
WHAT WORKS IN CRIME PREVENTION: AN OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS

by

Barry Poyner

Barry Poyner Research Consultancy

***Abstract'** In this review of 122 evaluations of crime prevention projects, the measures evaluated were grouped into six general categories: campaigns and publicity; policing and other surveillance; environmental design or improvement; social and community services; security devices; target removal or modification. Using objective indices of crime, about half of the measures evaluated were found to be effective. Successes were documented in all six categories of measures, but target removal or modification enjoyed the largest number of successes and social and community services the least.*

BACKGROUND

In the winter of 1987-8 when this research was being planned, a somewhat depressed view had emerged about the viability of crime prevention activities. The great surge of interest in crime prevention programs in the U.S., begun in the late 1960s, had all but ended by the early 1980s. In Britain, the political commitment to crime prevention had arrived later and still continued, but many of the results seemed disappointing.

The influence of the American academic community had ensured that many of the crime prevention programs developed in the United States were evaluated by academic researchers. (See, for example, Heller et al., 1975; Tien et al., 1979; and Rosenbaum, 1986 and 1988.) This tradition of evaluation had also been followed in Britain, though with perhaps less enthusiasm and less vigor than in North America.

Address for correspondence: Barry Poyner Research Consultancy, 2 Barnsway, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire WD4 9PW, United Kingdom.

Although some positive findings did emerge, many of the evaluation reports seemed to bring bad news. The evaluations both in Britain and in the U.S. seemed to suggest that few of the crime prevention projects had the desired effect of reducing crime. Not only were many projects poorly organized and incompletely implemented, but, even when they were carried out well, many doubts were raised about the effectiveness of the measures employed. Two examples of evaluations produced in Britain at that time, which gave a good deal of dissatisfaction to those responsible for crime prevention policy, were Trevor Bennett's evaluation of two neighborhood watch schemes (Bennett, 1987) and Poyner et al.'s (1986) evaluation of the crime prevention program of the National Association for the Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO).

This disappointment in the results of crime prevention programs seems to have had two interesting effects on research and policy. First, the negative findings that often emerged led policymakers to distance themselves from these research findings as if they were too painful and difficult to deal with. As a result, continued monitoring of prevention initiatives has often been abandoned, and the accumulation of findings from evaluations made over the last 15 to 20 years has been largely neglected. In its place new programs have attracted highly controlled and, incidentally, very expensive evaluation activities, in the hope that any good news that might be extracted from newly funded initiatives can be given the fullest recognition and the widest publicity.

Our concern at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations was that there was too little accumulating wisdom about the effectiveness of crime prevention measures. The psychology of crime prevention politics was such that a true scientific tradition of developing knowledge and understanding of what was effective—and why—was largely blocked. In its place, the scientific debate on crime prevention seemed in danger of becoming debased into little more than a slanging match between opposing theories of social versus situational crime prevention.

Familiarity with a number of evaluations of crime prevention projects both from Britain and North America, and to some extent from other countries such as Holland and Sweden, led us to believe that there was room for much more optimism. There was little doubt that many of the evaluations revealed ineffective crime prevention activities, yet there were also successful projects. It was puzzling to us that somehow the successes were often overlooked while far more attention was given to the failures. In particular, there seemed to be much more willingness for academic researchers to find fault with the methodology of evaluation than to build on any positive findings. We felt that overall, there was a great deal more that could be usefully extracted from past evaluations,

and we became intent on a thorough reassessment of whatever evaluation literature we could assemble.

We were aware of a number of what are sometimes called "meta" evaluations, but these are usually directed at reviewing a large number of similar projects, such as those already mentioned by Heller et al. (1975) on "Operation Identification" and Tien et al. (1979) on street lighting projects in the U.S. There have also been one or two broadly based reviews of evaluations (e.g., see Rosenbaum, 1986) of selected community crime prevention projects. However, none of these previous reviews have tried to encompass the whole field of crime prevention evaluations.

SEARCH FOR EVALUATIONS

We were already aware of much evaluation work that had been done in Britain, and efforts were made to obtain fuller documentation, fill in gaps and update ourselves as best we could through contacting all the familiar channels and following up any leads. For more international coverage, we were invited to use the library associated with the School of Criminal Justice on the Newark campus of Rutgers University, which proved to have a very substantial collection of evaluation literature that complemented our knowledge of the British material. Although predominantly from North America, there was also material from other English-speaking countries and those that often publish in English, such as Holland, Sweden and, to a lesser extent, Germany. We were fairly certain that the reason evaluation literature is not generally available in other languages is that the evaluation of crime prevention activities has not been carried out to anything like the same extent as in English-speaking countries.

The selection of material was made with very straightforward criteria. We were interested in evaluation reports on any initiatives where at least part of the intention was to reduce the incidence of crime and where efforts had been made to assess the effect of the initiative on crime. For the most part, these evaluations related to local projects such as neighborhood watch schemes, but more general initiatives were also included, such as the introduction of steering-column locks on motor cars. By insisting that evaluations discussed the impact of the initiatives on crime, evaluations of treatment programs or of delinquency prevention programs based on effects within a specific offender population were excluded. Even so, a number of programs of this kind were included where they appeared to meet our criteria of measuring the effect on crime.

In the measurement of crime reductions, we accepted the evaluations based on officially-reported crime and from victimization surveys, as well as other records such as those kept by security organizations. After some uncertainty, we decided against using data on the fear of crime. Although it is clear that the fear of crime is in itself a problem, we became increasingly uncertain of the reliability of fear reduction as a measure of crime reduction. Our impression was that evaluators often turned to measuring fear when they had little confidence of being able to demonstrate measurable reductions in crime. It also seems certain that fear, particularly in a small area, will be relatively easily influenced by any activity associated with a crime prevention initiative. Publicity arising from the initiative, or any increased presence of the police or other agencies, might all contribute to major changes in attitudes toward crime without necessarily reducing criminal activity.

THE RESULT OF THE SEARCH

The relatively simple selection criteria enabled us to identify 122 evaluation studies that were suitable for further analysis. (A complete list of these evaluations appears at the end of this paper.) Some of these evaluations were simple studies of the effects of introducing a single preventive measure and examining its effect on one or more types of crime. These simple evaluations provided the easiest data to interpret. Often the evaluations were much more complex, involving a combination of several different types of measures. Typical of the complex evaluations are those in public-sector housing where measures as diverse as organizing activities for young people, improving door and window security and increasing police patrols might all be introduced at the same time.

