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PREFACE

The purpose of this exploratory study is to identify and assess the information available regarding citizen patrols in residential areas and to design and recommend further research as needed. The results of the study are presented in three volumes. This report, *Patrolling the Neighborhood Beat: Residents and Residential Security*, contains the full study, including the relevant policy issues, the research methods and field procedures that guided the study, and the findings and conclusions. A second volume, R-1912/1-DOJ, serves as the executive summary of the study. A third volume, R-1912/2-DOJ, *Case Studies and Profiles*, contains the products of our fieldwork, including brief profiles of more than 100 patrols and detailed narratives that describe 32 of the patrols.

This study was funded under the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice's Phase I National Evaluation Program. The main objective of Phase I was to explore certain criminal justice topics in preparation for a full evaluation and to recommend whether such an evaluation would be worthwhile. This study thus represents a preliminary assessment of what is presently known about resident patrols. The impetus for the study stems from the longstanding interests of a group of Rand researchers in citizen participation and in service delivery and quality of life at the neighborhood level.
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Purpose of the Study

In the face of rising crime rates and a declining sense of security, urban residents have initiated a variety of crime prevention efforts. Although improved architectural design (Newman, 1972) and increased protection from the local police department have been common demands, many residents have also felt that their own vigilance and active concern over neighborhood conditions can play an important role in assuring an adequate level of residential safety. Typical crime prevention activities have taken a wide variety of forms, including property identification campaigns, programs to make residents more aware of good crime prevention practices, increased use of security devices, and programs to encourage citizens to report suspicious incidents (see U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1970; and National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973 and 1974).

The purpose of this study is to examine one category of crime prevention activities—resident patrols and guards—and to review in an exploratory manner the available evidence about them. The formation of resident patrols and guards represents an important form of citizen participation in neighborhood affairs. Unlike other crime prevention activities, most of which require residents only to be more alert and sensitive to crime prevention in their daily routines, a patrol or guard activity demands active organizational support and personal commitment.

The range of functions performed by resident patrols varies considerably. In New York's wealthy Upper East Side, parents of private school students wear orange ponchos while they patrol streets in the vicinity of schools near Central Park to deter narcotics dealers and street gangs from harassing children on their way to and from school (Fowler, 1974). Residents of Garfield Park in Chicago have adopted a similar strategy to protect pedestrians, especially women. The residents patrol the neighborhood on foot, check bus stops and train platforms for loiterers and other signs of potential danger, and provide
escort services (Johnston, 1975). In Jersey City, committees representing public housing tenants place observers in the lobbies to monitor entries into the building and to report suspicious activity (Piro, 1974). However, despite their disparate activities, these three groups regard themselves as only the "eyes and ears" of the police and prohibit their members from intervening to prevent or abort criminal activity.

Not all groups are committed to nonintervention, nor do all groups act cooperatively with the police. When municipal officials of Oakland, California, squelched civilian proposals to establish a community police review board in 1966, black militants led by Huey Newton established the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense. The Black Panthers subsequently initiated "shot-gun patrols . . . to observe police conduct, to prevent acts of police brutality, to inform blacks of their rights when dealing with the police, and 'to preserve the community from harm'" (Knopf, 1969). During approximately the same period, a gang of black and Puerto Rican youths in New York's poverty-ridden Lower East Side organized to drive the narcotics trade from their neighborhood by physically confronting known drug dealers ("Addicts Victims Turn Vigilante," 1969).

