me something to do," he explained, "and it also lets me see different faces. I like what I'm doing."

The duties of the volunteers consist primarily of monitoring ingress to the building and regulating access to the underground parking garage. Both of these duties are executed from a main desk located in the front of the lobby. During each shift, a monitor sits at the desk and "keeps his eye" on lobby activity. He is responsible for insuring that every visitor signs a log book, indicating his name, intended destination, and time of visit. Each monitor is instructed to challenge verbally any unauthorized person who does not sign the log or who tries to slip by the front desk.

Monitors supervise access to the underground parking facility by means of an intercom system and the aforementioned video televisions. When drivers approach the locked garage entrance, they must transmit their names and apartment numbers over the intercom. The resident monitor then presses

a button, located on the wall behind the front desk, to release the garage door. As an added precaution, a video camera is focused on the parking entrance so that the monitors on duty not only hear drivers' names, but also view their cars on one of the lobby televisions.

Aside from the log book and the electronic devices at the desk, the resident monitors have no special equipment with which to carry out their charge; nor do they have special uniforms or other identifying apparel. There is a telephone located at the desk, but it is to be used only in cases of extreme emergency. When problems arise, monitors are instructed to contact the manager's office, which is open Monday through Friday from 8:30 A.M. until 5:00 P.M. If an incident occurs requiring the police or some other emergency service, the manager or his assistant makes the appropriate contacts. In that regard, volunteers also are instructed never to interfere in an incident, but to report all problems or suspicious activity to the manager. Similarly, residents in distress are told to telephone the manager's office directly or to use an emergency switch located in the bathroom and bedroom of each apartment. These switches are connected to a panel at the front desk and, when activated, signal the desk monitor that there is a problem in the respective apartment.

The Housing Authority contracts with a private security company to provide supplemental guard service on weekends, holidays, and week nights--the times when monitors

are not on duty. The guards work two eight-hour shifts and perform essentially the same duties as the resident volunteers. The guards, however, wear special uniforms and carry nightsticks. When they come on duty each afternoon at 4:30 P.M., the front doors of the building are locked, and the guards use a buzzer activated from the security panel at the desk to open the doors.

Organizational Structure and Activities

As previously mentioned, the original monitors were recruited by the management either at tenants' meetings or during leasing interviews. This mode of recruitment still predominates, but is now supplemented by a more direct outreach emanating from the manager's office. When the volunteer roster is low, the manager or one of his associates personally contacts individuals and encourages them to join the monitoring program. In general, however, there appears to be an almost continual recruitment effort on the part of management since there has never been a time when additional volunteers could not have been used. The manager's office is also responsible for shift scheduling and for finding substitutes for absentees; staff from that office even fill in personally when a replacement cannot be found. Should any disciplinary problems arise, they, too, would be handled by Brown or one of his assistants.

When actually selecting volunteers, Brown is most interested in having reliable, alert individuals sitting

at the front desk. "We need people who can come regularly and who'll keep a good watch over things going on," he said. Training for new recruits is brief and is conducted by Brown. Essentially, new volunteers are informed about behavioral rules and the duties required of them while on the job (a manual is permanently located at the front desk). They are also introduced to the electronic hardware at the security panel, although technical instruction is minimal since the monitors only have to maintain the log book and operate the parking garage access switch.

No participants in the program are paid; all activity is entirely voluntary. For that reason, manager Brown feels that it is difficult to maintain long-term commitments from many residents. He pointed out that, while some of the volunteers have been working since 1973 when the building originally opened, others have dropped out of the program after only two months. Funds for the purchase and maintenance of the security hardware and fees for the private guards come from the Housing Authority's capital budget, but no stipends have ever been made available to the resident monitors. Occasional dinners and parties have been arranged for the volunteers, but to date no other remunerations have been awarded them. Total expenditures in 1975 for the resident monitors will probably amount to less than \$100.

Brown does not feel, however, that an absence of salaries discourages tenant participation in the monitoring

program. More serious, he feels, is the dearth of activity at the front desk. "Even though many of our residents join up because they are looking for something to do, they get bored quickly and then reduce their participation in the operation," he said.

Total membership in the monitoring program has fluctuated during its lifetime, but never has the system been in danger of folding. There has always been sufficient interest to maintain the desk duty on a regular schedule without interruption. Brown indicated that the shifts of the private guards could probably be extended if no volunteers were available for lengthy periods of time.

According to Brown, police relations with the volunteer monitors are good, but there is no formal coordination of activities with the district headquarters. Although local patrolmen frequently visit the project, usually stopping to chat with the monitor on duty, Brown says he would like to have one specific patrolman assigned to the building on a regular basis. "So far, we haven't been able to get that kind of a commitment from the police," he said.

Outcomes

Mr. Brown was enthusiastic in his assessment of the volunteer monitors. The most serious problem cited was that of maintaining volunteer commitment on a consistent basis. Boredom seemed to be the most frequent reason for abandoning desk duty. Since the building appears to be crime-free and

since no monitors have ever experienced serious problems or suffered recriminations while on or off duty, fear has never been expressed as a reason for not joining the patrol. According to Brown, no monitors have ever encountered any criminal activity while on duty, and even belligerent visitors have been few. "I've never had any problems," said volunteer monitor Earl Thompson, "but I hear that the night guards sometimes have trouble with drunks. Nothing ever happens during the day though," he added. "It's always quiet."

In that regard, Brown feels that the desk monitors are valuable deterrents against criminal activity and that crime could become a problem were the volunteers to be removed from their posts. Safety, he said, would probably become a serious issue if there were no routine surveillance at the front entrance.

Assessing the reputation of the monitoring program among project residents is not easy, but both Brown and Halprin assert that many Pembroke Gardens occupants chose to live there because of the security provisions. There have been no complaints about the monitors either acting in a dictatorial manner or overstepping their bounds. The residents just seem to "like having them there," Brown said.

It is difficult to determine the importance or the effectiveness of the monitors in isolation from the additional anti-crime features in the building (i.e., the hired guards, the locked entranceway doors, the bright lighting,

and the secured underground parking facilities). Perhaps the best endorsement of the program comes from the fact that the Baltimore Housing Authority has chosen to encourage this activity in all of its public housing projects for the elderly.

Belle Ville Security Guards

New Orleans, Louisiana

Private security guards were hired by the Belle Ville Neighborhood Association in 1965 to stem the tide of rising crime in that area. Burglary, vandalism, rape, and murder were becoming serious crime problems when residents of this wealthy, architecturally-distinct New Orleans neighborhood decided to hire private security guards.

The Belle Ville community is a well-delineated eight-by-ten-block area composed of many historic antebellum homes. One of the oldest neighborhoods in the city of New Orleans, it has managed to preserve its stability and grace despite the toll time has taken on surrounding neighborhoods. Located just a few miles from the downtown business corridor, Belle Ville was described by one of its residents as "a high-level income island in a central city area." Census figures from 1970 record the area to be almost exclusively white, with the mean income at \$17,900. At least 29 percent of the population, however, earned in excess of \$20,000, and the median value of owner occupied homes was over \$50,000.

Origin of Patrol

In 1965, local residents, alarmed by the volume and seriousness of criminal activity in their neighborhood, turned to their longstanding community organization (it had been formed in the 1930s) for help. On behalf of the concerned residents, Mr. Oliver Grenet, a leader of the Belle Ville Neighborhood Association, and two other gentlemen from the group personally visited the assistant superintendent of police to discuss the area's crime situation.

According to Grenet, the police were sympathetic to the problems, but were unable to assure any solutions. Pleading manpower shortages in general, the assistant superintendent said he could not afford to permanently assign more men to the Belle Ville beat, but suggested that the residents hire off-duty policemen to supplement service in the area. That was an unacceptable option, explained Grenet in an interview, because there was no guarantee that the same men would be available on a routine basis throughout the year. "It was clear that our only realistic alternative would be to hire private patrol people, which is what we did, and, basically, this has solved our problem."

Original subscribers to the private patrol numbered eighty, and these families paid \$10 per month for daily service, eight hours per day. Initial members were recruited by word-of-mouth, either at Grenet's urging or at the encouragement of one of several neighbors who supported the patrol concept.

The original goals of the Belle Ville patrol remain largely unchanged. The private security force was initially hired to deter rising crime in the area, and also to help create a buffer between the Belle Ville section and its surrounding high-crime neighborhoods. From all accounts, the patrol quickly proved its merit, and community leaders have seen no reason to alter its focus.

Patrol Operations

The Belle Ville patrol operates on a year-round basis, seven days per week, from 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 A.M., except Wednesdays, when the patrol begins at 3:00 P.M. According to Grenet, the free time on Wednesdays traditionally has been reserved to tend to any automotive repairs or equipment problems that might need attention.

Basically, the 20-hour daily shift is divided among three guards who are specifically assigned to the Belle Ville neighborhood. There is no particular patrol leader among the three, although two of the guards are considered full-time and work an average of fifty hours per week, while the third serves part-time and contributes about thirty hours per week. All of the guards are in the employment of a private company that contracts directly with the Belle Ville Neighborhood Association; none of the guards resides in the community. The Belle Ville patrolmen all seem to have good attendance records, but when they are absent, the security company is responsible for finding a substitute in order to preserve uninterrupted patrol service.

All patrol members are trained by their company in the use and maintenance of their equipment and are informed of the legal issues involved in search, detention, and arrest. One Belle Ville patrolman attended the New Orleans Police Academy where he received professional law enforcement training.

The principal charge of each patrolman is to maintain regular surveillance over the neighborhood. Each guard is expected to cruise the eight-by-ten-block area continually, keeping an eye out for criminal activity or any suspicious event. Additional activities include meeting residents who are entering their homes late at night, checking the doors and windows of subscribers' homes at least once a day, and keeping a watchful eye on houses left vacant by travellers.

In order to help them execute their duties, a wide array of equipment is made available to the Belle Ville patrolmen. Each guard wears a clearly identifiable uniform and carries a set of handcuffs, a nightstick, and a .38 caliber pistol. The unmarked car which is driven by patrolmen is equipped with a spotlight, a citizen band radio, a police-call monitor, and a radio-telephone whereby subscribers can contact the patrol directly when its assistance is needed. The original patrol in 1965 was not so extensively outfitted, but, according to Grenet, Belle Ville Neighborhood Association officials have closely followed patrol activities and through the years have responded to growing needs by making more equipment available.

All three patrol members have been designated as specially commissioned police officers who have been granted the power of arrest. They are instructed to intervene in any suspicious activity, and have not hesitated to do so. "I'm a crime fighter," said Roger Cadieux, a patrolman in Belle Ville for eight consecutive years, "and when I see something going on, I'm going to break it up." He estimated that during his Belle Ville tenure he has appeared as the arresting officer in about 100 criminal court cases and in almost 200 municipal court hearings. "Sure I think it's dangerous," Cadieux said, "but it's my business and I like it. I'll probably do this kind of work the rest of my life."

As part of their routine, the guards keep a daily log of all telephone calls received, the number of contracts made with the security company's base station, and the incidents in which they have intervened. The condition of all equipment, including the automobile, and the number of miles traveled on each shift are also recorded. Copies of the daily logs are kept by both the security company and the Belle Ville Neighborhood Association in care of Mr. Grenet.