Not only were the forms of crime prevention projects diverse, but the detailed design of individual measures also varied a great deal. Nevertheless, it did seem possible to classify the measures into categories commonly used in the crime prevention literature. Table 1 sets out a classification which seemed to grow naturally from the material we had assembled. The number of evaluations that refer to each measure is listed in the right-hand column of Table 1. The measures are listed in order of the number of evaluations in which they appear. The 122 evaluations reported on the effectiveness of some 47 different types of preventive measures. (See list of evaluations at the end of this paper.) In all, there were some 249 different citations of these measures in the 122 evaluations. For convenience, the types of measures are grouped **into six general categories, as follows:**

- A. Campaigns and publicity
- B. Policing and other surveillance
- C. Environmental design or improvement
- D. Social and community services
- E. Security devices
- F. Target removal or modification.

FORM OF THE ANALYSIS

Once assembled, the material was considerably more extensive than expected. The large number of evaluations would clearly have an influence on how the material might be analyzed. Originally, it was assumed that the number of evaluations and the range of measures would be about one-third the size of the final data base. It had been assumed that the analysis would take individual types of measures in turn, compare their performance in a number of evaluations, and draw conclusions about each. Such an approach is still possible with a large sample of evaluations, but to do this thoroughly would lead to a very long and perhaps tedious project write-up, which would certainly be tedious to read.

The large database of evaluation material suggested that some relatively crude numerical analysis might be attempted in place of the more descriptive approach originally planned. Some simple method of rating the evidence from evaluations might help to construct a rough-and-ready guide to the effectiveness of measures without being too heavily subjected to a myriad of detailed qualifications, whether of methodology or of accuracy of the data. More detailed qualifications could always be developed later as the debate demands by going back to the original evaluation studies.

METHOD OF RATING EVALUATIONS

In developing a simple rating scale for evaluations, it was concluded that there were only four essentially different categories to recognize. First there were the evaluations that provided good evidence of crime reduction. To go beyond this and rate reductions in terms such as high, medium and low did not seem practical. The variations in the presentation of crime data in the original evaluations would not make it easy to develop such a level of refinement.

The next category was common in the evaluations. There are many evaluations which claimed that crime had been reduced, but for a variety of reasons it was hard to accept the claim on the evidence presented.

Table 1: Classification of Measures

Group and type of preventive measure showing the number of citings of each measure on the right-hand side of each column.

A.	CAMPAIGNS AND PUBLICITY (74 citings)	
A1	Advertising/publicity to encourage the use of security devices	17
A2	Property marking	16
A3	Publicity for the project	13
A4	Security surveys	13
A5	Doorstep campaigns by the police	9
A6	Police talks in schools	3
A7	Anti-shoplifting signs or posters	3
B.	POLICING AND OTHER SURVEILLANCE (68 citings)	
B1	Neighborhood or block watch	18
B2	Increased police patrols	15
B3	Focused or saturation policing	13
B4	CCTV surveillance	9
B5	Citizen or vigilante patrols	5
B6	Concierges	4
B7	Increased staffing of facilities	2
B8	Security guards for housing blocks	1
B9	Extra ticket inspection staff	1
C.	ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN OR IMPROVEMENT (45 citings)	
C1	Lighting	11
C2	Fencing	7
C3	Design changes to improve surveillance by staff	5
C4	Cleanup of neighborhood	5
C5	Physical improvements to housing (modernization, painting, etc.)	4
C6	Landscaping	4
C7	Security screens for staff	2
C8	Road closure or street changes	2
C9	Improved visibility of store interiors	2
C10	Wider market gangways	1
C11	Parking meters designed to display last coins	1
C12	Secure bicycle compound at school	1
D.	SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (27 citings)	
D1	Forming a residents' association (public-sector housing)	8
D2	Organized recreational activities for young people	5
D3	Providing youth and community centers or play areas	5
D4	Localizing housing services (public-sector housing)	3
D5	Counseling and social work	3
D6	Education projects	3

continued on next page

E.	SECURITY DEVICES (26 citings)	
E1	Improving domestic door and window locks	12
E2	Electronic access control	6
E3	Burglar alarms	4
E4	Car steering-column locks	2
E5	Increased security of drug cabinets in pharmacies	1
E6	Chaining of retail goods on display	1
F.	TARGET REMOVAL OR MODIFICATION (5 citings)	
F1	Exact fare systems on buses	2
F2	Reducing amount of cash in tills	2
F3	Removing coin-operated gas/electricity meters	1
X.	OTHER (4 citings)	
X1	ID required for use of personal checks	1
X2	Publicly identifying the most shoplifted items	1
X3	Rewarding children for not shoplifting	1
X4	Escorting senior citizens (QAPs)	1

Objections would vary from poor methodology to the incompleteness of the information, or the report might be badly written and confusing. Another reason for doubting a claim of crime reduction would be that the level of reduction described could not be considered statistically significant.

The two other categories were relatively simple to determine. First there were evaluations in which the evaluators concluded that there was no effect on crime, or at least no measurable effect, and second, there were studies in which evaluators found that crime actually became worse following the introduction of the measure. Such an increase in crime may be the result of extraneous factors, but it is clear that under such conditions the measures could not be claimed as effective.

To summarize these four categories, we rated measures on a scale as follows:

+ 2	When there was good evidence of crime reduction
+ 1	When positive findings had been produced, but there were concerns or doubts about the validity of these results
0	Where the evaluators claimed there was no effect on crime
-1	Where evaluations showed that crime had increased.

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES

Table 2 lists the measures in the same order as in Table 1. The first four columns of the table show how evaluations of each measure were rated overall on the scale + 2, + 1, 0 and -1. The distribution across the four columns gives an immediate guide as to how each type of measure performed in the evaluations. The fifth column on the right-hand side of the table gives an average score, assuming that the scale + 2 to -1 is linear. Although many might consider this methodologically dubious, the calculation of this average provides a ready means of ranking measures in order of their effectiveness. Providing these averages are used as no more than a rough guide, the method can be justified. Of course, when an average is based on only one or two evaluations, the scores should not be taken too seriously. Even so, any + 2 evaluation score is always welcome.

Perhaps the first and most important finding of this overview emerges in Table 2. It shows that, although there are plenty of disappointing findings, shown in columns 0 and -1 and to a lesser extent in column + 1, there are plenty of evaluations that provide good evidence of crime reduction. Among 249 citations of measures in the sample of evaluations, about half (121) were classified as + 2. From the point of view of the researchers, this largely justifies our conviction that there is plenty of evidence to show that crime prevention can work, providing we understand what works and under what circumstances. Our troubled politicians and administrators should not lose heart.

The findings in Table 2 are open for readers to inspect at their leisure and according to their own particular interests. However, it is clear that some measures look more promising than others. For example, publicity for a crime prevention project (A3) and the use of doorstep campaigns by the police (A5) show relatively high scores, and suggest that these are important ingredients in many successful crime prevention initiatives. Other high-scoring measures include focused or saturation policing (B3), the employment of concierges in apartment blocks (B6) and the use of design changes to improve surveillance (C3).

