

## Problems and Prospectives in Reducing Crime

**Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D. (University of Cincinnati)**

---

**Lawrence F. Travis, Ph.D. (University of Cincinnati)**

---

*An earlier version of this article was presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Orlando, Florida, March 1986. This evaluation was conducted under a contract with the City of Cincinnati. Such support does not necessarily indicate concurrence of the sponsor with the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained therein.*

### **Introduction**

In August 1983, the City of Cincinnati awarded a grant to the College Hill Forum for the development and implementation of a crime prevention program. This program was to be evaluated in hopes that it could serve as a model for other area communities. The purpose of this article is to describe the College Hill crime prevention project and to present the results of the evaluation.

College Hill is a community within the City of Cincinnati. With a population of 17,327, it is the fifth largest community in the city. The population of College Hill closely mirrored that of the city as a whole: 33.9 percent black (city 33.8 percent), 27.5 percent under age 18 (city, 26.7 percent), and 23.2 percent retired (city, 24.1 percent).

### **Community Crime Prevention**

There has been increased interest and activity in the area of community crime prevention in recent years. This rebirth of community involvement in crime control can be traced to the President's Commission on Crime and Administration of Justice (1967). The Commission reported that 50 percent or more of crimes committed were not reported to the nation's law enforcement agencies. In an effort to increase reporting, and thereby, the efficiency of crime control, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration sponsored several programs aimed at increasing citizen involvement in crime control (Boston, 1977). As Lavarkas and others (1983) noted, "Since the late 1960's, millions of dollars have been spent to promote community crime prevention."

During the initial stages of this movement toward citizen prevention, two distinct strategies seemed to emerge. On the one hand, there were several studies of citizens' likelihood to report criminal behavior (Bickman, 1976; Bickman, et al., 1976a, 1976b), and ways to increase citizen reporting of crime. A second thread developed wherein several studies were conducted to test the effectiveness of "target hardening" (Jeffery, 1971; Wallace, 1976).

Crime reporting projects took many forms, ranging from education programs for youth and adults, to the mounting of citizen patrols. With the latter type of programs, the citizenry are encouraged to serve as the "eyes and ears" of the police. Latessa and Allen (1980) reported on one such project that employed local citizens to provide part-time patrol of the neighborhood. This project operated under the assumption that the patrolling citizens would not only increase the likelihood that crimes would be discovered and reported to the police, but would also provide a deterrent to criminal activity in the neighborhood.

Target hardening approaches ranged from residential and commercial security surveys through architectural planning for crime control. Many police departments provided surveys to residents to detect needed security improvements such as increased lighting and installation of dead-bolt locks. Operation Identification projects were supported by L.E.A.A. in several communities. In these projects citizens were encouraged to mark their personal property to reduce the risk that it would be stolen, and to enhance the probability that the property, if stolen, could be recovered and returned (Heller, et al. 1975). Perhaps the most most ambitious of the target hardening efforts involved the preparation of building plans and city designs which were intended to reduce crime "through environmental design" (Jeffery, 1971; Newman and Johnston, 1974; Neiburg, 1974).

Within the general rubric of "target hardening" yet another mode of crime prevention developed — one based on the relatively new study of victimology. Based on the pioneering work of Von Hentig (1948) and others, criminologists argued that certain individuals may behave as victims. That is, some persons place themselves in vulnerable positions and act in ways that make themselves more likely to become the victims of crime. The result of this work has led to a crime prevention strategy based on behavioral alteration. With this approach, people are trained to reduce their risk of victimization by becoming more aware of possible danger and more cautious in their everyday lives (Greenback, 1974).

Since these early efforts at crime prevention in the community, many models and programs have been adopted throughout the nation. Indeed, the emphasis on community crime prevention has not diminished. However, most recent community crime prevention projects include aspects of all of these separate strategies. Generally speaking, contemporary community crime prevention projects enlist citizen support and cooperation in reporting crimes, target hardening, and behavioral alteration. The methods employed to achieve these ends vary with the scope of the project and the level of resources available.