Organizational Structure and Activities

The three patrolmen are all middle-aged white males. Patrolman Cadieux's eight consecutive years of service in Belle Ville make him the veteran of the group, while the two other individuals have patrolled in the neighborhood for about three to four years.

The security guard company for which they work is ultimately responsible for selecting, hiring, and disciplining the guards, although Grenet, who is now the Association's security committee chairman, has worked closely with the company in regard to these matters. "We're very selective about the kind of guards we want," said Grenet, "and have made our preferences clearly known to the security company. There have been several times when we've dismissed patrolmen who we felt were below our expectations."

In that regard, Grenet makes most major policy decisions in conjunction with the two other members of the security committee. "Any decisions involving changes in coverage, hiring and firing, or the expenditure of sums over \$200 or \$300 must first be cleared by the Committee as a whole," said Grenet. "The minor decisions I usually make myself."

Patrolman Cadieux added that he and the other guards are often consulted for their opinions about matters involving the patrol routine and daily operations. "Our opinions are respected by Mr. Grenet, the residents, and our company," said Cadieux.

The 20-hour patrol maintained in Belle Ville is expensive. A \$40,000 yearly fee is levied by the security company to cover all expenses and a service charge. That fee is paid by some 700 households that subscribe for patrol service through the Belle Ville Neighborhood Association. "With so many subscribers, however," Grenet explained, "the

patrol service can be offered at a reasonable cost." Single family homes are charged \$7.00 per month for coverage, while apartment units are only charged \$3.50 per month. Households are billed twice yearly, and the funds are used to pay for equipment, maintenance costs, and salaries.

The Belle Ville Neighborhood Association has never received any public funding or foundation grants to help defray costs. From its inception, it has been entirely financed by local residents.

In the history of the patrol there have been no serious setbacks concerning the level of activity; rather, it has grown steadily through the years. Starting with eighty subscribers paying \$10 per month for a daily eight-hour patrol, there were enough households by the third year of operation to sustain a 20-hour per day patrol. The Association has also hired a part-time secretary (at \$600 per month) to take care of all patrol billing matters and clerical work.

Grenet has steadily increased patrol subscriptions by conducting semi-annual recruitment drives, the first of which was formally organized in 1967. The part-time secretary is also responsible for this solicitation effort which involves a mass mailing to the 2,000 residents of Belle Ville. Letters are sent to both subscribers and non-subscribers alike, either thanking them for their participation or encouraging them to support the patrol. Grenet claims that some 80 percent of the single family households

in the area currently subscribe to patrol service and that apartment complexes are also substantially represented. With rising prices, however, a large number of subscribers are needed to offset the costs of the professional security arrangement in Belle Ville. "It's a dilemma," Grenet explained. "Without money, you can't hire good guards, but without competent guards, residents are reluctant to pay the patrol costs." Grenet's aim is to enlist about 200 new members in the coming year, "and we'll get them," he confidently asserts.

Outcomes

The Belle Ville Patrol, now in its tenth year, appears to be healthy and fully operational. While crime has significantly decreased in the area, the potential for a serious problem remains, and residents therefore feel a full-scale patrol is still in order. For example, in the fall of 1974 a persistent "cat burglar" stalked the neighborhood and extra guards had to be called in to help trap the culprit. The following spring there was an armed robbery and murder in the neighborhood. According to Grenet, the combined effect of these incidents was to remind residents of their community's vulnerability to crime. He added, however, that the incidents marked the only two such serious threats in the area since the security patrol went into operation.

There have been no major changes in the nature of the patrol's activity since its start-up, except that as the guards increasingly displayed their courage and skill, they were supplied with more sophisticated equipment in order to carry out their duties.

From all accounts, the members of the Belle Ville patrol are aggressive, fearless individuals who do not shy away from responsibility. Lesser men might have been frightened off by some of the incidents in which the guards have been involved, but from patrolman Cadieux's point of view, the riskier the work, the more interesting it becomes. While guards have intervened in burglaries in progress, apprehended countless suspicious persons on trespassing charges, and have thwarted numerous vandals, no one has ever been seriously injured on patrol. Cadieux, himself, once needed stiches for cuts he received when falling down in pursuit of a burglar, but no guards have ever been wounded by a gun or have even had to use their own revolvers while on the job.

The Belle Ville patrolmen maintain regular contact with the local police and view themselves as providing supplementary police protection. New Orleans policemen in the Bayside District Headquarters know the guards on a first name basis and regularly stop to chat with them or exchange crime information when they are out on patrol. In fact, Belle Ville security guards assist in official "police officer in distress calls" almost once a week. In turn,

Sgt. Jerry Yancey of the Bayside police station estimates that the security guards register about eight or nine calls per month with police for assistance in incidents usually involving burglars, drunks, or speeders. The guards contact the police by the radio-telephone in their car.

In general, response to the patrol has been positive from both residents and police. Neighborhood complaints are usually voiced directly to the individual guard or to Grenet and have mainly concerned lack of visibility or slow response. "We've had no serious complaints," explained Grenet, "because if a patrolman looks as if he isn't going to work out, we dismiss him before any crisis occurs." He cited two incidents in which patrolmen were fired for either sleeping on the job or coming to work apparently intoxicated.

As previously mentioned, police have an excellent rapport with the Belle Ville guards and praise them for both their conduct and their performance. Several policemen feel that the guards are directly responsible for reducing crime in the Belle Ville area and attribute their success to "good judgment, fearless action, and complete familiarity with the neighborhood."

Sgt. Yancey feels it is difficult to assess the probability of the patrol having displaced crime to surrounding areas because of the high volume of criminal activity already existing there. "Crime has always been in those neighborhoods," said Sgt. Yancey, "but I don't know how much of it is perpetrated by would-be Belle Ville criminals."

It seems that the quality of police protection has not dropped significantly in the Belle Ville neighborhood, although Grenet and Sgt. Yancey both admit the private patrol has allowed the police to relax some of its service in Belle Ville. "But that's with our permission," said Grenet, "because our guards give us excellent service, and it's probably to our advantage to have police concentrating on the surrounding neighborhoods."

From all indications, the Belle Ville patrol is successfully preventing crime in the area. Although no formal evaluations of the patrol have been conducted, local police credit the guards with deterrence, and Grenet says he thinks that criminal activity in Belle Ville has been cut by some 80 percent. Perhaps it is patrolman Cadieux, however, who offers the best indication of the patrol's success. When he first came on the job, he says, purse snatching incidents were rampant, and each night he would receive a total of ten or twelve calls pertaining to auto thievery or suspected burglaries. "Now," he claims, "I get one stolen car call every two months, and three burglary calls every six months."

Grenet added that, while the security patrol is the major crime prevention activity going on in the area, the Belle Ville Neighborhood Association brought engravers into the community several years ago to participate in the police-sponsored "Operation ID" program. Several residents are also involved in a city-wide project entitled "Women Against

Crime," which is essentially a security awareness and crime reporting activity. Grenet estimated that at least fifty homes in the neighborhood are wired with individual electronic alarm systems, but, to his knowledge, none of these residences ever have been burglarized.

"Locks and lighting, however, are a different story," he said. Grenet claimed that almost every single-family dwelling in the Belle Ville area was equipped with window and door locks, and that the acquisition of proper lighting had been approached from two directions. That is, individual efforts to illuminate property had been widespread, while city officials also had been pressured to install high-intensity street lights in the area.

Casa Vista Security Guards

Boston, Massachusetts

"Casa Vista"--or Horizon House--is a housing project for the elderly situated in Boston's Delmar Bay section. It is located in a multi-ethnic neighborhood where community organization has steadily increased since 1967 when residents coalesced to oppose a proposed urban renewal project for the area.

The eighteen-story building opened in September 1974, and security guards have been on duty since that time. Professional security was mandated by the serious narcotics problem existing in the neighborhood, along with widespread

burglaries, muggings, and purse snatchings. The same types of crimes still threaten the neighborhood today.

The residents of Casa Vista reflect the multi-ethnic make-up of the entire Delmar Bay section. Of the approximately 230 residents, about 30 percent are white, 25 percent are black, 20 percent are Spanish-speaking (mainly Puerto Rican), 10 percent are Chinese, and the remaining occupants represent a diverse array of Eastern European and Middle Eastern nationalities. Because it is a public housing project, all residents must comply with the income limitations imposed by the Boston Housing Authority in order to qualify for an apartment.

Origin of Patrol

The neighborhood in which the housing project is located has had a history of community activism. In 1967, Spanish-speaking residents, mainly from Puerto Rico, formed a non-profit group entitled People for Community Control (PCC). The purpose of the organization was to combat plans proposed for the area by the Boston Redevelopment Agency. To counteract the Agency's proposals, PCC formulated its own neighborhood development program which focused primarily on expanding housing opportunities for the area's large low-income population. Included in the PCC plan was a proposal to develop and manage under the "Turnkey" program a Boston Housing Authority Project for the elderly. In the late summer of 1974, that building became a reality, and

upon securing the management contract for the building, PCC delegated the management responsibilities to one of its employees, Mr. Edgar Linson.

Throughout every stage of planning for the building, input from area residents was consistently sought. In fact, a neighborhood planning group (which included prospective tenants of Casa Vista) was formed to work with the architect and the PCC developers. Named the Grass Roots Task Force, the twenty people composing the group's membership represented area residents, PCC associates, and employees from various social service agencies. The planners labored for almost two years, deciding issues pertaining to spatial design, furnishings, social programs, and security. About seven participants of this planning effort now reside at Casa Vista.

Under the mandate of this planning group, and with funds made available by the Boston Housing Authority, PCC hired private security guards when it undertook the management of Horizon House in September 1974. The planning group, however, did consider other security alternatives in the course of its deliberations. Locked doors, increased lighting, volunteer monitors, and special design plans to promote visibility on the ground floor were all debated. Also considered were the installation of such electronic hardware as a buzzer and intercom network, and a video system that would include individual television monitors in each apartment. Ultimately, the planning group endorsed all of

the above security features in addition to the guards--and all were implemented in the building.

As tenants began occupying the building, efforts were made to maintain the "participatory environment" which marked the development stages of the high-rise. Although PCC supervises routine management operations, a Tenants Association was formed to discuss and vote on issues affecting residents--issues which often focus on security-related matters, said Mr. Walter Vickers, vice president of the Association. In fact, Vickers, with the assistance of several other residents, personally drafted a proposed constitution for the Horizon House Tenants Association which was later ratified at a general meeting of building residents. Most non-administrative decisions affecting tenants are now brought before the Association, and the management's ultimate goal is to have a completely self-governing building.

In addition to participation in Tenants Association affairs, residents join in activities both within the building and in the neighborhood at-large. At Casa Vista, tenants organize, among other activities, film showings, pot luck dinners, choral sessions and crochet classes. They serve on committees dealing with grievance procedures, security issues, and the distribution of unmarked Housing Authority funds. Outside of the building, they participate in community-wide meetings conducted by PCC, attend special adult programs at the nearby Boswell Community School, and

have actively participated in elections for board members of PCC and the Delmar Planning Area Council.

Winifred Jones, president of the Casa Vista Tenants Association, discussed the level of participation among residents in the apartment complex. "I think the building does pretty well," she said. "Each nationality has elected members to the Tenants Council, and they all have at least one unofficial representative who verbalizes the feelings and complaints of his friends.