It is also interesting to compare the groups within each classification. An average score can be calculated for the whole group by simply adding the columns in each group. The first interesting finding from this is that all but one of the six groups score quite well. The three largest groups, A, B, and C—campaigns and publicity, policing and surveillance, and environmental design—have about the same overall score. Group E (security devices) has a similar score, while the small group F has the very high overall score of 1.80, suggesting that "target removal or

Table 2: Overall Effectiveness of Measures

Group and type of preventive measure	+ 2	+ 1	0	-1	Av.
A. CAMPAIGNS AND PUBLICITY (74 citings)	37	24	11	2	1.30
A1 Advertising/publicity to encourage the use of security devices	4	5	7	1	.71
A2 Property marking	8	5	3	0	1.31
A3 Publicity for the project	9	4	0	0	1.69
A4 Security surveys	5	7	1	0	1.31
A5 Doorstep campaigns by the police	7	2	0	0	1.78
A6 Police talk in schools	2	0	0	1	1.00
A7 Anti-shoplifting signs and posters	2	1	0	0	1.67
B. POLICING AND OTHER SURVEILLANCE (68 citings)	36	20	10	2	1.32
B1 Neighborhood or block watch	5	10	3	0	1.11
B2 Increased police patrols	6	4	4	1	1.00
B3 Focused or saturation policing	10	2	1	0	1.69
B4 CCTV surveillance	7	0	1	1	1.44
B5 Citizen and vigilante patrols	1	3	1	0	1.00
B6 Concierges	3	1	0	0	1.75
B7 Increased staffing of facilities	2	0	0	0	2.00
B8 Security guards for housing blocks	1	0	0	0	2.00
B9 Extra ticket inspection staff	1	0	0	0	2.00
C. ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN/IMPROVEMENT (45 citings)	24	12	9	0	1.33
C1 Lighting	6	4	1	0	1.45
C2 Fencing	4	1	2	0	1.29
C3 Design changes to improve surveillance by staff	4	1	0	0	1.80
C4 Cleanup of neighborhood	3	0	2	0	1.20
C5 Physical improvements to housing (modernization, painting, etc.)	1	1	2	0	.75
C6 Landscaping	1	1	2	0	.75
C7 Security screens for staff	1	1	0	0	1.50
C8 Road closure or street changes	1	1	0	0	1.50
C9 Improved visibility of store interiors	1	1	0	0	1.50
C10 Wider market gangways	1	0	0	0	2.00
C11 Parking meters designed to display last coins	1	0	0	0	2.00
C12 Secure bicycle compound at school	0	1	0	0	1.00
D. SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (27 citings)	3	4	16	4	.22
D1 Forming a Residents' Association (public-sector housing)	2	1	4	1	.50
D2 Organized recreational activities for young people	0	1	4	0	.20
D3 Providing youth and community centres or play areas	1	1	2	1	.40
D4 Localized housing services (public sector housing)	0	1	2	0	.33
D5 Counseling and social work	0	0	3	0	.00
D6 Education projects	0	0	1	2	-.67

continued on next page

E.	SECURITY DEVICES (26 citations)	14	7	5	0	1.35
E1	Improving domestic door and window locks	5	5	2	0	1.25
E2	Electronic access control	5	0	1	0	1.67
E3	Burglar alarms	0	2	2	0	.50
E4	Car steering-column locks	2	0	0	0	2.00
E5	Increased security of drug cabinets in pharmacies	1	0	0	0	2.00
E6	Chaining of retail goods on display	1	0	0	0	2.00
F.	TARGET REMOVAL OR MODIFICATION (5 citations)	4	1	0	0	1.80
F1	Exact fare systems on buses	2	0	0	0	2.00
F2	Reducing amount of cash in tills	1	1	0	0	1.50
F3	Removing coin-operated gas/electricity meters	1	0	0	0	2.00
X.	OTHER (4 citations)					
X1	ID required for use of personal checks	1	0	0	0	2.00
X2	Publicly identifying the most shoplifted items	1	0	0	0	2.00
X3	Rewarding children for not shoplifting	1	0	0	0	2.00
X4	Escorting senior citizens (QAPs)	0	1	0	0	1.00

modification" is one of the most effective approaches to crime prevention.

The bad news seems to be reserved for group D, with a very low overall score. It is clear from inspection of the data in the columns alongside this group that none of the measures involving "social or community services" can be claimed to have much direct impact on crime.

EFFECTIVENESS AGAINST SPECIFIC CRIMES

The analysis in Table 2 is confined to assessing the impact of the measures on crime as a whole. Indeed some of the evaluations were so crude that they merely talked about "crime," with no clarification of what types of crime were involved. Clearly a more thorough investigation into the effect of measures on crime must consider how the measures affect different crimes. It is true that some measures such as neighborhood watch (B1) or CCTV surveillance (B4) are aimed at a broad range of crimes, whereas exact fare systems on buses (F1) are aimed specifically at reducing robbery. In the four tables that follow (Tables 3-6), a more specific analysis is made of the impact of measures on four different types of crime. The crimes are: residential burglary, commercial burglary, car crime (combined) and robbery. Analyses of theft from the person, assault and vandalism could have been presented from the same database, but the number of evaluations available was considered too small to present a broad comparison of measures.

Table 3: Rank Order of Measures Against Residential Burglary
(61 evaluations)

Type of preventive measure	+ 2	+ 1	0	-1	Av.
EFFECTIVE MEASURES (1.50 or more)					
B8 Security guards for housing blocks	1	0	0	0	2.00
F3 Removing coin-operated gas/electricity meters	1	0	0	0	2.00
A5 Doorstep campaigns by the police	4	2	0	0	1.67
A3 Publicity for the project	4	4	0	0	1.50
C8 Road closure or street changes	1	1	0	0	1.50
LESS CERTAIN MEASURES (Under 1.50)					
A2 Property marking	7	4	3	0	1.29
B2 Focused or saturation policing	2	1	1	0	1.25
C4 Cleanup of neighborhood	2	1	1	0	1.25
E1 Improving domestic door and window security	5	6	2	0	1.23
A4 Security surveys	3	6	1	0	1.20
B1 Neighborhood or block watch	4	10	3	0	1.06
C1 Lighting	1	5	1	0	1.00
C5 Physical improvements to housing	1	2	1	0	1.00
B6 Concierges	1	1	1	0	1.00
C6 Landscaping	1	1	1	0	1.00
DOUBTFUL MEASURES (Under 1.00)					
A1 Advertising/publicity to encourage the use of security devices	2	4	3	0	.89
B2 Increased police patrols	2	5	4	0	.82
C2 Fencing	1	2	2	0	.80
E2 Electronic access control	1	1	2	0	.75
D1 Forming a residents' association (public-sector housing)	1	2	2	1	.50
B4 CCTV surveillance	1	0	0	1	.50
D4 Localized housing services (public-sector housing)	0	1	2	0	.33
D3 Providing youth and community centers or play areas	0	2	1	1	.25
INEFFECTIVE MEASURES (Zero or less)					
D2 Organized recreational activities for young people	0	0	2	0	.00
B5 Citizen or vigilante patrols	0	0	1	0	.00
D5 Counseling and social work	0	0	1	0	.00
D6 Education projects	0	0	0	1	-1.00