Previous investigations of resident patrols have laid some useful but limited groundwork. Some studies have intensively examined one type of patrol activity. Knopf (1969) and Anderson et al. (1974), for instance, studied youth patrols that emerged during outbreaks of civil disorders. Although such studies have been illuminating in regard to single types of patrols, they did not develop a comparative framework for assessing different types of patrols and guards. Other studies have examined a wide variety of citizen crime prevention activities (e.g., Washnis, in press), including patrols and guards, but used only limited sources of information and an informal set of research methods. In some cases, these studies have openly restricted themselves to descriptive and nonevaluative observations. Marx and Archer (1971 and 1972), for instance, examined 28 self-defense groups but made no attempt to evaluate the patrols or to discuss outcomes; Brown (1969) merely listed the prominent patrol and guard projects that appeared in several cities during the 1960s. In contrast, this study attempts to
o Identify the variety of resident patrol and guard activities,
   o Establish criteria for assessing and understanding the patrol and guard activities,
   o Report on preliminary evidence with regard to these criteria, and
   o Examine the necessity of further research, including the feasibility of conducting various evaluations of these activities,

and thus to provide preliminary information about the extent and nature of patrol activities.

**Definition of Resident Patrol and Guard Activities**

For the purposes of this study, we have defined a resident patrol or guard to be a citizen crime prevention activity with four characteristics. First, there must be a *specific patrol or surveillance routine*. Patrol personnel, whether resident volunteers or guards paid by residents’ groups, maintain a regular, fixed schedule of crime prevention duties. The duties exist on a routine basis and are not merely triggered by specific crime incidents. This criterion excludes those activities (e.g., taxi patrols) in which a person reports emergencies observed in the course of his or her daily activities. It does not exclude those situations in which a person serves on a part-time basis—but for a specific shift—in a patrol function.

Second, the routine of the patrol must be aimed at preventing *criminal acts*. On this basis, local chapters of the Ku Klux Klan or vigilantes in Queens, New York, organized only to harass congregating homosexuals (Bird, 1969) would be excluded because of the personal and political interests represented by those persecuting groups. By emphasizing the prevention of criminal acts, the definition also excludes groups that perform only such tasks as identifying or remedying hazardous environmental conditions, including unit areas, broken locks, weak railings, and malfunctioning traffic signals. At the same time, if a group carries out both crime patrolling as well as activities not directed at
crime prevention, it is included within our definition.

Third, the patrol or guard activity must be administered by a citizen or residents' (e.g., homeowners' or tenants') organization or public housing authority. The formal organization may be weak and may include substantial participation by the local police department. It must, however, have some formal role structure—e.g., a hierarchy of roles, with patrol members having different types of assignments—and be a resident organization, or a nonpolice organization acting under the direction of residents. For instance, guards hired by realty companies or landlords would be excluded because such guards are paid from some portion of the rent, and tenants usually have no influence or control over the provision of the service. However, guards hired by condominium owners through their homeowners' association would be included. These nuances aside, the third criterion mainly excludes spontaneous resident patrol activities that might arise in an emergency, unless the activities were subsequently formalized and organized, and it also excludes volunteer patrol or guard functions organized and administered solely by the local police department.

Fourth, the activity is directed primarily at residential rather than commercial areas. The patrols or guards are concerned with the security of neighborhood activities that take place in public as well as private areas. This criterion excludes situations in which private police are hired to protect retail stores, transportation depots, warehouses, and other commercial and industrial facilities.¹

Since resident patrols are generally subject to substantial changes in the function they perform, as well as in their scale of operations, it is necessary to specify at what point in a patrol's history all these definitional concerns should apply. For the purposes of our study, if a patrol fulfilled the definitional conditions at any point during its history, it would be included in the universe of study.

Even given these definitional criteria, the problems in identifying patrols in the field are more complex than those of studying, for

¹For studies of the private police, see Kakalik and Wildhorn (1971) and Becker (1974).
example, such federal programs as Model Cities. Despite local pro-
grammatic variations, such federal programs have the same title and
auspice and have relatively similar organizational structures. They
can be easily located and contacted in every city through uniform chan-
nels of inquiry. A more appropriate analogy to the difficulties of
identifying resident patrols might be the problems of identifying com-
munity leaders in a city—a search fraught with definitional problems,
as well as respondents' values, biases, and personal relationships.
Although decisions on various definitional issues may be documented to
maximize consistency, in the end there remains the possibility that
different investigators will disagree over inclusion or exclusion de-
cisions. Another study might certainly arrive at a slightly different
universe.