"When we have Association meetings, about 90 percent of the tenants come," she continued, "and I think that's a good sign. It means they want to know what's happening in the building, and want to express themselves accordingly."

Mrs. Jones speculated that her "verbal, outgoing personality" might have been the reason she was drafted by several tenants to enter the contest for presidency of the Tenants Association. "Before I moved to the building, I was an old Delmar resident, and one who verbalized a lot. Also, I had had past experience as a community worker with the elderly," Jones explained. "When I moved into this building, several people knew about my background, and encouraged me to become active in building affairs. Next thing I knew, they had me up running for President."

Like the PCC management, Jones looks to the day when Casa Vista will be entirely self-governing and possibly even self-administered. "I personally think the social service directors here take over too much responsibility; they don't leave enough to the individual," she opined.

Patrol Operations

The original goals of the security force at Horizon House were to prevent unauthorized access to the building, maintain surveillance around the immediate grounds of the complex, and provide assistance in case of emergencies. These goals have not changed in the one and a half years that guards have been on duty at Casa Vista. The guards also perform some non-crime related activities, mostly calling taxi cabs for tenants and displaying a willingness to talk with the residents.

The current security shifts at Casa Vista are staffed by single guards who work 8-hour shifts, Monday through Friday, from 5:00 P.M. until 8:00 A.M. Weekends are covered by 24-hour protection, divided into three shifts of eight hours each. The guards work year-round and are responsible for watching only the high-rise building and the lot upon which it is situated.

The main activities of the guards include monitoring the ingress of all visitors and having them sign in and out at the guard desk in the lobby; taking a walking tour of the building each hour in order to check hallways, the roof, and the outside plaza and parking lot; maintaining a log of all activities in each shift; and monitoring the emergency panel, an electronic console with lights connected to switches in each apartment and activated by residents who need assistance.

If a guard witnesses a crime, his instructions are to "directly get involved," to "apprehend the criminal, if possible," Linson said. If a weapon is visible, or if it is clearly unsafe for a guard to intervene, he should call the police immediately. Should tenants need to summon the guard on duty, they can do so either by calling him on the telephone or by pulling the emergency switch in their apartment. Guards at Casa Vargas are unarmed, although they do carry night sticks. They also wear uniforms and badges for identification and have access to a telephone located at their lobby desk. All equipment is provided by the security company.

Last Spring, Linson and several members of the Security Committee tried to initiate supplemental security service during daylight hours by encouraging male residents to volunteer as lobby monitors. Upon implementation of the program, members of the Security Committee kept in close contact with the volunteers, hoping to learn from their experiences and thereby improve the system, explained Chairman Vickers.

Ultimately, the monitoring program failed, and the minutes of the April 3, 1975 Security Committee meeting indicate some of the difficulties which had beset the program. The main problems, as voiced by the tenant volunteers, concerned personal safety and difficulties encountered with visitors refusing to sign the register book. While advice was offered concerning the latter problem, the former

was never resolved, and as a result, a sufficient number of volunteers were never recruited because residents felt too vulnerable to physical attack. "The plan was discontinued after a few months because many of the volunteers simply felt afraid," explained manager Linson. He also added that it was difficult to get steady commitments from volunteers without offering financial incentives.

Organizational Structure and Activities

About three or four regular guards constitute the security staff at Casa Vargas. Most of them are near thirty years of age, and all are male. The process of recruiting, selecting, and training the security agents is handled by the parent security company, which also finds substitutes for guards who are absent.

Since guards were first employed at the housing project, the management has not only asked five or six of them to leave, but has also switched to a completely different company in order to get better service. Explaining the reasons for dismissing the guards, Linson said that some of them could not get along with the tenants, others were found either sleeping or intoxicated while at work, and one was accused of stealing items from the building.

To confirm these allegations, there exist minutes from general assemblies of the Tenants Association and meetings of the Security Committee which are replete with complaints from residents regarding the incompetence and

unprofessionalism of the guards. "None of this, however, accounts for the times the guards were late for work or just didn't execute their duties in a proper manner," Linson said. He estimated that the average guard turnover rate was one guard every two months.

Mr. Vickers elaborated more on the decision last Spring to change security companies. At that time, he said, guard service was performed only between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and midnight. "After midnight," he explained, "trespassers and derelicts frequently would enter the building and try to cause trouble." As a result of this situation, two events occurred: the change of security firms, along with expanded coverage (i.e., until 8:00 A.M.), and the convening of a group of tenants who were seriously concerned about security in the building. These tenants, according to Vickers, have been meeting steadily since last April and, under his leadership, have developed a new security program for Casa Vista. The plan, which he hopes soon will be endorsed at an open meeting of the Tenants Association, calls for two major revisions in the security system:

- (1) new guards manning the lobby shifts from 5:00 P.M. to 8:00 A.M. should be recruited from local, bilingual neighborhood residents who have had some experience in security guard work; and
- (2) a volunteer monitor system, composed of Casa Vista residents should be reinstated. Vickers' group hopes to recruit at least forty residents to participate in the project.

Financial support for the current guards comes from the Boston Housing Authority. Linson estimated that the \$4.10 per hour paid to the security guard company should total about \$27,000 for the 1975 year. Under the new security plan, funds still would be appropriated by the Boston Housing Authority, but "because there will be no middle-man (i.e., a security guard company), Linson explained, "the individual guards should be making more money than the ones currently here."

Although there have been no official studies or evaluations conducted to assess the effectiveness of the guards, Linson feels that their performances have been unsatisfactory. "They are so irresponsible," he said. "We're lucky nothing has ever happened here that would have challenged their abilities."

As manager of the building, Linson is responsible for most of the administrative work pertaining to the security guards. He said that such activity consumes about two hours each week.

Outcomes

While there has been no change in the nature of guard activity in the past, as previously described, the current security service has been expanded to increase protection during the early morning hours. Because of continuing dissatisfaction with guard performance, however, Linson hopes

that the newly-conceived security plan will be adopted. "We have already identified several potential employees," he said, "and because we have a week-to-week contract with our guard company, there should be no difficulty in terminating their services."

Currently, the guards at Casa Vargas have no coordinated activities with police, although they view themselves as supplementary police protection. Contact with the police only occurs when officers are specifically summoned to the project, and that has usually been for health-related emergencies. Linson acknowledged that police respond rapidly to calls from Casa Vista, despite what he called "deplorable police service" in other neighborhoods of Delmar Bay. Vickers raised the issue of alleged harassment by Delmar Bay police of individuals who are not native-speaking Americans. "Police treat our bilingual residents with contempt and disdain," he said, "despite the numerous complaints that have been lodged over the years. What a difference it would make if the police would even respond to our simple request for foreign-speaking operators at the local police station."

The community relations officer at the Delmar Bay police station said that he has never heard any disparaging remarks about the conduct of the guards at Casa Vista. Nor has he been made aware of any incidents or mishaps in which the guards were accused of acting with poor judgment. He admitted, however, that there is no rapport or "steady

line of communication" between the guards and the local police, so only major incidents involving the guards would be brought to the attention of the police. The officer added that the police and the guards have minimal personal contact in the field because the local patrolmen have no instructions to make regular stops at Casa Vista. The community relations officer also pointed out, although he has not been made aware of any specific difficulties with the guards, such matters would be considered internal problems and probably would be handled by the project management and tenants.

Despite the accusations about guards and police, the Casa Vista building has been spared any serious criminal incidents. There has been petty vandalism outside the building and several attempts by troublemakers to get into the complex, but, so far, there has been no major criminal activity. The most serious incident handled by a guard that Linson could remember concerned a struggle between a guard and an intoxicated 77-year-old resident of the building who was armed with a loaded gun. The police were called to the scene, the tenant was arrested and eventually sentenced to one year in prison under the mandate of the new Massachusetts gun control statute.

The guard involved in that struggle feels that the security protection at Casa Vista has been successful in keeping trespassers and other trouble-makers out of the

building. "I've heard lots of stories about the derelicts and vandals who successfully got into the building when there was only one guard shift (5:00 P.M. to midnight) on duty here. A full nighttime watch has made a big difference in security," he said.

Although the guard said that he had no way of knowing what opinions local police hold about the security personnel at Casa Vargas, he feels that the tenants are satisfied with the protection they are getting from the replacement security company. "There have been no conflicts with residents," he said, "and many of them tell us how much better we are than the previous security company." The guard also commented that when he assumed his post at the elderly housing project he thought it was going to be "jumping with excitement because of the crime rate in the general neighborhood." "Instead," he said, "it's turned out to be a quiet job." The most fulfilling part of his work, he added, has been his exposure to people of ethnic origins he had never before encountered. "It's really broadened my perspectives about people," he said. "It's destroyed stereotypes I now know I never should have held."

Linson feels there is no sure way to discern how effective the guards have been in deterring crime, although he believes strongly that some form of protection is needed for residents of the building. "The uniform and the visibility of the guards may keep criminals away and help the

tenants feel safer," he said, "but there is no way of really knowing." Vickers added that since the extension of guard service last spring there had been an almost total absence of trespassers entering the building late at night. Nevertheless, Linson commented that he will feel "much better" when the new security plan is put into operation.

In that regard, both Linson and Vickers acknowledged that their concept of the "best" security program would consist of 24-hour daily coverage provided by competent guards who were residents of the Delmar Bay neighborhood. "If we had the funds to implement around-the-clock service, and if we could find guards who happened to live in the area and were truly capable and committed to their work, then we would know that our building was secure," Linson commented.

CHAPTER IV

ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE CASE STUDIES

The examinations of the four residential patrols, guards, and monitors shed light on the issues discussed and the questions raised in the previous section on citizen participation in voluntary activities as well as in crime control endeavors. The following analysis of those topics will be undertaken by citing specific examples from the study sites, and occasionally by including information from the Rand Corporation's national survey on security patrols.

Question 1: What Measures Do Citizens Take to Combat Residential Crime?

Although the focal point of each case study was the patrol or guard activity, in each instance, additional modes of crime prevention were implemented by residents. All the efforts combined yield what sociologist Gerald Suttles would call a "defended neighborhood"--that is, a residential area which seals itself off by a variety of means in order to achieve a measure of social control. Claiming that the earmarks of the defended neighborhood are found most often in the inner city, Suttles writes:

It is here that one finds vigilante community groups, militant conservation groups, a high incidence of uniformed doormen, and frequent use of door buzzers and TV monitors. Not all of these defensive tactics are equally available to all residents of the inner city, and in many instances one may replace the other. What they indicate is the general apprehensiveness of inner city dwellers, rich and poor alike, and the necessity for each of them to bound off discrete areas within which he can feel safe and secure.¹

A defended neighborhood is achieved through a process, referred to by Temple University Professor Seymour Rosenthal, as "turf reclamation." In the case of residential security, turf reclamation involves a combination of physical and social practices which are aimed at promoting not only the security of individual structures, but also of the neighborhood in which the buildings are situated.²

From the findings in the case studies, it seems the residents of the four sites subscribe to, albeit with varying degrees, the turf reclamation approach of combining "software" and "hardware" programs to achieve security. In terms of physical technology, site hardening devices were used by residents of all four areas, although they were employed more extensively in the cases of the two individual buildings. That is, both of the "vertical" public housing structures were endowed with elaborate electronic equipment

¹Gerald D. Suttles, The Social Construction of Communities (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1972), p. 34.