Key:

- + 2 Good evidence of crime reduction
- + 1 Some evidence of crime reduction
- 0 No measurable effect on crime
- 1 Crime increased

Table 4: Rank Order of Measures Against Commercial Burglary
(12 evaluations)

Type of preventive measure	+ 2	+ 1	0	-1	Av.
EFFECTIVE MEASURES (1.50 or more)					
A2 Property marking	2	0	0	0	2.00
C1 Lighting	2	0	0	0	2.00
A3 Publicity for the project	1	0	0	0	2.00
A5 Doorstep campaigns by the police	1	0	0	0	2.00
E5 Increased security of drug cabinets in pharmacies	1	0	0	0	2.00
A4 Security surveys	2	2	0	0	1.50
LESS CERTAIN MEASURES (Under 1.50)					
B2 Increased police patrols	1	0	1	0	1.00
E3 Burglar alarms	1	0	1	0	1.00
INEFFECTIVE MEASURES (Zero or less)					
A1 Advertising/publicity to encourage the use of security devices	0	0	1	0	.00
B4 CCTV surveillance	0	0	1	0	.00
Key:					
+ 2	Good evidence of crime reduction				
+ 1	Some evidence of crime reduction				
0	No measurable effect on crime				
-1	Crime increased				

Tables 3 through 6 are set out in a similar way to Table 2, with average scores produced for each measure in relation to the particular kind of crime under consideration. The measures are listed in rank order of their average scores, the measure with the highest score at the top. It is clear from such a rank-ordered list that measures at the top are likely to be the most effective measures for preventing the crime, although the highest score of 2.00 is often based on only one evaluation. The measures toward the bottom of the list, especially with scores around zero, will probably be the least effective. For consistency of comparison between the four tables, the rank orders of measures have been divided into four levels of effectiveness:

Effective measures —scores of 1.50 or more

Less certain measures —scores over 1.00 but under 1.50

Doubtful measures —positive scores under 1.00

Ineffective measures — scores of zero or less

Table 5: Rank Order of Measures Against Car Crime
(34 evaluations)

Type of preventive measure	+ 2	+ 1	0	-1	Av.
EFFECTIVE MEASURES (1.50 or more)					
B6 Concierges	1	0	0	0	2.00
C3 Design changes to improve surveillance by staff	1	0	0	0	2.00
C8 Road closure or street changes	1	0	0	0	2.00
E2 Electronic access control	1	0	0	0	2.00
E4 Car steering-column locks	1	0	0	0	2.00
B3 Focused and saturation policing	3	1	0	0	1.75
C2 Fencing	3	1	0	0	1.75
A3 Publicity for the project	2	1	0	0	1.67
B4 CCTV surveillance	2	1	0	0	1.67
A5 Doorstep campaigns by the police	1	1	0	0	1.50
C4 Cleanup of neighborhood	1	1	0	0	1.50
LESS CERTAIN MEASURES (Under 1.50)					
B2 Increased police patrols	2	4	1	0	1.14
C1 Lighting	1	3	1	0	1.00
D1 Forming a residents' association (public-sector housing)	1	1	1	0	1.00
D3 Providing youth and community centers or play areas	1	1	1	0	1.00
B5 Citizen or vigilante patrols	0	1	0	0	1.00
C6 Landscaping	0	1	0	0	1.00
D4 Localizing housing services (public-sector housing)	0	1	0	0	1.00
DOUBTFUL MEASURES (Under 1.00)					
B1 Neighborhood or block watch	1	3	2	1	.57
A1 Advertising/publicity to encourage the use of security devices	1	2	3	1	.43
INEFFECTIVE MEASURES (Zero or less)					
D2 Organized recreational activities for young people	0	0	1	0	.00
Key:					
+ 2	Good evidence of crime reduction				
+ 1	Some evidence of crime reduction				
0	No measurable effect on crime				
-1	Crime increased				

Table 6: Rank Order of Measures Against Robbery

(27 evaluations)

Type of preventive measure	+ 2	+ 1	0	-1	Av.
EFFECTIVE MEASURES (1.50 or more)					
B7 Increased staffing of facilities	2	0	0	0	2.00
E2 Electronic access control	2	0	0	0	2.00
F1 Exact fare systems on buses	2	0	0	0	2.00
A3 Publicity for the project	1	0	0	0	2.00
B6 Concierges	1	0	0	0	2.00
C3 Design change to improve staff surveillance	1	0	0	0	2.00
B3 Focused or saturation policing	6	1	0	0	1.86
C9 Improved visibility of store interiors	1	1	0	0	1.50
F2 Reduce amount of cash in tills	1	1	0	0	1.50
LESS CERTAIN MEASURES (Under 1.50)					
B4 CCTV surveillance	3	0	2	0	1.20
C1 Lighting	3	0	2	0	1.20
A2 Property marking	1	1	1	0	1.00
A1 Advertising/publicity to encourage the use of security devices	0	1	0	0	1.00
C7 Security screens for staff	0	1	0	0	1.00
C8 Road closure or street changes	0	1	0	0	1.00
DOUBTFUL MEASURES (Under 1.00)					
A4 Security surveys	1	1	2	0	.75
B1 Neighborhood or block watch	0	1	1	0	.50
INEFFECTIVE MEASURES (Zero or less)					
B2 Increased police patrols	0	1	1	1	.00
A5 Doorstep campaigns by the police	0	0	1	0	.00
E3 Burglar alarms	0	0	2	0	.00

Key:

+ 2	Good evidence of crime reduction
+ 1	Some evidence of crime reduction
0	No measurable effect on crime
-1	Crime increased

Interested readers will want to study the tables and draw their own conclusions, and so the tables are left to speak for themselves. There are, however, a number of general points that can be made. As discussed before, care should be taken not to take too much notice of scores based on only one or two evaluations. Many of these measures, such as the removal of coin-operated meters from housing (F3), are likely to be very effective, but since only one evaluation was available, the average ranking score can be misleading. Further, less positive evaluations might significantly reduce a high average score.