Contrast with Other Citizen Crime Prevention Activities

These four characteristics of resident patrols roughly distinguish
them from other citizen crime prevention activities. To show the
variety of citizen crime prevention efforts, Table 1 lists the main
types of projects that have been initiated and Appendix A describes
each activity briefly (U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1970; Fink and
Sealy, 1974; White et al., 1975; and Washnis, in press). These pro-
grams represent alternative forms of citizen involvement in public
safety, though they may occasionally include a patrol activity as well.

To summarize the characteristics of the crime prevention programs
described in Appendix A, the matrix in Table 1 distinguishes among pro-
grams according to their objectives and the degree of citizen involve-
ment. At one extreme, some programs have the objective of reducing
crime pressure\(^1\) by organizing educational, employment, recreation,
rehabilitation, and counselling opportunities. At the other extreme,
programs attempt to enforce the law or reduce the crime vulnerability
of a specific residential area by increasing citizen reporting of crimes
or by improving communications between police and residents. In re-
gard to citizen involvement, the range is as follows: no involvement

\(^1\)The distinction between crime pressure and crime vulnerability is spelled out in Sagalyn et al., 1973.
Table 1
CITIZEN CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS FOR RESIDENTIAL AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Guard Activity</th>
<th>Main Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Enforce Some Law or Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No patrol or guard routine</td>
<td>Street lighting programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home security programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Patrol or guard routine, administered by citizen group</td>
<td>Vigilante groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Patrol or guard routine, administered by local police department</td>
<td>Police reserve units (auxiliary police)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(citizens act in their normal daily roles only), active involvement administered mainly by a citizens' group, or active involvement administered mainly by the local police (citizens serve as members of police reserve units).

Table 1 indicates how resident patrols and guards are related to other crime prevention activities, and it graphically depicts the focus of our study. We will be concerned with those programs whose main objectives are either to reduce residential vulnerability to crime or to enforce some law relating to residential safety (columns 1 and 2) and whose activities call for citizens to be engaged in patrol or guard functions as administered mainly by a citizens' group (row B). The programs to be studied include activities commonly known as resident patrols, security guards, youth patrols, escort services, and block security programs, most of which attempt to reduce the crime vulnerability of a residential area. The projects also include vigilante or community protection groups that may or may not engage in enforcing rules of behavior (sometimes operating in opposition to the local police).1

The study will not cover the other portions of the matrix because the other programs have different characteristics, and other investigations have been completed or are under way on these topics. For instance:

- Yin and Yates (1975) evaluated the literature on programs aimed at improving police-resident communications (column 4);
- Bickman et al. (in press) have analyzed the programs aimed at improved citizen reporting of crimes (column 3);
- Several Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) reports (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1972; and National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973 and 1974) reviewed programs aimed at reducing crime pressure in society at large (column 5);

---

1It should be pointed out that Brown's (1969) review of vigilante groups in American history suggested a strong contrast between the vigilantism of the 19th century and of the 1960s. Brown claims that most of the contemporary groups do not constitute classical vigilante groups because they have not taken the law into their own hands and have restricted themselves to patrol activity and assisting the police.
Fairley and Liechenstein (1971), Sagalyn et al. (1973), Mattick et al. (1974), and Heller (1975) reviewed and compared devices used to reduce a residential area's vulnerability to crime (row A, column 2); and

A number of studies have examined the use of auxiliary police, such as reserve units and community service officers (King, 1960; Kakalik and Wildhorn, 1971; and Fink and Sealy, 1974). ¹

Social Significance of Patrols

Historical Perspective. The notion of community self-help in the sphere of law enforcement, far from being new, is a tradition that has strong roots in the history of the nation. Brown (1969) noted that early self-help movements tended to materialize in periods when a community's revered values, social structure, property, and wealth were threatened. He distinguished two phases of American vigilantism: a first stage that occurred in the late 1700s and early 1800s when citizens in lawless frontier towns organized to apprehend criminals and marauders, particularly horse thieves, and a second stage of urban neovigilantism that began in the mid-1800s and mainly involved the persecution, oftentimes violent, of racial and ethnic minorities. Brown likened modern urban vigilantism to the former type of frontier vigilantism in its goals of civil order and residential safety and in its disinclination to use violence.