²Seymour J. Rosenthal, "Turf Reclamation: An Approach to Neighborhood Security," HUD Challenge (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), pp. 1-3.

that is obviously absent--and also would be difficult to implement--in the "horizontal" lay-out of neighborhoods.

Both Pembroke Gardens and Casa Vista, then, have considerable anti-crime hardware to help execute the charge of crime control. Permanently locked entranceway doors, video equipment to monitor activity in the lobby, the parking areas and the interior stairwells, and emergency switches in each apartment are common to both sites. Casa Vista, in addition, is supplied with a buzzer-intercom system to regulate the flow of visitors to the building, and also had its ground floor designed specifically to facilitate surveillance opportunities.

A "hardware" item found at all four of the areas, however, was high-intensity lighting. Lighting precautions exist at two levels--the individual structure, and the public thoroughfare upon which the site is located. At the public housing developments, floodlights were in place at both buildings to illuminate the lot, and special street lights had been provided by each city to brighten the blocks where the housing projects were located. In the case of the two neighborhoods, community leaders specifically urged residents to equip their homes with adequate outside lighting, and each neighborhood had, in turn, pressed city officials for improved street lights in their areas. Other mechanistic hardware common to all sites included locks for doors and windows, and burglar alarm systems, which in some instances were even installed in automobiles.

In terms of "software" approaches to residential security, citizens were involved in various efforts to secure their residences as well as to achieve a measure of turf control. In both communities, for example, requests were made of local law enforcement officials for additional police coverage, and many residents participated in the "Operation ID" program (engraving items of value with one's social security number or another mark of identification).

Rosenthal, however, considers the most crucial element in achieving turf reclamation to be the development of community cohesion and responsibility.³ In all of the sites, except perhaps Pembroke Gardens, this requisite to turf control was evident. In the O'Brien neighborhood, for example, community organization was expressed in the very fact that a patrol was organized, in addition to the supplementary crime prevention activities that had been undertaken by residents, such as crime reporting, attending security education meetings, and instituting the whistle-for-help program. Similarly, in Belle Ville, the fact that the community was organized enabled citizens to decide upon a course of action, and to maintain their commitment to it. At Casa Vista, some of the tasks executed by the Security Committee also assumed a community organization focus. That is, in addition to their planning efforts for the building, members of the committee tried to involve residents

³Ibid., p. 3.

in security awareness programs and impress upon them the importance of adopting security-conscious demeanors in urban residential settings.

In addition to the monitors, patrols, and guards, then--which constitute the major crime prevention efforts in all four case study sites--a mixture of hardware and software activities have been implemented to safeguard the residential environment. This combination of sophisticated technology and active community involvement has made the concepts of "turf reclamation" and "defended neighborhood" a reality in the four case study neighborhoods. In turn, crime vulnerability and opportunities for criminal activity have been reduced in the areas.

Question 2: How Does the Economic Status
of a Residential Area Affect Its Approach
to Curbing the Crime Problem?

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PATROLS AND GUARDS BY INCOME
LEVELS (TABULATED FROM CASE STUDIES)

Name	Type of Patrol	Residents' Economic Status
Pembroke Gardens	Volunteers and hired guards	Low income
Casa Vista	Hired guards	Low income
O'Brien Neighborhood	Volunteers	Mid- to upper-income
Belle Ville	Hired guards	Upper income

TABLE 4

TABULATED FROM NATIONAL SURVEY BY THE RAND CORPORATION

Type of Patrol	General Income			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
Volunteer or Paid Resident Patrol ^a	39	38	2	79
Hired Guard	6	5	16	27
Total	45	43	18	106

^aWhere combinations of volunteers and hired guards exist, the patrol was included only in the volunteer category.

While the case studies present the rules, as well as the exceptions, to participation in residential patrol and guard efforts, an analysis of the Rand report data indicate that modes of participation vary among economic settings. For example, the upper-income groups identified represent about 17.0 percent of the total sample population of 106. Of that group, some 88.9 percent of the respondents rely upon professional security service, while only 11.1 percent prefer a voluntary patrol.

The forty-three patrols identified in the middle-income category constitute approximately 40.6 percent of the sample population. Within that group, about 11.6 percent of the respondents have hired security guards, while an overwhelming 88.4 percent have organized resident-manned volunteer patrols. Finally, in the low-income category, respondents composed 42.4 percent of the survey group, and

were divided with 13.4 percent of the population having contractual guard service, and 86.6 percent having organized volunteer patrols. In tabular form, the figures appear as such:

TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF PATROLS AND GUARDS (BY INCOME LEVELS)
ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGES OF THE
RAND SURVEY POPULATION

Resident's Income Level	% of Population N = 106	Volunteer or Paid Resident Patrol	Hired Guard
Low	42.4%	86.6%	13.4%
Middle	40.6	88.4	11.1
High	17.0	11.1	88.9

From this information, then, it appears that a "self-help" ethic is more prevalent in low- and middle-income neighborhoods than in upper-income ones, self-help meaning here that citizens assume the principle roles in carrying out the routine crime prevention functions, rather than simply organizing to make patrolling by another group possible (i.e., hired private guards). From the information in the case studies, however, it is obvious that a variety of elements comprise residents' concerns about crime, and in that sense, upper-income individuals appear to exhibit at least as much interest as other people. That is, participation in crime reporting, engraving of valuables, installation of burglar alarms, and demands for more police

protection were all evident in both of the upper-income case study areas. In both those communities, residents were concerned about crime and actively involved in trying to reduce it.

The evidence indicates, then, that while actual levels of concern about crime prevention may be comparable among all income groups, residents of low- and middle-income neighborhoods are more prone to forming volunteer security patrols than are residents of upper-income areas. To a large degree, this situation is probably related to the economics involved. As indicated in the "Belle Ville" case study, an effective guard service is costly to maintain, and as a result, is usually within the financial reach of only the more affluent in our society. Volunteer patrols, on the other hand, can be operated at minimal costs, and are therefore reasonable alternatives for neighborhoods or buildings whose residents are of limited financial means. At both "Pembroke Gardens" and the O'Brien neighborhood, for example, yearly expenditures averaged between \$100 to \$200, as compared to the \$40,000 spent at Belle Ville.

In certain situations, however, economics may not be the determining factor in deciding upon a mode of residential crime surveillance; instead, a particular neighborhood or development's ideology may be just as important. This is clearly demonstrated in the case of the O'Brien neighborhood, and to a certain extent, at Pembroke Gardens. That

is, the residents of the O'Brien area can plainly afford to engage private security guards, but have deliberately chosen to conduct their own patrolling. Ascribing to the belief that as residents, they have an inherent commitment to insuring the liveability of their neighborhood, the O'Brien citizens feel they must personally assume the obligations of making their neighborhood a safer place to live. Similarly, at Pembroke Gardens, (and by implication, all Baltimore housing projects for the elderly), it is conceivable that funds could be obtained for 24-hour security guard service. Nevertheless, because of the value placed upon citizen participation by the local housing authority, the concept of the tenant monitoring program is supported and encouraged.

This leads to the hypothesis that, although in the aggregate, different income groups appear to opt for different modes of residential crime surveillance, the exceptions to the rule indicate there is no definitive correlation between income and the type of participation chosen. Rather, ideological beliefs or other values professed by residents of an area may be more important in determining the form selected for participation in security efforts.

Question 3: How Does the Evidence Regarding Citizen Participation in Anticrime Patrols Correlate with Earlier Hypotheses Associating Voluntary Action with Individuals of High Incomes?

The Rand Corporation's "state of the art" investigation into citizen participation in residential patrol

and guard activities uncovered evidence contrary to much of the published literature regarding economic status and voluntary action. Disputing the sociological research of the 1950s asserting that participation was a positive function of income, and challenging the widely held beliefs of the 1960s that the poor were unable to engage in instrumental voluntary activity, the case of residential patrols and guards reveals that lower income groups can be mobilized for constructive participation in community affairs.

It is not enough, however, to simply cite the figures as proof of participation by the poor. Rather, some analysis is needed of the issues involved in the various levels of citizen participation, and the relationship of patrols to those issues. One of the most provocative articles addressing the question "What is citizen participation?" was written by Sherry R. Arnstein, former Chief Advisor on Citizen Participation in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Model Cities Administration. Entitled "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," the author constructs a typology of such activity, using examples from three federal programs: urban renewal, anti-poverty and Model Cities. The typology is arranged in a ladder pattern with each rung corresponding to the extent of citizen power involved in determining the plan and/or program. By way of illustration, the ladder is reproduced below:

Eight Rungs on a Ladder of Citizen Participation

8	<u>Citizen Control</u>	Degrees of Citizen Power
7	<u>Delegated Power</u>	
6	<u>Partnership</u>	Degrees of Tokenism
5	<u>Placation</u>	
4	<u>Consultation</u>	
3	<u>Informing</u>	Non-participation
2	<u>Therapy</u>	
1	<u>Manipulation</u>	

Emphasizing the theme that significant gradations of citizen participation exist, Arnstein summarizes the level of activity at each rung as follows:

The bottom rungs of the ladder are (1) manipulation and (2) therapy. These . . . describe levels of non-participation. . . . Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to . . . 'educate' or 'cure' the participants. Rungs 3 and 4 progress to levels of tokenism that allow the have-nots to hear and have a voice. . . . But . . . they lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded by the powerful. Rung (5) placation is simply a higher level of tokenism . . . (retaining) for the powerholders the continued right to decide. Further up the ladder are levels of citizen power with increasing degrees of decision-making clout. . . . (A) (6) partnership enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional powerholders. At the topmost rungs, (7) delegated power and (8) citizen control, have-not citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power.⁴

⁴Sherry R. Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 35, No. 4 (July 1969):216-24.

In that Arnstein's analysis concerns levels of power in a decision-making process, it may be somewhat of an inferential leap to apply her typology directly to participation in residential patrols. But in as much as her basic concern is with providing have-not citizens with the opportunity to participate in the planning and execution of programs, then the case of resident patrols and guards falls among the upper rungs of her citizen participation ladder.

Breaking out the levels of participation in relation to the types of patrols and guards involved, the following typology could be constructed:

Patrol Type	Level of Participation
1. Resident-manned patrol or monitoring activity	
a. In public housing	(Depending upon the administrative structure:) Delegated Power or Partnership
b. In private endeavors	Citizen Control
2. Resident-hired security force	
a. In public housing	Informing or Consultation
b. In private endeavors	Citizen Control

In general, this diagram indicates that high levels of participation exist in cases where professional security guards have been hired, as well as in situations where citizens, themselves, perform the residential surveillance

functions. In the case of hired guards, citizen participation is evidenced in the organizational forms residents adopt in order to make a neighborhood patrol possible. Citizen control is maintained in these situations by virtue of the legal contract that binds the performance of the guards to the demands and expectations of residents. On the other hand, in public housing projects where guards have been hired by management, this level of citizen control does not exist. However, as evidenced by the Casa Vista case study, resident satisfaction can play an important role in deciding a particular security team's fate. That is, ever-increasing complaints from tenants prompted the management there to oust a security guard company because of alleged incompetence.