### **Evaluation Activities**

A part of the overall goal of the Criminal Opportunity Reduction Effort (CORE) was to test the applicability of this model for other neighborhoods within the city. Thus, an evaluation of the project was a condition of funding. The evaluation involved both outcome estimation (effects of the project on crime and fear of crime) and process evaluation (analysis of organization and implementation of the project). The

following sections describe project activities and assess the overall administration of the program.

### **Activities of C.O.R.E.**

October 1984 eight mass meetings were held at neighborhood churches and Town Hall to explain the projects to residents of College Hill, and to recruit block-watch captains. A total of twenty block-watch meetings were also held to organize and implement block-watch groups throughout the community. In this first year alone, the block-watch program was presented to over 1,000 residents in the meetings. Through the community newsletter, the Journal, information about the project was sent to 7,000 College Hill addresses each quarter. Forum and the project staff also concentrated on securing coverage of the project in the news media, with great success.

Target hardening activities proceeded along several lines. As a result of educational efforts at the various meetings, scores of home security surveys were conducted by the Police Division's community affairs officer. Project identification engraving tools were secured and circulated throughout the community. Block-watch stickers, emergency telephone number stickers, and leaflets were printed and distributed throughout the community. Neighborhood watch street signs were ordered and plans made to erect them.<sup>1</sup> Finally, efforts were begun to provide increased lighting and improved fencing for a community parking lot which had been identified as a major site of criminal activity in the community.

Through 1985, these activities continued. The signs were erected, lighting of the parking lot was completed, and the neighborhood block-watch meetings and organization was expanded. In addition, the project staff increased their efforts at public education and general crime prevention consciousness-raising.

With the target hardening activities in place and a nucleus of neighborhood block-watch, the attention of the project staff was devoted to education and public awareness through 1985. A two tiered strategy to increase public awareness was adopted. Project staff, in cooperation with the Police Division, stepped-up efforts at public education in College Hill. In addition, staff became involved in the national crime prevention movement, beginning in mid-1984 and continuing through 1985.

Project staff secured printed matter on crime prevention and child safety from insurance companies, other corporate sponsors, and the publication of its own materials. Staff then obtained a "McGruff" costume (the national community crime prevention spokesman/symbol). Project staff, in costume, would visit schools or churches with a Cincinnati police officer to distribute literature. McGruff appeared in the "College Hill Days" parade, and at other affairs which drew large attendance.

On a national level, the project served as the local coordinators for the greater Cincinnati area for "National Night Out" in both 1984 and 1985. Through these efforts, the increasing cooperation of the media, the project disseminated crime prevention

information to the College Hill Community and beyond. The participation in "National Night Out" resulted in national media coverage and publicity for the project.

Delays in securing agreements to parking lot leases and environmental protection agency approval for the installation of improved fencing at the parking lot hampered completion of the project. The fencing was expected to be completed in June 1986, and the project has been granted a continuance until that time.

### Problems in Project Administration

As is to be expected in any large scale effort of this type, where the control of the project is divided among several levels and the success of the project depends upon the voluntary cooperation of many different people and organizations, administrative difficulties hampered the attainment of project goals. In addition to the normal operational problems expected in an effort such as this, the City of Cincinnati experienced a budget deficit during this time period which resulted, among other things, in a reduction of police staffing and a decrease in the ability of the Police Division to support the efforts of the project. While the Cincinnati Division of Police did not have a crime prevention unit per se, the duties normally associated with such a unit were assigned to a community assistance officer. In response to budget reductions these officers were temporarily reassigned to other duties.