It has to be admitted that some of the conclusions will suffer from the crudeness of the methodology. For example, it might seem difficult to accept in Table 5 that the cleanup of a neighborhood (C4) can have a strong influence on car crime. Although direct causal links may be found, it is also possible that a relatively high score for this measure arises because it is frequently accompanied by other measures that are more likely to have a direct effect on car crime. Nevertheless, despite this kind of imperfection, the resulting analysis does seem to make a good deal of sense from what we know from crime research generally.

For example, in comparing the two burglary tables (Tables 3 and 4), the position of lighting (C1) is rated quite differently. Against commercial burglary, lighting appears very effective, whereas for residential burglary the evidence is much less strong. But this is what we might expect from our knowledge of the two kinds of burglary. Residential burglary is believed to occur mainly in the daytime when homes are more likely to be unoccupied and when lighting would have little influence. Commercial burglary is more likely to occur at night because that is when commercial property will be unoccupied, and it is more likely that lighting would be relevant to deterring crime.

CONCLUSIONS

Over and above the detailed conclusions that can be drawn from the tables, there are some general points that might be put forward. First, the tables make it quite clear that there is room for plenty of optimism in the field of crime prevention. Such a broad analysis does not tell us what makes an individual crime prevention project successful, but it makes it quite clear that many of the measures already well known in the crime prevention field can be made to work.

Second, the form of analysis set out in this paper does seem to offer a fairly robust means of over-viewing the findings from a large number of crime prevention evaluations. It is clear that to change a few of the ratings or to add or remove one or two evaluations from the tables will not make a great deal of difference to the overall pattern.

It seems to the author that it would be helpful to all those concerned with policymaking to use some similar method of continuous monitoring of our state of knowledge about what works in crime prevention. It might be possible to develop some kind of league table of crime prevention measures. If this were to be attempted, it would be worth giving further effort to improving the classification and tidying up the ranking method. When much of the classification and ranking work was done for this paper, **the idea of producing league tables or "best buys" in crime**

prevention had not emerged. In retrospect, it is clear that further development should make better tables and provide appropriate support material, including the inevitable qualifications. It is also clear that more evaluations would be welcome, in particular evaluations of measures that have received less attention so far. Similarly, we would benefit from more evaluations of measures directed against crimes such as personal theft, assault, and violence.



Acknowledgements. This paper describes research carried out by Barry Poyner and Barry Webb. The work was begun while they were part of the scientific staff of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations and completed after leaving to develop independent research and consultancy activities. The research was funded by a grant from the Leverhulme Trust. We would like to acknowledge the generous help received from Phyllis Schultze of the Criminal Justice/NCCD Library at Rutgers University.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, T. (1987). *An Evaluation of Two Neighbourhood Watch Schemes in London: Executive Summary*. Cambridge: The Institute of Criminology.
- Heller, N.R W.W. Stenzel, A.D. Gill, R.A. Kolde and S.R. Schirmerman (1975). *National Evaluation Program Phase 1 Summary Report Operation Identification Projects: Assessment of Effectiveness*. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, DC: USL Government Printing Office.
- Poyner, R, E Webb and R. Woodall (1986). *Crime Reduction on Housing Estates: An Evaluation of NACRO's Crime Prevention Programme*. London: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (ed.) (1986). *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* Sage Criminal Justice System Annuals, Volume 22. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- (1988). "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature." *Justice Quarterly*, 5(3):323-395.
- Tien, J.M., V.F. O'Donnell, A. Barnett and P.R Mirchandani (1979). *National Evaluation Program Phase 1 Report: Street Lighting Projects*. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

List of Evaluations Included in the Analysis

The evaluations are listed in a conventional reference format of author, title, and source. The last line of information on each evaluation lists the main types of preventive measure involved using the codes in Table 1.

The ratings used in the tables are not published in this list. Part of the reason for this is that the crime classifications in the evaluations are inconsistent. Sometimes evaluators present only overall crime figures or use general terms such as "property crime." If burglary data are given, it may not be clear how far this is residential or commercial burglary. Similarly, car crime is often treated as one category, whereas other evaluations distinguish theft of and theft from vehicles.

The ratings used to create Tables 2-6 are the best judgments available from notes made earlier in the research. Further work on these tables could produce some refinement, but it is unlikely to lead to major revisions.

- Allatt, P. (1982). *An Experiment in Crime Prevention on a Difficult-To-Let Estate*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK: Department of Social Work Studies, Newcastle-upon-Tyne Polytechnic. (See also: Allatt, P. (1984). "Residential Security: Containment or Displacement of Burglary." *Howard Journal* 23:2:99-116.)
E1, B2, A5
- Arthur Young and Company (1978). *Second Year Evaluation for the Cabrini-Green High Impact Program*. Chicago, IL: author.
B4, B6, C1, E2
- Beedle, S. (1983). *Evaluation of the Home Security Program: A Three Year Follow-Up Study* Portland, OR: Crime Prevention Division, Portland Police Bureau.
E1
- (1984). *Evaluation of the Richmond Project: A Crime Prevention Project Conducted by East Precinct and the S.E. Uplift Crime Prevention Program*. Portland, OR: Crime Prevention Division, Portland Police Bureau. (See also: Beedle, S. (1980). *Evaluation of the Home Security Program*. Portland, OR: Crime Prevention Division, Portland Police Bureau.)
A4, B1, E1
- Bennett, T. (1987). *An Evaluation of Two Neighbourhood Watch Schemes in London: Executive Summary*. Cambridge, UK: Institute of Criminology. (See also: Bennett, T. (1990). *Evaluating Neighbourhood Watch*. Aldershot, UK: Gower.)
A2, B1