In the case of neighborhood patrols and building monitors, the highest forms of community participation and control exist. As exemplified by the O'Brien patrol, all decisions regarding management, operations, and finances are made communally. In this particular patrol, because there are no elected officials or appointed chairpersons, open meetings are conducted periodically where changes are discussed and policy is set.

In general, most of the neighborhood volunteer patrols identified in the Rand report are characterized by this high degree of citizen participation and control. The exceptions are those patrols which are conducted under

the auspices of local public housing authorities, of which Pembroke Gardens is representative. In most instances, the administrative duties of these surveillance groups are assumed by the management of the development, which is also often responsible for having initially recruited and organized the volunteer security program. Nevertheless, the tenants, themselves, are obligated to maintain daily patrol duty, and often provide management with valuable suggestions for program improvement.

Although not particularly well-documented, the notion that political and social participation has increased among lower income groups is widely subscribed to today. Because of the relatively recent mobilization and politicization of certain groups in society--particularly blacks, young adults and the poor--it is not surprising that this assumption has gained prominence. Linking this hypothesis to recent studies showing increased levels of associational membership among lower status individuals are sociologists Herbert Hyman and Charles R. Wright. Their findings are based on a 1962 secondary analysis of national sample surveys which had been initially administered in 1955--the substance of which had provided the data base for research then conducted by the authors, linking organizational membership to upper-income characteristics. In analyzing the results of the replication surveys, the authors wrote in a 1971 article:

Inspection of the findings reveals that the substantial relationship between membership and higher status, documented in the earlier study, still holds. If we examine the trends to locate the sources of the changes over this seven-year period, we observe that the growth of membership is not accounted for by a disproportionate increase in the prevalence of membership in the higher status groups. . . . The change has distributed itself all along the continuum, and, if anything, the sharpest growth appears to have occurred in the less advantaged. . . .

The course of the process of voluntary association membership from 1962 to 1970 may remain a mystery . . . (but) . . . the general consistency of the findings from our several trend analyses does give us some confidence in extrapolating and conjecturing that membership gradually increased in the sixties, and that those groups who formerly had not forged their strength into collective forms have increasingly begun to do so.⁵

Thus, while the evidence from the Rand report citing citizen participation in residential patrol, guard, and monitor activities takes issue with the earlier hypotheses concerning economic status and voluntary action, it supports more recent propositions citing the growth of participation among lower income groups.

⁵Herbert Hyman and Charles R. Wright, "Trends in Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Replication Based on Secondary Analysis of National Sample Surveys," American Sociological Review 36 (April 1971): 205.

CHAPTER V

IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNERS

Planning for Crime Prevention

Crime, and the fear of it, have become major factors determining the lifestyles of today's urban dwellers. The "fortress mentality" pervading both city and suburban attitudes has socially isolated neighbors from one another, and has forced individuals to assume self-imposed curfews as fears for personal safety have prompted them to confine many activities to daylight hours. In addition, this fear of crime has induced a major exodus of middle-income families to suburbia, while simultaneously leaving whole sections of central cities unused by certain classes of people who are afraid to enter their environs. The whole fabric of American life is becoming increasingly segregated as fear of crime causes withdrawal and retreat among members of every social class. For all of this, city planners are, at best, only peripherally involved in crime prevention planning. The likelihood is great, however, that they will increasingly participate as fear of crime escalates among urban residents.

Author Jane Jacobs was one of the earliest observers to call attention to the impact of crime on urban

neighborhoods, and proposed concepts of territoriality, surveillance, proprietorship, and increased social and economic activity to palliate the problem.¹ In one of his critiques of her work, urbanologist Lewis Mumford disagreed heartily with the emphasis Jacobs placed upon the effects of crime in urban residential settings. He accused her of being obsessed with it, and said it was a negative and unworthy preoccupation.² But the current tide seems to flow in Jacobs' direction. As widespread fear of crime translates into individual demands for safety in the residential milieu, planning concepts that incorporate security concerns must be embraced. To whom do these planning burdens fall, however? To a wide array of public and private agents, including, principally, community organizers, social service planners, architects, criminal justice planners, public housing authority officials, private housing developers, and neighborhood residents, themselves. While the concerns and skills of each may differ, all can have a shape in promoting the security of a residential area.

Depending upon the situation, the role of the "security activist" will differ. At new construction sites, architects and developers can work hand-in-glove, the first employing certain concepts at the initial design stage that

¹Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities (New York: Random House, 1961).

²Lewis Mumford, The Urban Prospect (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968), pp. 191-95.

will contribute to security, while the second authorizing the installation of anti-crime hardware devices at both individual units and public spaces throughout the development. In situations where existing housing is being remodelled or rehabilitated, landlords and architects can play similar roles to increase security.

On the other hand, community organizers can set the stage for a "software" approach to crime prevention. Having previously discussed the concepts of territorial imperatives and turf reclamation, community organizers can work to develop the sense of community among individuals that is necessary to bring about this kind of approach to security. Once the community worker has succeeded in bringing residents together around the issues of crime, he can then organize them into taking collective action against the perceived problems. In discussing the importance of community organizers in a "turf reclamation" approach, Professor Rosenthal wrote:

In brief, two important elements are required for a successful grip on community safety and security. One is personnel who have the training and/or the experience in organizing communities, especially someone who understands the intricacies of community conflict and has the skill of an organizer. The other element is an organized community.³

In social service agencies, planners are in a prime position to facilitate the work of community organizers.

³Rosenthal, "Turf Reclamation," p. 3.

At the most fundamental level, they can recommend the need for such agents in a particular area, but perhaps more important, can arrange for the resources required to help communities become organized. In addition, they can call for the installation of site-hardening devices to supplement the security efforts in a given neighborhood or building.

In public housing authorities, most crime prevention activities emanate from the office of the director of security. Here, the director and his staff are involved in a broad range of activities, such as deliberating architectural design plans, deciding upon electronic devices for individual sites, and implementing tenant-oriented programs, such as escort services, security education meetings, and resident patrols. Because of the diverse natures of these activities, public housing security offices require planners with a variety of skills.

Comprehensive criminal justice planning is conducted today largely at the state level, although most major cities have a local "criminal justice coordinating council." Because these agencies oversee planning related to the whole sphere of the criminal justice system (including the courts, the police, and penal institutions), their focus on residential crime, per se, is necessarily limited. Heretofore, the principle thrust of their efforts in this field have been to process and procure federal grants for local groups and agencies involved in crime prevention planning and

programming. State and local criminal justice agencies have, however, been involved in information dissemination regarding federal crime insurance programs, and individual home security needs. While few CJCCs have attempted to do so, it seems an appropriate task for them would be to undertake periodic studies of residential police needs required by communities in their respective cities. Such an investigation would also help to clarify the individual crime problems besetting different urban neighborhoods.

Finally, residential crime prevention planning is conducted by residents, themselves, who seek to make their living environments more secure. The knowledge and skills required of these individuals represent a combination of much that has been previously discussed. The resident, or group of residents, wishing to restore safety to the neighborhood, must first employ community organization tactics that will arouse the interest--and participation--of fellow residents. Thereafter, they must verse themselves in various "hardware" and "software" approaches to residential security in order to help residents decide upon a course of action.

While this discussion has presented a general description of various planners' roles in residential crime prevention, those agents involved in organizing neighborhood security patrols, guards or monitors require a set of more specific guidelines. First, however, they must understand the need for, and the benefits of, a citizen patrol.

Advantages of Patrols

In our society where the generally accepted premise is that law and order is a governmental responsibility, citizens nevertheless are banding together to provide supplementary protection for their homes and neighborhoods. Given, then, the perceived need for additional residential security, what advantages do patrols, guards and monitors offer that would merit their support by residents and planners alike?

1. Patrols are relatively inexpensive--The deterrence function of patrols could obviously be performed by police, but it rarely is. Strains on police manpower and budgets preclude the hiring of additional personnel solely for the purpose of patrolling residential areas. On the other hand, citizen patrols are inexpensive precisely because they are not professional policemen, and therefore do not require personnel costs such as salaries, uniforms, or fringe benefits.

2. Patrols can be effective in executing a surveillance function--Because of the organizational structure and manpower supply, and because of the limited area in which they operate, patrols are highly capable of providing a watchman's presence in a particular place at a particular time. In addition, many patrol members note that because residents are more familiar with their neighborhood than any outside

officer could be, they have a heightened ability to detect suspicious activity.

3. Patrols indirectly improve an individual's ability to deal with crime--Experience on a civilian patrol is likely to make an individual more aware of security needs. A patrol member often gains an enhanced sense of territorial proprietorship and responsibility, and is more likely to be alert for suspicious behavior even when not on patrol. He will know how to report a crime and will probably be more willing to do so.

4. Patrols contribute to other desirable social goals--Patrol groups are likely to result in greater neighborhood or development cohesiveness, which in turn improves the residents capability for common action to meet other problems. Where there is no existing neighborhood organization, the patrol may serve as the vehicle for its formation.

Thus, citizen patrols constitute a potentially significant approach to improving residential security, as well as to developing community cohesion. For residents and planners undertaking the organization of a neighborhood patrol, the following general guidelines should be considered.

Commitment to Tackling the Crime Problem

Foremost among considerations for determining the probability of inaugurating a successful patrol is to assess the level of commitment among residents for maintaining a

patrol operation. This evaluation would apply equally to areas interested either in hiring professional security guards or in forming a volunteer patrol. In the former case, evidence of adequate financial resources must be established, or patrol activity will terminate prematurely due to lack of funds. In such situations, the financial burden can be eased by increasing the number of subscribers to a level whereby service fees can be kept to a minimum. The Belle Ville neighborhood exemplifies this situation. Recalling from the case study, original subscriber fees were \$10 per month for 56 hours of service each week; however, as membership grew, the cost of service declined. Today, with some 700 subscribers, household assessments approximate \$7 per month for 141 hours of weekly guard service.

The antithesis of this situation is found in the previously referred to mid-city New Orleans neighborhood where after less than a year of operation, financial constraints may mandate the dissolution of the guard service there.

In the case of volunteer patrols, sustained activity is necessarily predicated upon the willingness of residents to give of their time and energy. Without commitment, there is no patrol. This situation is most dramatically expressed in a letter issued by the Boston Housing Authority which explains the goals and operations of its tenant patrol

program. So insistent is the Housing Authority upon adequate levels of support that according to the statement, it will make no attempts of its own to organize patrols in any buildings; rather, tenants must first indicate to the Housing Authority their interest in forming a patrol, and only when satisfied of their sincere interest will the Authority offer its organizational expertise to the residents. These sentiments are echoed in a patrol manual published by the New York City Housing Authority. Emphasizing the key role of citizen participation, the NYCHA director writes,

While our experienced staff can be very helpful in recruiting, we can do no more than tenant interest permits. . . . The program can only go as far as they want it to go. This is entirely as it should be. Meaningful tenant participation must be voluntary.⁴

Choosing Alternatives

Once the commitment to fighting the crime problem is established, the planner and the residents are in a position to discuss the various alternatives suitable to the site. As previously discussed, sociological literature tells us that persons with high social class--as measured by levels of education, social prestige, and income--appear to be the easiest persons to recruit for membership in voluntary associations. This implies that persons living

⁴Samuel Granville, "New York's Experiment in Tenant Safety," HUD Challenge (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 24.

in upper-income neighborhoods would be likely candidates for participation in volunteer security patrols.