Interviews with key staff revealed the need for Police Division representation at block-watch and public meetings. Police attendance was necessary to provide legitimacy and credibility to the program, as well as to insure expert, professional advice about crime prevention to those in attendance who raised questions. Similar concerns were voiced in quarterly progress reports from the project to the City. Furthermore, volunteers did not feel qualified to conduct home security surveys and were concerned that their suggestions for improvements to residents were not viewed as being as credible as were those of a police officer. »

On the administrative side, throughout the life of the project, staff were hampered by the absence of a single contact person within the Department of Safety who was familiar with the project and its operation. Over the two year span the staff were required to continually educate and re-educate Safety Department personnel charged with oversight of the project.

Another limiting factor identified by the staff was the difficulty they encountered in taking quick action. Sub-contracts for the lighting and fencing work, purchase orders for street signs and printing and the like were processed through the City, with considerable delay. Further, as a result of City regulations, staff were not able to leverage their resources through "sweat equity" or competitive bids. For example, the City required that the Highway Maintenance Division install the signs at a cost of \$25.00 each. The design and colors of the signs were controlled by prior City policy decisions, and sign-making was required to be done through the City sign shop. On a positive note, this cooperation with the City proved beneficial to other communities. The project purchased large quantities of signs and printed materials which allowed

substantial economies of scale. The cheaper excess of material was then available for sale or distribution to other communities. It should be noted however, that there was some resentment that funds were required to subsidize other efforts at the expense of possible greater efforts in the project area.

A final set of administrative problems surrounded the project, and although they did not effect the overall success of the project, they did cause a great deal of frustration for the volunteer staff. For example, the staff experienced difficulties with some area businesses which leased the affected parking lot. Businessmen who held leases with the parking lot were initially suspicious of the plan to improve lighting and fencing. It was difficult to convince many of them that the improvements would not result in increased rental fees or costs to their businesses. Thus, what was expected to be a quick and pro-forma amendment to existing leases required a level of discussion and brokering that took its toll on the volunteer staff.

Another problem that arose was that Block-Watch captains were not always willing to hold meetings in their homes during winter months, reducing the length of time during which the recruitment of block watchers could be conducted. Understandably, most interested persons were not able to accommodate meeting of twenty to thirty residents inside their homes and preferred to schedule meetings for the summer months when they could be conducted out-of-doors. Not only did this reduce the recruitment period, it also hampered efforts to disseminate information, provide continued education to block-watchers, and otherwise limited the block watch program. This required the community relations officer to "bunch" his activities into the warmer months, thereby creating a "bulge" in his workload.

A final problem relates to on-site administration of this sort of project. As a result of the nature of the criteria for the award, those most likely to secure the project are citizens who already devote a significant amount of time to voluntary community service on a community council. Due to contract restrictions, the CORE project was not allowed to hire any support staff for the project. The net result was that the project represented an added workload to the existing volunteer staff. When coupled with the above mentioned difficulties with city bureaucracy, the stress resulted in several of the early supporters experiencing "burn out".

### Outcome Estimation

The difficulty of determining the impact of a project of this type stems in part from the multiple objectives of the project. On the one hand, the project seeks to increase citizen/police cooperation and thereby encourage the reporting of crime. On the other hand, it seeks to reduce crime as reflected in crime known to the police through deterrence and crime prevention techniques. To achieve one objective is to frustrate the other. Thus, multiple measures of project performance have been included in this evaluation.

## Performance Measures

This project had multiple objectives, and therefore, no single measure of project performance was sufficient to evaluate the project's impact on the community. A series of measures were utilized to measure the effectiveness of the project.

Measures of project outcome effectiveness included:

1. The proportional change in selected crime in the project area.
2. The change in the number and types of victimization of individuals residing in the project area over the life of the project.
3. The attitudes of project area residents regarding the effectiveness of the project and its potential impact on the police, the community and crime.

Data for each of these measures were generally available. Selected crime data were provided by the Cincinnati Police Division. These data were available for the project area beginning with the year prior to the project's implementation, and for the two years of actual operation. Similar data were available for the city as a whole. The crime data presented in this report reflect crime rates as reported to the police beginning January 1, 1983 through December 31, 1985. It should be noted that because of the size and boundaries of the project area, a contiguous area could not be developed to measure spillover.