- Berkowilz, M. (1975). *Evaluation of Merchant Security Program: A Case Study Assessing the Impact of Electronic Protection Devices on Safety in Retail Stores in New York City*. New York: New York City Police Department
B4, E3
- Birmingham (UK) City Council (1988). Untitled report on the introduction of concierges into two tower blocks of housing.
B6
- Burrows, X (1980). "Closed Circuit Television on the London Underground." In: R.V.G. Clarke and P. Mayhew (eds.), *Designing Out Crime*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
B4
- and K. Heal (1980). "Police Care Security Campaigns." In: R. V.G. Clarke and P. Mayhew (eds.), *Designing Out Crime*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
A1
- Cedar Rapids (IA) Police Department (undated, probably 1972). *Installation, Test, and Evaluation of a Large Scale Burglar Alarm System for a Municipal Police Department: Report of the Second Year of Operation*. Cedar Rapids, IA: author.
E3
- Chaiken, J.M., M.W. Lawless and K A. Stevenson (1974). "The Impact of Police Activity on Subway Crime." *Urban Analysis* 3:173-205.
B3, F1
- Cirel, P., P. Evans, D. McGillis and D. Whitcomb (1977). *An Exemplary Project: Crime Prevention Program, Seattle, Washington*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
A2, A4, B1
- Clifton, W. (1987). *Convenience Store Robberies: An Intervention Strategy by the City of Gainesville, Florida*. Gainesville, FL: Gainesville Police Department
B4, B7, C1, C9, F2
- Cline, D. (1982). "Farm Chemicals—One Approach to Theft Prevention." *On Patrol in Manitoba* 9(1): 14-16. (Winnipeg: Manitoba Police Commission.)
A1, A2
- Crow, W.X and X Bull (1975). *Robbery Deterrence: An Applied Behavioral Science Demonstration. Final Report*. La Jolla, CA: Western Behavioral Science Institute.
C9, F2
- Decker, X.F. (1977). "Curbside Deterrence? An Analysis of the Effect of a Slug-Rejector Device, Coin-View Window and Warning Labels on Slug Usage in New York City Parking Meters." *Criminology* (August): 127-141
C11

- Diener, E. and R. Crandall, R. (1979). "An Evaluation of the Jamaican Anti-Crime Program." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 9(2): 135-146.
B3
- Donovan, E.X and W.F. Walsh (1986). *An Evaluation of Starrett City Security Services*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
D1
- Eck, X and W. Spelman (1987a). "Parking Lots in Newport News." In: *Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
B3
- and W. Spelman (1987b). "Prostitution Related Robberies." In: *Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
B3
- and W. Spelman (1987c). "Burglary in Apartment Complex, Newport News." In: *Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
AS, C4, D1
- Eckblom, P. (1987). *Preventing Robberies at Sub-Post Offices: An Evaluation of a Security Initiative*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 9. London: U.K. Home Office.
E11
- Forrester, D., M. Chatterton and K. Pease (1988). *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project, Rochdale*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 13. London: UK Home Office.
A2, A4, B1, E1, F3
- Fowler, F.J. Jr., M.E. McCalla and T.W. Mangione (1979). *Reducing Residential Crime and Fear: The Hartford Neighborhood Crime Prevention Program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. (See also: Fowler, F.J. and T.W. Mangione (1982). *Neighborhood Crime, Fear and Social Control: A Second Look at the Hartford Program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.)
C8 (also neighborhood policing team and community organising)
- Glickman, M. (1983). *From Crime to Rehabilitation*. Aldershot, UK: Gower.
D6
- Goff, C. (1981). *An Evaluation of Roseburg's Residential and Commercial Crime Prevention Project*. Salem, OR: Oregon Law Enforcement Council.
A2
- Griswold, D.R (1984). "Crime Prevention and Commercial Burglary: A Time-Series Analysis." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 12:493-501. (See also: Lavrakas, P. and J. Kushmuk (1986). "Evaluating Crime Prevention through Environmental Design: The Portland Commercial Demonstration Project."

- In: D. Rosenbaum (ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.)
A4, AS, C1
- Heal, K. and G. Laycock (1987). *Preventing Juvenile Crime: The Staffordshire Experiment*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 8. London: U.K. Home Office.
D2
- Hedges, A., A. Blaber and B. Mostyn (1979). *Community Planning Project: Cunningham Road Improvement Scheme Final Report*. London, UK: Social and Community Planning Research.
B2, C1, C2, C4, C5, C6, D1, D3
- Henig, XR. (1984). *Citizens Against Crime: An Assessment of the Neighborhood Watch Program in Washington, DC*. Occasional Paper No. 2. Washington, DC: Center for Washington Area Studies, George Washington University.
A2, A4, B1
- Hiew, C.C (1980). "Prevention of Shoplifting: A Community Action Approach." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 23:1:57-68.
A1, A3, A6, A7
- Hillyer, X (1984). "Crime Prevention and Housing: The Cowgate Project" Paper presented at a seminar organized by Institute of Housing.
B2, C2, C4, C5, D4
- Hulin, XQ. (1979). "Community Based Crime Prevention Project" *Crime Prevention Review* 6:3. (Sacramento, CA: Attorney General's Office.)
A2, A4, B1
- Husain, S. (1990). *Neighbourhood Watch and Crime: An Assessment of Impact*. London, UK: The Police Foundation.
B1
- James, S. and R. Wynne (1985). *Tenant Perceptions of Crime and Security on Melbourne's High-Rise Housing Estates*. Melbourne, AUS: University of Melbourne Criminology Department
B4, B6
- Jenkins, A.D. and I. Latimer (undated). *Evaluation of Merseyside Home Watch (Summary)*. Merseyside (UK) Police: Management Development and Force Planning Unit
B1
- Jones, D. (1982). *Portage La Prairie Project: Problem Identification and Program Evaluation*. Ottawa, CAN: Crime Prevention Centre, Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
A1, A2
- Jones, L. (1987). *The Penlan Project*. Unpublished report of the project coordinator to the joint sponsors (Home Office and West Glamorgan County Council) and to the County Crime Prevention Initiative Steering Committee. U.K Home Office 5 Towns Initiatives.
A2, A3, A5, E1

- Joyce, P. (1983). "Street Patrol Does Work." *Police Chief* (December):42-46.
A1, B2, B5
- Kelling, G., T. Pate, D. Dieckman and C Brown (1974). *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Summary Report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
B2
- Kenney, D.X (1986). "Crime on the Subways: Measuring the Effectiveness of the Guardian Angels." *Justice Quarterly* 3(4):481-496.
B5
- King, M. (1988). *How to Make Social Prevention Work: The French Experience*. London, UK: National Association for the Care and Rehabilitation of Offenders.
D2
- Kleiman, M.A., W.E. Holland and C Hayes (1984). *Evaluation of the Lynn Drug Task Force Report to the District Attorney for Essex County*. Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Harvard University. Working Paper No. 84-01-03.
B3
- Knowles, L., C Lesser and F. McKewen (1983). "Burglary Prevention: A Citizen Initiated and Created Neighborhood Watch Program." *Police Chief* (February): 36-38.
B1
- Knutsson, J. (1984). *Operation Identification—A Way to Prevent Burglaries?* Stockholm, Sweden: The National Council for Crime Prevention.
A2
- Latessa, E.J. and H. Allen (1980). "Using Citizens to Prevent Crime: An Example of Deterrence and Community Involvement" *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 8:69-74.
B5
- and L.F. Travis (1987). "Citizen Crime Prevention: Problems and Prospectives in Reducing Crime." *Journal of Security Administration* 10(1):38-51.
A1, A2, A4, B1, C1, C2
- Laycock, G. (1984). *Reducing Burglary: A Study of Chemist's Shops*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 1. London, UK: U.K. Home Office.
E5
- (1985). *Property Marking: A Deterrent to Domestic Burglary?* Crime Prevention Unit Paper 3. London, UK: U.K Home Office.
A1, A2, A5
- Leland, L.S., W.E. Rushton and J.E. Watson (1984). "The Effectiveness of Promoting Neighborhood Watch Door-to-Door." *Police Chief Quarterly*: 42-44.
A1, A3, A5
- Lewis, E.R and T.T. Sullivan (1979). "Combating Crime and Citizen Attitudes: A Study of the Corresponding Reality." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 7:71-79.
C1