This research evidence, however, indicates the contrary. At least in the case of anti-crime patrols, it does not appear that any significant number of individuals of high socioeconomic status are willing to volunteer their participatory efforts. This understanding, then, leads to the recommendation that in upper income neighborhoods concerned about crime, planners should direct their activities to organizing the administrative mechanisms necessary for engaging, and maintaining, hired security service. (The specific organization structure recommended is outlined in a later section of this chapter.)

Exceptions to this recommendation would apply to areas characterized by their "Urbanite" population--and the professed approbation of social participation usually found in such settings. Such areas, of which the O'Brien neighborhood is indicative, are usually inhabited by a combination of long-time residents and newly arrived middle- to upper-income professionals who have chosen to stake their claim in the "frontier" of the inner city. These Urbanites regard citizen participation as a vital element of neighborhood life, and would be more prone to forming their own patrol than hiring professional guards to work for them.

In low-income areas, a different situation exists. Despite the sociological literature suggesting that levels

of participation among low socioeconomic status groups are minimal, the Rand research findings indicate that a significant amount of lower class participation has been marshalled under the banner of crime prevention, and particularly in the implementation of volunteer security patrols and monitors. Therefore, confronted with the task of developing plans for a crime-ridden low income area, a planner should seriously consider helping residents mobilize a volunteer patrol if citizen interest exists.

It should be acknowledged, however, that a large percentage of the low-income patrols identified in the Rand survey operated in public housing developments, and as such, may have been easier to organize because of the closed environments existing there. In fact, as Gerald Suttles contends, most public housing developments inherently incorporate at least three elements of "the defended neighborhood" which, in turn, facilitate any efforts to induce citizen participation. Those elements are:

- distinct boundaries, reinforced by unified architectural design and a single source of ownership/management
- a ready-made name for each development and an image or identity which surfaces even before the project is occupied
- cultural or racial homogeneity, by virtue of economic (and sometimes racial) guidelines determining tenant selection.⁵

⁵Suttles, The Social Construction of Communities, pp. 41-42.

In addition, it could be argued that participation is achieved more easily in public housing for the elderly than in conventional public housing because residents there are not of the "hard core" lower class which have increasingly come to occupy present-day public housing.⁶ Rather, many senior citizens have chosen public housing as a means to alleviate some of the economic burdens of old age, and as such, are not necessarily saddled with the kinds of social problems besetting other public housing tenants. Therefore, their social backgrounds may make them more amenable to participatory behavior.

When faced with organizing a patrol in a low-income setting, however, the practitioner should not instinctively assume that the poor are more willing than the rich to participate in anti-crime patrols. If funds can be made available (as is often the case in public housing for the elderly), planners should assess the desirability of private guard service to volunteer activity. It may be that given a choice, low income groups might opt for a more "professional" approach to securing their environment. Financial assistance could be sought through private foundations, mayors' Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils, and LEAA-funded state planning agencies.

⁶Lawrence M. Friedman, "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview," in Jacobus tenBroek, ed., The Law of the Poor (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, 1966), p. 318.

As the case studies reveal, patrols are only one aspect--although often the most significant--of a total community crime prevention package. Other essential elements include installation of individual home security devices (such as burglar alarms, door and window locks), increased crime reporting and street-watching on the part of residents, and the sponsorship of meetings by community associations, or public housing projects, to educate people in the ways of crime prevention. In any given community setting, planners can set the stage for citizen awareness of, and participation in, crime prevention by encouraging or helping to organize these varied approaches to reducing criminal opportunity.

Defensible Space Concepts

In addition, a new and important role for planners has emerged since the publication of Oscar Newman's "defensible space" studies at New York University. Using public housing projects as principle research sites, Newman developed a concept of promoting residential security through the use of architecture. In effect, he demonstrated that certain basic design principles (effective at either the initial design stage, or, as he did, in modifications to existing housing) can promote security. Architecture, he showed, can encourage "zones of territorial influence" among residents, while also creating opportunities for

natural surveillance that allow them to act as their own policing agents.⁷ As noted earlier, Newman's defensible space concepts were utilized in the development of Casa Vista by having the contours of the ground floor designed to create maximum opportunities for surveillance.

In view of the widespread recognition accorded Newman's research, it would behoove architects, planners and builders to familiarize themselves with its import as they deal with specific sites, plans, and opportunities for residential construction, rehabilitation and modernization. As any design for security needs to be tailored to the specific situation, it would be specious to present detailed design specifications and suggest their applicability on a national level. Regional differences as well as differing needs of specific groups preclude a neat security shopping list for planners, but as fear of residential crime escalates across the nation, practitioners should make themselves aware of design considerations that produce a natural system of community protection. As Ferris Lucas, the executive director of the National Sheriffs' Association recently wrote, "Planners are learning a great deal about better locks, more efficient methods of lighting, even techniques for breaking up the space into more controllable areas."⁸

⁷Oscar Newman, Defensible Space (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1972).

⁸Ferris Lucas, "Self-Help Crime Prevention Program," HUD Challenge (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 26.

Police Protection

The role police should play in a community's crime prevention plan is usually particular to the site. That more police coverage is desired is the hue and cry of both urban and suburban neighborhoods today, but the amount as well as the form of coverage varies from site to site. Because of pressing manpower shortages, however, neighborhood demands for increased law enforcement protection often go unmet. This situation, in turn, frequently gives rise to neighborhood security patrols, as residents seek to provide themselves with a level of protection local police cannot offer. From the results of the Rand survey, this is a consistently cited reason for forming citizen patrols. That is, the inability of police to provide coverage prompts residents to find alternative means of protection. Most participants in these endeavors perceive their roles to be that of "the eyes and ears of the police," although some groups may regard their service as the major crime prevention effort in the neighborhood. Few groups, however, are openly antagonistic to local law enforcement officials.

Although it appears that crime patrols fulfill an important public service in many areas, sociologist Gary Marx warns of a danger inherent in this form of citizen participation. In referring to the secondary effects of patrols in low income areas, he suggests that their presence can perpetuate the second-class services usually provided

minority groups, while middle and upper class neighborhoods can successfully apply pressure on officials for more police.⁹

This fundamental need for basic police coverage was also cited by Samuel Granville, deputy director of management for the New York City Housing Authority, and one of the original organizers of its tenant patrol program-- which in 1974 involved 12,000 volunteers in approximately 120 patrols spread among every borough of the city. In discussing the tenets upon which a sound security program is based, Granville enumerated five elements: effective lock systems, adequate lighting, electronic hardware, tenant patrols, and police coverage. Granville warns, however, that "tenant patrols cannot substitute for basic uniformed police protection."¹⁰

For planners and residents, this indicates that in few situations should a patrol be instituted for the purpose of substituting its services in lieu of those provided by the local police. The only exceptions may be in those instances where a patrol is purposefully organized to be of an adversary nature, or if the caliber of patrol coverage is comparable to that provided by the Belle Ville security force. Otherwise, maintaining basic police protection should be an essential element of any community security plan.

⁹Marx and Archer, Community Police, p. 75.

¹⁰Granville, "New York's Experiment in Tenant Safety," p. 25.

With specific regard to patrol operation, it may not be possible, or even desirable, to plan a program requiring the full coordination of patrol activities with local police; however, a combination of the approaches used by the Belle Ville and O'Brien patrols seems desirable. That is, patrol leaders should be directed to maintain contact with the local police district captain for a variety of purposes: to mutually share crime information regarding the patrolled neighborhood; to foster improved police-community relations; and to increase the likelihood of police cooperation should neighborhood residents press for additional police coverage. If the district captain appears particularly receptive to the patrol concept, planners might want to work out the details of the patrol operations with him. If not, some other form of regular police contact might be arranged, such as monthly meetings between local police and patrol participants, or periodic "training" sessions where policemen instruct the residents about tactics of surveillance, self-defense, or some other patrol-related activity.

Organizational Techniques

Hired Security Guards

Once the components of the plan have been determined, building or neighborhood support must be mobilized to put the operation into effect. In the case of hired guards, the exercise is less complicated. As indicated previously,

the first step is to determine the level of financial support available. If present funding exists, and long-term financing can be projected, negotiations with a private security company can take place. The administrative structure of the Belle Ville patrol presents a good model for the implementation of hired security service.

Under the auspices of the Belle Ville Association, subscriber recruitment was conducted throughout the neighborhood while Association officers simultaneously explored the services of private guard companies. Upon selection of a firm, the officers negotiated a contract in which they were given the prerogative to stipulate the nature and level of services desired.

The cost of the security operation was then divided among all subscribing residents, and collection and billing procedures were centralized under the Belle Ville Association. Thus the officers of the neighborhood organization served as the conduit for hiring the guards as well as for recruiting membership for the service. Ongoing responsibilities such as monitoring guard performance, recruiting more subscribers, and supervising contract renewals were transferred to a newly created Security Committee.

According to Belle Ville Security Chairman Oliver Grenet, patrol success depends upon two key factors: keeping subscriber fees low, and hiring efficient, effective guards. "The problem," he said, "is that good guards are expensive, and people, even rich ones, are tight with their

money. On the other hand, if people don't perceive the guards to be capable and professional, they'll just withdraw their support all together." In Grenet's view, the resolution to this dilemma has been to maintain the aggressive subscriber recruitment campaign that was begun some ten years ago when the guards were initially hired. "The more people we have, the lower we can keep individual fees while still taking in a net total that affords us the best professional security available," Grenet said.¹¹

In those situations where there are fixed funding levels for hired security patrols, the quality of service provided may suffer. "The amount of money given to us by the Boston Housing Authority severely restricts our options," commented Edgar Linson, the manager at Casa Vista, "so we try to get the optimal service within our budget. In two years we've tried two security companies, but neither have proven particularly capable." Linson said the effect of this "inferior" service has been to strengthen the capacity of the Tenant Association's Security Committee, making it responsible for monitoring the performance of the guards, and for initiating security education campaigns among tenants.¹² In circumstances, then, where guard performance is perceived to be less than satisfactory, residents must

¹¹From an interview conducted August 5, 1975.

¹²From an interview conducted September 24, 1975.

be encouraged to aid in their own protection by assuming a "security conscious" demeanor, while simultaneously reminding the guards of their professional duties and responsibilities.

Volunteer Patrols

The effort to organize a volunteer patrol is more complex than that required to hire private security service. Because it is a purely voluntary activity, without active community support and participation, a citizen patrol will fail. Therefore, in many respects, the community organization tactics used to form a neighborhood patrol are more crucial than the administrative structure adopted to implement it.

David High, one of the spokespersons of the O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol, has been instrumental in helping several groups of Boston residents form patrols in their respective communities. What follows is an outline of the organizational techniques he views as essential to creating a successful citizen neighborhood patrol.¹³

1. Assess the Problem--The first step is to assess the crime problem in the neighborhood. Organize an informal meeting for residents to share whatever information they possess concerning street and residential crime. This helps to dispel rumors, as well as provide a means for gathering the facts.

¹³From an interview conducted February 29, 1976.

2. Approach the Police--With the facts in hand, enlist several residents to bring the community's problem to the attention of the local police. "My experience has consistently shown that inner city neighborhoods do not receive the police protection they need," High said. "When residents see that the police respond with only lip-service to their requests, they'll realize that their only resort is to band together to help themselves," he continued.