Data on the rates of victimization of project area residents were gathered through a survey. This survey was administered on two occasions to randomly selected households and businesses in the College Hill area. Telephone numbers were randomly selected from address listings obtained through the telephone company. Using a random starting point, a systematic sample was taken from this listing. The pre-test included 189 respondents and the post-test was conducted with a sample of 199. Concurrently with the victimization survey, an attitudinal scale was administered. This scale was designed to assess the level of perceived fear of crime in the neighborhood, receptivity to the project, response to the concept of neighborhood crime programs, and attitudes toward the police.

Victimization and attitudinal data were collected prior to the initiation of the project for a pre-test, and just following conclusion of the two years of the project's operation.

## Data Analysis

Analysis of the data pertaining to the changes in crime rates was relatively straightforward. The percentage changes were calculated for the project area and for the city as a whole for the first year of project operation and for the two year period. Differences were tested for statistical significance using the difference between proportions test.

The victimization and attitudinal data were analyzed by comparing the pre-test results with the post-test results. The chi-square statistic was used to determine if the differences were significant.

## Crime Data Analysis

Data for crimes known to the police play a critical role in this evaluation. The data for the period January 1983 through December 1983 were compared to a similar time frame from 1984 and 1985 for the project area and the city as a whole. These data should be viewed in light of similar studies which have indicated that reported crime trends may be among the least useful measures of program effectiveness (Latessa and Allen, 1980; Reiss, 1980; Sparks, 1980). Even the direction of change in reported crime may prove to be misleading. As mentioned previously, if the project's efforts improve police and community relations the tendency of citizens to report crime may be increased, which will produce an apparent increase in crime as a result of the project's success. With this caveat in mind, Tables 1 and 2 present trends in selected reported crime data.

Table 1 is a summary table presenting selected crime data for the treatment area (College Hill) and the entire city during the first year of program operation. The percentage changes listed in Table 1 and 2 were derived from raw crime figures provided by the Police Division. In some cases they are based on a very small total number of incidents which leads to rather large percentage changes associated with small changes in the actual number of incidents.

As seen in Table 1, the College Hill area reported a drop in burglary, larceny, auto theft and the total crimes reported during the first year of program operation. These crime categories are considered amenable to citizen crime prevention projects, particularly burglary and auto theft. The treatment area did report a large increase in aggravated assaults, and a slight increase in robberies. Four of the six areas resulted in a significant difference between the treatment area and the city as a whole. Perhaps the most surprising difference was for auto theft, with the College Hill area reporting a 55 percent drop, while the city reported a 3 percent increase.

Table 2 presents the results of the crime data over the two years of program operation (1983-85). These results are even more dramatic, with the treatment area reporting crime reductions in all but one category: aggravated assault. Again, the College Hill area reported a reduction in burglary, larceny, auto theft and the total. Over the two year period they also showed a drop in rape and robbery. The city also reported an overall reduction in reported crimes, however, there were significant differences in the amount of reduction, and once again the percentage of auto thefts rose for the city.

The category which exhibits a clear trend toward decreasing crime only in the project area was auto theft. This is a crime which can be prevented through the efforts of a citizens' crime reporting project.

**Table 1**

**Percentage Changes in Reported Crimes for College Hill and City**  
January 1983 Through December 1983 & January 1984 Through December 1984

Crime	College Hill	City
Rape	01	+16.51
Robbery	+41	-51
Aggravated Assault*	+551	+61
Burglary*	-111	-21
Larceny*	-121	-41
Auto Theft*	-551	+31
Total*	-HZ	-31

(Differences were significant at .05.)