- Matthews, R. (1986). *Policing Prostitution, A Multi-Agency Approach*, Centre for Criminology Paper No. 1. London, UK: Middlesex Polytechnic B3, C8.
- Mayhew, P., R.V.G. Clarke and J.M. Hough (1980). "Steering Column Locks and Car Theft." In: R.V.G. Clarke and P. Mayhew (eds.), *Designing Out Crime*. London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
E4
- McC Campbell, M.S. (1983). "Robbery Reduction through Directed Patrol." *Police Chief* (February):39-41.
B3
- McCord, I and W. McCord (1959). (See Powers, E. and H. Witner [1951].)
——(1978). (See Powers, E. and H. Witner [1951].)
- McNees, M.P., D.S. Egli, R.S. Marshall, J.F. Schnelle and R.R. Todd (1976). "Shoplifting Prevention: Providing Information Through Signs." *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 9(4): 399-405.
A7, X2
- IF. Schnelle, R.E. Kirchner and M.M. Thomas (1980). "An Experimental Analysis of a Program to Reduce Retail Theft." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 8(3): 379-385.
A7, X3
- Mukherjee, & and P. Wilson (1987). "Neighbourhood Watch: Issues and Policy Implications." *Trends and Issues*, No. 8. Woden, AUS: Australian Institute of Criminology.
B1
- Musheno, M.C., XP. Levine and DX Palumbo (1978). "Television Surveillance and Crime Prevention: Evaluating an Attempt to Create Defensible Space in Public Housing." *Social Science Quarterly* 58(4):647-656.
B4
- Northumbria (UK) Police (undated). "Prevention of Fear: Part 1 Fellinging." Unpublished report
E1
- Northumbria (UK) Police (undated). *Car Crime—Let's Crack it Campaign*. Force Evaluation, 1988. Northumbria, UK: author.
A3, B2, B4, C2
- O'Brien, XT. (1975). "The Neighborhood Task Force in New Brunswick, New Jersey." *Police Chief*(June): 48-49.
A5
- O'Leary, XM. and G. Wood (undated). *A Review of the Experimental Neighbourhood Watch Scheme, Holmcroft/TilUngworth, Stafford, March to September 1984*. Staffordshire, UK: Staffordshire Police.
A1, B1
- O'Rourke, TX (1975). "High Visibility Patrol: Cherry Hill, New Jersey Experiments." *Police Chief* (June): 46-47.
A1, A2, A3, A5, B2

- Painter, K. (1988). *Lighting and Crime Prevention: The Edmonton Project*. London: Centre for Criminology, Middlesex Polytechnic.
C1
- (1989). *Lighting and Crime Prevention for Community Safety: The Tower Hamlets Study First Report*. London: Centre for Criminology, Middlesex Polytechnic.
C1
- Pate, A.M. (1984). *Evaluation of the Urban Initiatives Anti-Crime Program*. Final Report to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
C6, D1, D2, D4, D5, E1, E2.
- (1986). "Experimenting with Foot Patrol: The Newark Experience. * In: D.P. Rosenbaum(ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?*" Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
B2
- W.G. Skogan, M.A. Wycoff and L.W. Sherman (1985). *Coordinated Community Policing: The Newark Experience. Final Draft Report* Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
B2, B3, A5, C4
- Pearson, D.A. (1980). *Evaluation of Multnomah County's Commercial Burglary Prevention Program*. Salem, OR: Oregon Law Enforcement Council.
A4
- Pennell, S., C Curtis and I Henderson (1985). *Guardian Angels: An Assessment of Citizen Response to Crime*. Vol. 2, Technical Report San Diego, CA: San Diego Association of Governments.
B5
- Pennington, R. (undated). *An Evaluation of the Open Garage Door Burglary Program*. St Louis, MO: County Police Department
A3
- Powers, E. and H. Witner (1951). *An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency: The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. (Further evaluations of this project were also consulted: McCord, X and W. McCord (1959). "A Follow-up Report on the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 322:89-96; and McCord, X (1978). "A Thirty-Year Follow-up of Treatment Effects." *American Psychologist* 33:284-289.)
D2, D5, D6
- Poyner, R and C Wfme (1988). "Cleveland Transit- Implementing and Monitoring Measures." In: R Poyner and C W&me (eds.), *Preventing Violence to Staff, Health and Safety Executive*. London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
C7

- and R Webb (1987a). *A Dover Car Park: Reducing Theft and Vandalism, Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
C2, C3
- and R Webb (1987b). *Surrey University: CCTV in Car Parks. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. (See also: Poyner, R (1991). "Situational Crime Prevention in Two Parking Facilities." *Security Journal* 2(2):96-101.)
A1, B4
- and R Webb (1987c). *Gloucester House: A Reception Service. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. (See also: Skilton, M. (1986). "Making an Entrance." Unpublished report from London Borough of Brent, Housing Department)
B6, E2
- and R Webb (1987d). *South Acton Estate: Entry-Control Systems. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. (NB: Includes two separate evaluations of entry-control to tower blocks and to an underground car parking garage.)
E2, C2
- and R Webb (1987e). *Pepys Estate: Intensive Policing. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
B2, B3, E1
- and R Webb (1987f). *Selfridges: Controlling Shoplifting. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
B7, C3, E6
- and R Webb (1987g). *Birmingham Markets: Reducing Theft from Shopping Bags. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
C1, C10
- and R Webb (1987h). *Go-ahead Northern: Video Cameras on Buses. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. (See also: Poyner, R (1988). "Video Cameras and Bus Vandalism." *Journal of Security Administration* 11(2):44-51.)
A1, B4
- and R Webb (1987i). *Lisson Green Estate: Walkway Demolition, Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
E2
- and R Webb (1987j). *Hillfields Estate: Door and Window Security. Successful Crime Prevention—Case Studies*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
E1