3. Daytime Surveillance--Before formal patrolling is established, encourage women in the neighborhood to become aware of daytime street activity. They should learn to recognize what can legitimately be considered suspicious behavior, and should report it to the police. In addition, neighbors should make efforts to become acquainted so that there will be a friend to call in case of an emergency. "Many people don't realize the volume of serious crime that occurs during the daylight hours," High emphasized.

4. Begin Formal Patrolling--With the neighborhood aware of the facts, and having had their requests for extra protection refused by the police, the time is ripe to organize formal patrol activity. In order to avoid having the commitment become a burden, as many volunteers as possible should be recruited so that an individual's patrol responsibilities can be kept to a minimum.

5. Patrol Hours--"Be realistic, don't try to exceed your limitations," warns High. "If you can't sustain a

seven-night patrol, don't be discouraged. Do the best you can within your resources." Patrol hours, of course, should correspond with the times of greatest need, but should also be scheduled in accordance with the group's capacity.

6. Cautions to Be Emphasized--High warns of two hazards, both of different natures, but equally threatening to the vitality of the patrol. First, patrol participants should be cautioned about becoming involved in any confrontations on the street. Danger exists, and if patrol members are injured while on duty, it is conceivable that participation will drop as personal fear spreads among volunteers.

Also, engaging in confrontations subject patrol members to serious legal liabilities. Our legal system provides little middle ground between the sworn police officer and the ordinary citizen. Consequently, a patrol member who detains or confronts a suspect may be committing a crime himself--with assault, battery, kidnapping and false arrest among the possibilities. All patrol members, therefore, should be aware of the legal restrictions accompanying their activities. Second, High cites boredom with patrol routine as the most menacing problem. "The prevailing reason for quitting a patrol is boredom," High said. "Participants must be reminded constantly that boredom means success, and even if action slows down on the streets, we still need to be out there."

7. Community Activity--In addition to the patrol, residents should be encouraged to participate in other neighborhood crime prevention activities, such as street surveillance, crime reporting, and information dissemination. Individually, they should equip their homes with anti-crime devices, and should teach family members the importance of being security conscious.

8. Routine Police Contact--While High sees no necessity of involving local police in the administration or operation of patrol affairs, he places a premium on constant communication with police regarding criminal activity in the neighborhood. "Report crimes not just when you're on patrol, but at all times," High emphasized. "It's the only way the police will get a sense of what's really happening in the community, and be able to respond accordingly." High relates that after local police headquarters became convinced of the sincerity of the O'Brien neighborhood's crime prevention efforts, the police were more amenable to fulfilling their residential requests.

Mr. Leo Gullinello, the director of security for the Boston Housing Authority, offers additional suggestions for planners attempting to organize tenant patrols in vertical buildings, and in particular, in buildings on public housing sites.¹⁴ Gullinello has directed the tenant patrol program for the BHA since its inception in 1968. The key

¹⁴From an interview conducted October 7, 1975.

to success in Gullinello's patrol organization model lies in what he calls developing proprietary interests among tenants. "Tenants must come to feel that their entire building, as well as their individual apartments, are worth protecting from vandalism, burglary, and other crimes," he said. "Unless tenants feel they have something worth protecting, a patrol can never be organized."

In order to induce these proprietary interests among public housing residents, Gullinello says the Housing Authority must provide locks, alarms and lighting for project buildings, and must make concerted efforts to fulfill maintenance requests lodged by tenants. "It's a two way street," he explained. "If the Housing Authority acts on maintenance needs, then tenants have a clean, sanitary building they want to keep that way. If the Authority drags its feet on repairs and renovations, then residents get discouraged, and some even perpetrate more acts of vandalism just to get even."

Gullinello's community organization model, then, begins by arranging a pact between management and tenants. In exchange for residents' commitments to safeguard their building, management promises to provide security hardware as well as quick delivery on maintenance requests. With this understanding established, Gullinello or one of his staff members meets with the residents of a building to help develop a crime prevention program suitable to their needs. A building captain is then selected to administer

the activities decided upon, and residents themselves are called upon to register for specific patrol assignments. In vertical structures, a "patrol" usually means a group of residents who maintain a stationary surveillance post in the lobby of the building. In all cases, residents are warned not to intervene in incidents observed, but to report them to police, instead. "Surveillance is the most beneficial activity patrol members can perform," Gullinello states.

In addition to participating in the volunteer monitoring program, Gullinello feels it is important to encourage among tenants a sense of responsibility regarding "honest behavior." By this he means residents should be taught the importance of refusing to participate in any kind of criminal activity, as well as reporting to the police any crimes they see committed or have knowledge about.

Gullinello admits that organizing public housing tenants for participation in volunteer patrols is a difficult task, but asserts that it can be a successful one. Citing the experiences of both the Boston and New York City Housing Authorities, Gullinello says that,

Living in certain projects can be a 24-hour war, therefore it is easy for tenants to get discouraged, or else become too frightened to participate; but desperation prompts action, and if residents feel you are going to keep up your end of the bargain, they'll be more inclined to keep up theirs.

From these two views of organizing volunteer security patrols, several common themes emerge. Foremost is the sense of community concern that must be instilled in

residents if they are to feel impelled to action; second, is the supplementary crime prevention activities needed to accompany a patrol, such as constant street surveillance and the installation of anti-crime hardware; third, is the need to maintain good police relations by acting responsibly while on patrol duty, and consistently reporting criminal activity observed; and fourth, is the need to stave off threats to the livelihood of a patrol which stem from participants' boredom or fear for personal safety. The actual patrol routine and administration, however, will probably differ at each site (e.g., whether a stationary or mobile patrol is needed, whether the patrol should be carried out on foot or by car, the days and hours the extra security is needed, etc.), but if the previously described organizational techniques are employed, the chances for sustained patrol operation will be maximized.

CHAPTER VI

FIELD METHODS AND PROCEDURES

My interest in the subject of citizen participation in crime prevention developed during the time I was involved in a larger research project examining the incidence of resident patrols and guards currently in operation. That project, conducted by the Rand Corporation for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice, attempted a national survey to identify and assess the information available regarding patrol efforts in residential areas.

The research methods and field procedures used in the Rand study uncovered some 226 patrols and guards in sixteen urban sites throughout the country. Because I participated in developing the field methods implemented in the Rand survey--and consider them to be sensitive tools for discovering and investigating patrol efforts--I decided to apply them to this particular work. Therefore, the four case studies herein presented were initially identified and researched in the same manner as the evidence gathered for the Rand report. In fact, two of the case studies, "Pembroke Gardens" (in the city of Baltimore) and "Belle Ville"

(in New Orleans) were actually drawn from the research I contributed to the Rand project. Given their accessibility, however, the two Boston-area cases were investigated with considerable more intensity and rigor. That is, time and circumstance allowed repeated interviews with patrol and guard affiliates as well as police, and afforded the opportunities to personally attend neighborhood meetings and participate in patrol duty. Most important, the ability to observe patrol and guard activities over a certain period of time permitted a realistic assessment of the patrols' capacities in relation to the interview information obtained from patrol affiliates.

In contrast, only one day of field interviews were allocated for each of the New Orleans and Baltimore sites. Consequently, there was little opportunity to verify, by personal observation, the information obtained. I did, however, make an effort to corroborate alleged facts and opinions by interviewing various individuals at each patrol site, and when necessary, conducted long-distance telephone conversations with patrol affiliates in order to gather additional information.

Essentially, then, the methods of gathering evidence for the four case studies were similar, but more detailed information was accumulated for the Boston sites. The general field procedures used in this investigation, and applicable to all sites, are described below. Primarily, they are of two categories: literature searches, and

personal and telephone interviews conducted with police and individuals affiliated with patrols. As previously mentioned, the more comprehensive Boston-area research included attendance at neighborhood and building meetings, and participation in patrol duty. Also, valuable background information was obtained by reviewing relevant crime reports supplied by the Boston Police Department.

Literature Search

In initiating this study with a literature review, I searched both academic and popular publications for information regarding residential crime and citizen patrols and guards. Also, I reviewed sociological research pertaining to neighborhood organizational theory, and to citizen participation according to socioeconomic status. In all, books, journals, magazines, newspapers, government publications and even television programs were consulted for information about these topics.

Preliminary Interviews

While the literature search was valuable in revealing theoretical material important to the overall context of citizen participation, class status, and crime prevention, the interview process was relied upon to obtain the case information necessary for describing the citizen patrols. At all sites, the first step in the field methods was to make telephone inquiries of the following organizations

in order to locate existing security patrols and guards:

--the city's police department, requesting to speak with the community relations officer at headquarters

--the mayor's office

--the director of security at the local public housing authority

--urban affairs reporters for local newspapers.

Following these calls, I arranged personal interviews with the security coordinators at the housing authorities, and the directors of each city's "Mayor's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council."¹ As information sources, these individuals proved to have the broadest base of knowledge concerning the location of patrols and their general patterns of activity.

After these four initial contacts had been consulted, leads they provided were pursued by more telephoning, this time to each patrol coordinator mentioned in order to verify the authenticity of the group. In Boston, after all known patrols and guards were identified, two were selected for case study treatment. To supplement the Boston research, I later decided to include for analysis the New Orleans and Baltimore case studies which had been prepared earlier in conjunction with the Rand report.

¹In effect, these councils constitute the city planning agencies for criminal justice affairs. They are LEAA-affiliated, and are usually considered to be a branch of each city's chief executive's office.

Gathering Descriptive Information

My research techniques for acquiring descriptive patrol and guard information, however, were essentially the same for all sites. That is, first I arranged personal interviews with group leaders to discuss security organization, operation, and administration. I also asked them questions pertaining to the socioeconomic characteristics of group participants. In the case of the housing projects where there were no patrol leaders as such, I interviewed, instead, the building managers and, at Casa Vista, the tenant chairman of the security committee. I found these individuals to be the most knowledgeable about patrol administration and routine, and also best informed about general tenant participation in building activities.

Based on the numerous interviews I conducted for the Rand research, which was later confirmed in the Boston experience, I found that when setting out to accumulate patrol information, it is advantageous to contact the patrol coordinator first. In most cases, he proves to be the person best acquainted with patrol routine and operation. In a one-shot interview, the coordinator can usually provide a comprehensive outline of patrol activities which includes an historical account of the patrol's start-up as well as perceptions of past and present outcomes of patrol efforts.

Establishing positive relations with the group leader also facilitates further contact with the guards

and patrol members. Not only will the coordinator be receptive to answering additional questions at a later date, but he will also be more inclined to provide the vital "entrée" to contact with other group participants. As members often may be hesitant to answer inquiries about their patrol or guard affiliation without the authorization of their leader, forming a good working relationship with him is essential.

Finally, the patrol or guard coordinator may be able to reveal sources of information not readily evident to the researcher. That is, he may be able to indicate other people, agencies, or sources knowledgeable about patrol and guard activities that otherwise would not have been discovered.

Following the initial discussion with the group coordinator, I personally interviewed several participants in the patrol or guard activity. Although it would have been preferable to have randomly selected the interviewees, this proved not to be possible at the four study sites. At Casa Vista, the housing project surveilled by private guards, the supervisor at the security company headquarters suggested that only a certain guard be interviewed--that being the guard he considered "the most intelligent guy over there."