**Table 2**

**Percentage Changes in Reported Crimes for College Hill and City**  
January 1983 Through December 1983 and January 1984 Through December 1985

Crises	College Hill	City
Rape	-331	+141
Robbery	-191	-111
Aggravated Assault*	+441	+21
Burglary*	-281	-131
Larceny*	-241	-31
Auto Theft*	-351	+31
Total*	-261	-51

(Differences were significant at .05.)

**Victimization Survey**

The victimization survey for this study was conducted as part of the previously mentioned survey. The victimization survey instrument consisted of two short standardized questionnaires, with the majority of the questions requiring only a "yes" or "no" or an "agree" or "disagree" answer. The first survey was a pre-test administered before the implementation of the project. One hundred and eighty nine respondents were surveyed, each a resident or commercial establishment within the boundaries of College Hill. The post-test was administered to 199 respondents upon completion of the project.

The data from this survey are presented in Table 3. These data indicated that there was little difference in the number of victims between the pre-test and the post-test, however, a significantly lower number of respondents indicated that they had filed a report with the police between the pre- and post- tests. It should be noted that the actual number of victims was very small and therefore the results are somewhat unreliable. This survey also found that a significantly higher percentage of residents had heard of a crime being committed in their neighborhood between the two periods. Since the reported crime data did not indicate an increase in overall crime, it is possible that this difference was due to the efforts of the project in making citizens more aware of crime. There was no difference in the number of crimes witnessed, and these data are consistent with other similar projects that find that few crimes are actually witnessed.

**Table 3**

**Victimization Survey**

Statement	Pre-test January 1983		Post-Test January 1985		Statistical Significance
	N	%	N	%	
Have you been a victim in the past 12 months?					
Yes	22	11.6X	30	15.21	N.S.
No	167	88.4X	167	84.81	
Total	189	100.01	197	100.01	
Has a Police Report filed by victim?					
Yes	17	77.21	19	67.81	.05
No	5	22.82	9	32.1X	
Total	22	100.02	28	100.01	
Have you heard of a crime in your neighborhood?					
Yes	60	31.71	97	49.01	.05
No	129	68.32	101	51.01	
Total	189	100.01	198	100.01	
Have you witnessed a crime in your neighborhood?					
Yes	7	3.71	4	2.01	N.S.
No	182	96.31	193	98.01	
Total	189	100.01	197	100.01	

## Attitude Survey

The attitudes of the community are an important element in programs such as this one. Feelings about the safety and security of the community by its residents may well be as important as actual conditions. The attitudes of the residents toward the project may affect their behavior and ultimately the success of the project. Also, it can be argued that the major element in many crime prevention strategies is a favorable attitude regarding crime prevention. Citizen attitude regarding crime, the police and the project were measured through the use of a survey instrument which was administered as a pre-test and post-test in conjunction with the victimization survey.

Community attitudes toward the project were deemed critical, since the program was based on citizen involvement in crime prevention. If citizens hold strong negative attitudes toward the project, success is unlikely. Citizen responses to selected questions are presented in Table 4, comparing the pre-test and post-test results.

The attitude survey revealed that several significant shifts have occurred. These data indicated that the majority of residents do not feel that their neighborhood is dangerous, or that crime is on the increase. One of the significant shifts regarded knowledge of the project. The pre-test results found that slightly more than half of the respondents had heard of the project compared to over 70 percent two years later. Overall, the community presented a very positive attitude toward the project from the very beginning, and therefore no dramatic change occurred. There was almost unanimous agreement that the project would not interfere with the police, 86 percent pre-test to 89 percent post-test. The one additional significant difference that emerged concerned the perception of police success in reducing crime in the neighborhood, with 74 percent agreeing that the police were successful during the pre-test compared to 60 percent at the end of the project.

These findings reinforce the contention that the project/enjoyed widespread support from the community. The vast majority of residents were aware of the project and supported it. Similarly, most felt their neighborhood was safe. The majority of residents liked the police, and although fewer felt that the police were successful in reducing crime, this was not a majority view.