- R Webb and R. Woodall (1986a). "The Lower Bushbury Triangle." In: *Crime Reduction on Housing Estates: An Evaluation of NACRO's Crime Prevention Programme*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
C2, C4, C5, C6, D1, D3, E1
- R Webb and R. Woodall (1986b). "Haggerston Estate, Hackney." In: *Crime Reduction on Housing Estates: An Evaluation of NACRO's Crime Prevention Programme*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
D1, D3
- R Webb and R. Woodall (1986c). "Titford Estate, Sandwell." In: *Crime Reduction on Housing Estates: An Evaluation of NACRO's Crime Prevention Programme*. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. (See also: NACRO Sandwell/Dudley Community Development Unit, (undated). "Titford Review: Final Report" Unpublished.)
D1, D3, D6
- Research Bureau Limited (1977). "Car Theft Campaign Evaluation 1976-1977." Report prepared for the Central Office of Information (London). Job No. 94066-11352.
A1
- Research and Forecasts, Inc. (1983). "Detroit, Michigan: Neighborhood Watch in an Urban Area." *The Figgie Report Part IV. Reducing Crime in America: Successful Community Efforts*. New York, NY: author.
A2, A3, A4, B1, X4
- Riley, D. (1980). "An Evaluation of a Campaign to Reduce Car Thefts. In: R. V.G. Clarke and P. Mayhew (eds.), *Designing Out Crime*. London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
A1
- Rosenbaum, D.P., D.A. Lewis and XX Grant (1986). "Neighborhood-based Crime Prevention: Assessing the Efficacy of Community Organizing in Chicago." In: D.P. Rosenbaum (ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
B1
- Roy, XL. (1985). "A Neighborhood Watch Evaluation in the City of Winnipeg." Winnipeg, CAN: Winnipeg Police Department
B1
- Sacco, V.F. and R.A. Silverman (1981). "Selling Crime Prevention: The Evaluation of a Mass Media Campaign." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 23(2): 191-202.
A1
- Schlossman, &, G Zellman and R. Shavelson (1984). *Delinquency Prevention in South Chicago: A Fifty-Year Assessment of the Chicago Area Project* Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
D1, D2, D5

- Schneider, A.L. (1986). "Neighborhood-based Anti-burglary Strategies: An Analysis of Public and Private Benefits from the Portland Program." In: D.P. Rosenbaum(ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
A1, A2, A3, B1, C1
- Schnelle, I.E., R.E. Kirchner, M.P. McNeese and X.M. Lawler (1975). "Social Evaluation Research: The Evaluation of Two Police Patrolling Strategies." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis* 8(4): 353-365.
B2, B3 (Two evaluations)
- R.E. Kirchner, R.E. Casey, J.D. Uselton, P.H. and M.P. McNeese (1977). "Patrol Evaluation Research: A Multiple-Baseline Analysis of Saturation Police Patrolling during Day and Night Hours." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis* 10(1):33-40.
B2
- R.E. Kirchner, X.W. Macrae, M.P. McNeese, R.H. Eck, & Snodgrass, X.D. Casey and P.H. Uselton (1978). "Police Evaluation Research: An Experimental and Cost-Benefit Analysis of a Helicopter Patrol in a High Crime Area." *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 11(1): 11-12.
B3
- R.E. Kirchner, F. Galbaugh, M. Domash, A. Carr and L. Larson (1979). "Program Evaluation Research: An Experimental Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of an Armed Robbery Intervention Program." *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 12(4):615-623.
E3
- Seattle (W\) Law and Justice Planning Office (1975). *Burglary Reduction Program Final Report*. Seattle, W\ : author.
A2, A4, B1
- (1977). *Evaluation Report: Target Hardening*. Seattle, W\ : author.
E1
- Selden, P. (1978). *Using a Neighborhood Crime Prevention Program to Reduce Residential Breaking*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
A3, B5
- Simpson, X.H. and X. Hagan (1985). *Evaluation of a Vandalism Prevention Project*. Programs Branch User Report No. 1985-23. Ottawa, CAN: Ministry of the Solicitor General.
A6
- Spickenheuer, H.L.P. (1983). *Foot Patrols and Crime Prevention Instruction in Amsterdam-Osдорф*. The Hague, Netherlands: Ministry of Justice, Research and Documentation Centre.
A3, B2
- Stanford Research Institute and The University of California. (1970). *Reduction of Robberies and Assaults of Bus Drivers. Technological and Operational Methods*. Vol 3. Stanford, CA: author.
F1

- Stangier, X and SL Beedle (1981). *Evaluation of the Residential Security Program*. Portland, OR: Crime Prevention Division, Portland Police Bureau.
A4
- Tien, XM. and M.F. Cahn (1986). "The Commercial Security Field Test Program: A Systematic Evaluation of Security Surveys in Denver, St. Louis and Long Beach." In: D.P. Rosenbaum (ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
A4
- Touche Ross and Co. (1976). *City of Atlanta Bureau of Police Services: Target Hardening. Opportunity reduction project*. Final Report, Evaluation Component Atlanta, GA: Touche Ross and Co.
A2, A4
- Trojanowicz, R.C. (1986). "Evaluating a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program: The Flint, Michigan Project" In: D.P. Rosenbaum (ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
B2
- Van Andel, H. (1988). *Crime Prevention that Wbrks: The Care of Public Transportation in the Netherlands*. The Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
B9, C3
- Van Dijk, XM. (undated). *External Effects of a Crime Prevention Program in the Hague*. The Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
A1, A3, B2
- Veater, P. (1984). "Evaluation of Kingsdown Neighbourhood Watch Project, Bristol." Unpublished research report, Avon and Somerset Constabulary, Bristol, UK.
B1
- Votey, H.L. Jr. (1981). "Narcotic Addict Control in Santa Barbara County: An Evaluation of Effects on Property Crimes." *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 9(2): 150-159.
B3
- Willis, A. and D. Ford (eds.) (1980). *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: The School Demonstration in Broward County, Florida. Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
C2, C3, C6, C12, E3
- Webb R and G. Laycock (1992). *Reducing Crime on the London Underground: An Evaluation of Three Pilot Projects*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 30. London, UK: UK Home Office.
A3, B4, B7, C3
- White, T.W., K.J. Regan, J.D. Waller and X Wholy (1975). *Police Burglary Prevention Programs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
E1

Wright, R., M. Heilweil, P. Pelletier and K. Dickinson (1974). "The Impact of Street Lighting. Part 1: Results." Unpublished research report from University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

C1

Zimmer, L. (1987). *Operation Pressure Point: The Disruption of Street-Level Drug Trade on New York's Lower East-Side*. New York, NY: Research Center in Crime and Justice, New York University School of Law.

B3

Zipfel, T. (1986). "Broadwater Farm Estate, Tottenham, London." Unpublished report presented to NACRO (London) Working Party on the Policing of Housing Estates.

B2, C5, D1, D3, D4, E1