Similarly, at Belle Ville, the neighborhood association's chairman insisted that a particular guard be selected for interviewing. The guard also happened to be, in the

chairman's estimation, the most competent member of the security team. At Pembroke Gardens, meanwhile, the manager simply referred me to the monitor currently on duty, although he did gather together a few other patrol volunteers so that I could interview them.

In the case of the O'Brien Neighborhood Patrol, the group spokesman declined to make available a roster of all patrol participants from which I could have randomly selected patrol interviewees. Rather, he deliberately chose those members whose names, addresses, and telephone numbers he disclosed.

Actual interviews with patrol and guard participants were conducted both in person and by telephone. Some of the questions I asked members concerned motives for participation, time commitments, and their individual perceptions of patrol effectiveness. I also inquired extensively about patrol and guard operations in order to verify--or challenge--the information proffered by the four group coordinators.

In every city but one--Baltimore--the police were also interviewed regarding the activities of the residents and guards. In Baltimore, the chief of police refused to allow members of the force to cooperate with any LEAA-related project, so comments from the police about the resident monitoring program at Pembroke Gardens is perforce absent. At the other sites, however, I contacted officers

and patrolmen in the local police districts and questioned them about the crime situations in each neighborhood, the types and amounts of patrol/police contact, and their views regarding the effectiveness of the respective residential security efforts. In both New Orleans and Boston, I found the local community relations officers and the sector car patrolmen who covered the specific case study neighborhoods to be the most helpful. They were not only aware of the presence of the guards and patrols, but could also describe personal encounters they had had with them.

Because the Baltimore and New Orleans cases were constructed from telephone interviews and only one-day visits to each site, the scope of those investigations were necessarily limited to patrol-related matters. At the Boston sites, however, the opportunity existed to collect more indepth case information. In that regard, I attempted to obtain a "macro" perspective of citizen participation by interviewing community leaders about group activity, in general, as well as in relation to preventive security measures. A sense of "who participates in what kind of activities" was derived from conversations with the president of the O'Brien Neighborhood Association, and the director of the community development corporation that built, and now manages, the Casa Vista housing project for the elderly. In addition, I canvassed several members of the O'Brien patrol for information regarding their extra-curricular activities, and also queried patrol leaders about additional volunteer activities undertaken by members.

Similarly, at the housing project, I conducted discussions with the president and vice president of the Tenants Council to determine the kinds of activities in which building residents participate, as well as the frequency with which they join.

Aside from these primary field sources, I consulted additional informants for background material pertaining to the citizen participation efforts at the two sites under review. In the case of the housing project, a lengthy interview was conducted with Mr. Leo Gullinello, director of security for the Boston Housing Authority. In 1968, Gullinello helped to organize in a Boston housing project one of the first neighborhood security patrols in the Northeast, and since that time, has served as a consultant to groups nationwide who have considered implementing security patrols. In the interview, Gullinello not only described his model for creating an effective anti-crime patrol, but also discussed at length his views regarding community organization in public housing and citizen participation in crime prevention activities.

At Casa Vista, in particular, I observed citizen participation in action by attending two general monthly meetings of the Tenants Association, and obtained background information by reading minutes from previous tenants' meetings. I also perused transcripts of business conducted at meetings of the project's "Grass Roots Building

Committee," a community-based advisory group which guided the planning of the high-rise complex for the elderly.

In the case of the O'Brien neighborhood, my own personal participation in patrol duty provided insights to the extent and breadth of neighborhood involvement in patrol activity. In addition, it afforded a firsthand glimpse of how the patrol operates, and also suggested a general feeling for the communal spirit in the O'Brien area.

Finally, in the case of both neighborhoods, I obtained from the Boston Police Department a computerized list of all crimes reported in those areas between January 1, 1975 through December 11, 1975. Because each incident is listed by the address from which it was reported, the statistics provided a factual review of the residential crime situations in the two areas under study. They also helped to verify--or contest--the claims made by residents and patrol members concerning the particular crime problems in their neighborhoods, and the effectiveness of their efforts to curb them.

In summary, I accumulated most of the material for this investigation by undertaking relevant literature searches and by conducting telephone and personal interviews with local police and individuals involved in patrol-related activities. In total, I arranged thirty-five interviews, averaging one and one-half hours each, among all the research sites. I conducted the Baltimore field visit in

early July, and researched the New Orleans case in the beginning of August. The Boston sites, however, were interviewed and observed throughout the period of September through December, and I made periodic telephone "checks" to key patrol and guard information sources throughout the early spring.

In addition, the Boston-area information was supplemented by: personal attendance at residents' meetings and participation in patrol duty; the review of written material chronicling general citizen involvement in the two case-study neighborhoods; a copy of relevant crime statistics, supplied by the Boston Police Department; and, personal observations witnessed in the field environment.

In addition, because of the confidential nature of much of the material under discussion, patrol and guard anonymity has been attempted. Therefore, to achieve that aim, the case studies acknowledge the city in which each activity is located, but the names of all neighborhoods, patrols, and people interviewed have been changed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." Journal of the American Institute of Planners 35, No. 4 (July 1969):216-24.
- Axelrod, Morris. "Urban Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review 21 (February 1956): 13-18.
- Babchuk, Nicholas and Booth, Alan. "Voluntary Association Membership: A Longitudinal Analysis." American Sociological Review 34 (February 1969):31-45.
- Banfield, Edward C. and Wilson, James O. City Politics. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press and the M.I.T. Press, 1963.
- Bell, Wendell. "Social Structure and Participation in Different Types of Formal Associations." Social Forces 34 (May 1956):345-59.
- Bingham, Hon. Jonathan B. "Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act." Congressional Record 17, 92nd Congress. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Brown, Richard M. "The American Vigilante Tradition." In National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, Violence in America, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Black, Jonathan. "Black Power--the Jane Street Story." The New York Times Magazine. New York: New York Times, May 7, 1972, pp. 3-6, 38-40, 42, 44-45.
- Cahn, Edgar S. and Passet, Barry A., eds. Citizen Participation: A Casebook in Democracy. New Jersey: Community Action Training Institute, 1969.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

- Edwards, John N. and Booth, Alan, eds. Social Participation in Urban Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1973.
- Effrat, Marcia Pelly, ed. The Community: Approaches and Applications. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- "Fortress California." Time, Vol. 103, May 1, 1972, p. 84.
- Foskett, John. "Social Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review 20 (August 1955):431-438.
- Fowler, Glenn. "Parents to Patrol Streets in the Central Park Area." The New York Times, August 16, 1974, p. 33.
- Friedman, Lawrence M. "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview." In Jacobus tenBroek, ed., The Law of the Poor. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, 1966.
- Gans, Herbert. The Urban Villagers. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
- Granville, Samuel. "New York's Experiment in Tenant Safety." HUD Challenge. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975, pp. 22-25.
- Hausknecht, Murray. The Joiners. New York: Bedminister Press, 1962.
- Heidt, Sarajane and Etzioni, Amitai. Community Crime Control: An Exploratory Study (unpublished manuscript). New York: Center for Policy Research, 1973.
- Hodge, Robert and Treiman, Donald. "Social Participation and Social Status." American Sociological Review 33 (October 1968):722-41.
- Hollister, Robert. "From Consumer Participation to Community Control of Neighborhood Health Centers." Ph.D. dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1970.
- Jacobs, Jane. The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Random House, 1961.
- Hyman, Herbert and Wright, Charles R. "Trends in Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Replication Based on Secondary Analysis of National Sample Surveys." American Sociological Review 36 (April 1971):191-206.

- Kakalik, James S. and Wildhorn, Sorrel. Private Police in the United States: Findings and Recommendations, Vol. 1. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1971.
- Keyes, Langley Carleton, Jr. The Rehabilitation Planning Game: A Study in the Diversity of Neighborhoods. Boston, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1969.
- Knopf, Terry Ann. Youth Patrols: An Experiment in Community Participation. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, 1969.
- Kornhauser, William. "Power and Participation in the Local Community." Health Education Monographs No. 6. Oakland, Calif.: Society of Public Health Education, 1959.
- Lucas, Ferris. "Self-Help Crime Prevention Program." HUD Challenge. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975, pp. 26-27.
- Marx, Gary T. and Archer, Dane. "Citizen Involvement in the Law Enforcement Process: The Case of Community Police Patrols." American Behavioral Scientist 15 (September-October 1971):52-72.
- _____. Community Police: An Exploratory Inquiry. Cambridge: Harvard University-M.I.T. Joint Center for Urban Studies, 1972.
- McKenna, Ken. "Tenant Patrols: An Easy Way to Make Crime Difficult." New York Daily News, January 23, 1976.
- "More and More Vigilantes--Legal and Illegal." U.S. News and World Report, Vol. 78, February 4, 1974, pp. 40-42.
- Mumford, Lewis. The Urban Prospect. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.
- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. A National Strategy to Reduce Crime. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.
- National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Staff Report: Law and Order Reconsidered. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Newman, Oscar. Defensible Space. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1972.

- 1970 Census of Population and Housing. Baltimore Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1970.
- _____. New Orleans, Louisiana, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1970.
- Piro, Neil S. "Jersey City's Experiment in Tenant Safety." HUD Challenge, Vol. 5. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974, pp. 16-18.
- Rosenthal, Seymour J. "Turf Reclamation: An Approach to Neighborhood Security." HUD Challenge. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975, pp. 1-3.
- Ross, Murray G. Community Organization: Theory, Principles and Practice. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Russell, Dick. "What Citizens Are Doing to Fight Crime." Parade, June 22, 1975, pp. 8-10.
- Sagalyn, Arnold et al. Residential Security. U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C., December 1973.
- Schatzman, Leonard and Anselm. Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Spiegel, Hans B. C. Citizen Participation in Urban Development, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.
- Sullivan, Charles M. Socio-economic Characteristics of Boston Neighborhoods: Data from the 1970 U.S. Census. Boston, Mass.: Action for Boston Community Development, Inc., 1972.
- Suttles, Gerald D. The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Tenant Patrol Program. New York: New York City Housing Authority, 1973.
- "War on Crime by Fed-Up Citizens." U.S. News and World Report, Vol. 79, September 29, 1975, pp. 19-22.
- Wilson, James Q. "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal." Journal of the American Institute of Planners 39, No. 4 (November 1963): 245, 247.

Wright, Charles and Hyman, Herbert. "Voluntary Association Membership of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys." American Sociological Review 23 (June 1958):284-94.

Yin, Robert K. et al. Patrolling the Neighborhood Beat: Residents and Residential Security. Washington, D.C.: The Rand Corporation, 1975.

Personal Interviews

[To preserve anonymity, names of police, and patrol and guard affiliates interviewed cannot be disclosed.]

Florent, Catherine (Mrs.). New Orleans, Louisiana. Interviews, August 7, 1975 and January 19, 1976.

Gullinello, Leo. Director of Security, Boston Housing Authority. Interview, October 10, 1975.

Lamar, Marta (Mrs.). New Orleans, Louisiana. Interview, January 18, 1976.

Weiss, Linda. Mayor's Safe Streets Act Committee. Boston, Massachusetts. Interview, September 23, 1975.

Zorthium, Greg. Legislative Assistant to Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D.-N.Y.). Interview, February 17, 1976.