## Summary and Conclusions

The College Hill/CORE began in late 1983 and operated through 1985 with a core staff comprised of volunteer community leaders. The project organized a neighborhood block-watch program in College Hill and succeeded in instituting several target-hardening practices including residential security surveys, property identification, and environmental alterations to a high crime incidence location (parking lot).

Although always one goal of the project, public education and community consciousness-raising received increased attention from project staff beginning in late 1984. As a result of project efforts, several thousand pieces of mail were distributed throughout the community, over 1,000 residents attended neighborhood meetings,

and the College Hill Crime Prevention Project received substantial media coverage and publicity, both locally and nationally.

Administrative problems with type of project were identified as existing in three areas. First, as a result of not having a single identified contact within the City Safety Department, it was difficult for project staff to maintain communication and relations with Safety Department oversight of the project. The relatively "informal nature" of the citizen or community crime prevention project is not well suited to the requirements of municipal regulations and bureaucracy. Quick, decisive action was inhibited and staff of the project frequently felt that they were not in control, since they were required to abide by City regulations. Finally, the voluntary nature of the involvement of all parties in the project produced substantial management and organizational problems which heightened the stress experiences by project staff.

The outcome evaluation employed multiple measures to assess the effectiveness of the crime prevention project. Pre-test data were gathered including information about the distribution and number of offenses in College Hill and the city as a whole, as well as baseline survey data from individuals and business in College Hill. Respondents to the survey were contacted in random telephone interviews and asked a series of questions on their feelings about the safety of the community, the nature of the project, their relationships with the police, and their experiences as either witnesses or victims of crime.

Crime data provided by the Cincinnati Police Division revealed that the College Hill project area generally experiences a decrease in the amount of crime between 1983 (the year before the project began) and over the course of 1984-1985 (the project time period). With the exception of aggravated assault, the project area experiences reductions in crime in all measured categories. The most significant finding was the drop in auto thefts in the project area, while the city as a whole experienced a net increase in the number of auto thefts. The project area also experienced a significant decline in the numbers of burglaries and larcenies as well.

The survey of residents and businesses revealed little difference in the number of victims over the course of the project. The most notable differences were attitudinal. Post-test respondents were much more likely to report being aware of the crime prevention program, and having heard of a crime occurring in their neighborhood than were pre-test respondents. Both pre-test and post-test respondents reported that the majority of residents did not view their neighborhood as being unsafe, and that most residents did not believe that crime was on the increase. Moreover, there was almost unanimous agreement that the crime prevention project would not hamper the police, although fewer respondents felt that the police were successful in reducing crime.

Table 4

Citizen Attitude Survey

Statement	Pre-Test January 1983				Statistical Significance	Statement	Post-Test January 1984				Statistical Significance	
	H	I	N	I			H	I	N	I		
Worry about things being stolen.						Do you believe the project will interfere with police in crime prevention?						
Agree	4	U	80	40.21	U.S.	Agree	h	3.	i	4	2.01	U.S.
Disagree	98	50.81	107	53.87		Disagree	162	86.11	177	88.91		
Unsure	4	2.0	i	6.01		Unsure	M	10.	a	IS	9.01	
Total	193	100.01	133	100.07		Total	183	100.01	133	100.01		
This is a dangerous neighborhood to live in.						Do you believe the project is a good idea?						
Agree	13	6.31	n	B.51	H.S.	Agree	178	35.71	192	96.51	U.S.	
Disagree	US	87.31	171	B3.91		Disagree	1	0.51	1	0.51		
Unsure	11	5.51	n	5.51		Unsure	7	3.81	6	3.01		
Total	117	100.01	m	100.01		Total	186	100.01	139	100.01		
Crime in this neighborhood is on the increase.						Would you be willing to work on the project?						
Agree	36	13.01	10	70.11	U.S.	Yes	100	54.01	118	59.11	U.S.	
Disagree	116	61.41	113	51.31		No	85	46.01	79	40.11		
Unsure	37	13.61	36	18.01		Total	185	100.01	197	100.01		
Total	183	100.01	139	100.01								
Have you heard of the crime reporting project?						Police are successful in reducing crime in this neighborhood.						
Yes	39	54.11	143	72.11	.00	Agree	133	73.91	100	60.31	.00	
No	94	45.91	153	71.11		Disagree	13	6.31	23	14.61		
Total	183	100.01	138	100.01		Unsure	36	19.11	50	25.11		
						Total	182	100.01	193	100.01		
Do you believe the project will be successful?						Overall do you believe the police in this neighborhood.						
Agree	149	11.11	157	78.31	M.S.	Agree	157	83.51	156	78.41	IN. 5.	
Disagree	4	1.11	9	4.51		Disagree	7**	3.71	4	2.01		
Unsure	34	18.21	33	16.61		Unsure	24	12.81	33	19.61		
Total	187	100.01	139	100.01		Total	183	100.01	139	100.01		

Edward Utessa & Lawrence Travis, 1987, JSA, 10(1) 49

There are several possible interpretations of the results of this survey. One interpretation is that crime simply "spilled over" into contiguous areas. This implies that the project had a deterrent effect on would-be criminals. Unfortunately, it was not possible to develop a control area due to the boundary restriction of the area under study. Another possibility is that these crime reductions are simply part of an overall trend developing in the city, and this certainly seems true with some crime categories. Finally, it is quite possible that the project made citizens more aware of crime prevention and thus, the results were due to the success of the project in meeting its goals.

Note

<sup>1</sup> By City ordinance, neighborhood watch signs erected within the City of Cincinnati must conform to the selected design and can only be installed after the Division of Police verifies at least fifty percent resident participation in a block-watch program.

References

Bickman, L. (1976) "Attitude Toward an Authority and the Reporting of Crime", *Sociometry* 39 (1): 76-82.

Bickman, L. (1976a) National Evaluation Program - Phase I Report - Citizen Crime Reporting Projects, Final Report. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Bickman, L., et al. (1976b) Citizen Crime Reporting Projects - National Evaluation Program - Phase I, Summary Report. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Boston, G. B. (1977) *Community Crime Prevention: A Selected Bibliography*. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Greenback, A. (1974) *Survival in the City* (New York: Harper and Row).

Heller, N. B., et al. (1975) Operation Identification Projects: Assessment of Effectiveness, National Evaluation Program - Phase I Summary Report. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Jeffery, C. R. (1971) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*. (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).

Latessa, E. J. and Allen, H. E. (1980) "Using Citizens to Prevent Crime: An Example of Deterrence and Community Involvement", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 8(1): 69-74.

Lavrakas, P. J., et al. (1983) "Transmitting Information about Crime and Crime Prevention to Citizens: The Evanston Newsletter Quasi-Experiment", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 11 (4): 463-73.

Neiburg, H. L. (1974) "Crime Prevention by Urban Design", *Society*, 12 (1): 41-47.

Newman, O. and Johnston, S. (1974) Model Security Code for Residential Areas, (New York: Institute for Community Design Analysis).

President's Commission on Crime and Administration of Justice (1967) The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Reiss, A. J. (1980) "*Understanding Changes in Crime Rates*" in S. E. Fienberg and A. J. Reiss (eds.) Indicators of Crime and Criminal Justice: Quantitative Studies (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office): 11-17.

Sparks, R. F. (1980) "*Criminal Opportunities and Crime Rates*" in S. E. Fienberg and A. J. Reiss (eds.) Indicators of Crime and Criminal Justice: Quantitative Studies (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office): 18-28.

von Hentig, E. (1948) The Criminal and His Victim. (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Wallace, W. D. (1976) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design-Annotated Bibliography. (Arlington, VA: Westinghouse Electric Corporation).