Modern resident patrols raise many issues of theoretical interest to the social scientist. For example, the patrols might be viewed as part of a social movement toward community control and self-help that surfaced in many neighborhoods in the 1960s. This view is supported by

¹The auxiliary police have actually been the least studied of all of these groups, even though substantial efforts exist in many cities. The auxiliaries are generally citizen volunteers, but the auxiliary police programs were excluded because they did not really fit under the main concerns of the present study (e.g., they are police-organized rather than citizen-organized). Future investigations, however, might find a comparison between resident patrols and auxiliary police useful because these efforts represent alternative policy directions.
patrol members' comments that, if law enforcement is to reflect community values, residents must be directly involved in the provision of protective services. Some patrol members also note that because residents are more familiar with their neighborhood than any outside peace officer could be, they have a heightened ability to detect suspicious activity. Thus, resident patrols constitute a potentially formidable approach to law enforcement.

Patrols might also be considered an element of what some observers see as an opposition to "big government" and the encroachment of governmental activities into every sphere of individual life. In many areas, disillusionment with the inferior quality and mounting costs of public services has prompted citizens to develop their own initiatives. Action becomes especially desirable in crisis situations, such as the suspension of police services. One group in Queens mobilized resident security patrols to protect neighborhoods when massive New York City layoffs reduced police coverage ("Queens Block Associations Press Patrol Plan," 1975).

Finally, formation of a resident safety patrol might also reflect criticism of the police. Although civilian critiques have varied from reports of police ineffectuality to accusations of police brutality or selective enforcement of the law, the fact that civilians perceive a need to organize to protect their lives and property is a potentially important commentary on the apparent effectiveness of police services.

Policy Perspective. To policymakers and law enforcement authorities, the patrols present a quandary. The diversity of ideologies propped up and actions taken by the patrols precludes any blanket assessment of their value or danger to the communities in which they operate. In recent years, escalating demands for police service and severely taxed local budgets have enhanced the appeal of civilian crime prevention efforts to law enforcement agencies, but the uncertainty about the nature and social costs of the patrol activity has forestalled official support or even generated opposition in many cities. The policymaker still needs to know what kinds of resident patrols, if any, should be supported, as well as when and how to provide such assistance.
Officials in the various State Planning Agencies (SPAs) in criminal justice were the main policymaking audience of our study. The study is intended to assist these officials in: advising local groups that undertake crime prevention activities, recommending potential guidelines for developing new state legislation, and deciding what types of patrol projects to support, if any. SPA officials in all states were asked to identify the facets of resident patrols about which new information would be most helpful, as well as if they knew of any patrols in their states. The officials contacted as well as their comments are described in Appendix B. We may summarize their questions as follows:

1. How many patrols exist, and how old are most of them?
2. In what types of neighborhoods do most of these patrols emerge?
3. What level of costs do most patrols incur, and what, if any, is their organizational affiliation?
4. How many members do the patrols have, and are the members paid or voluntary?
5. To what extent has LEAA supported such patrols?
6. What type of equipment and training do most patrols have?
7. What relationship does the police do most patrols have?
8. What has been the effect, if any, of the patrols?

Our study will relate some preliminary evidence for answering these questions, although in some cases the evidence is not necessarily adequate. Chapters II and III describe the conceptual framework for attempting to understand how resident patrols work and the methods of gathering our evidence. Chapter IV reports the results of previous studies and our own fieldwork in addressing the questions, and Chapter V discusses some implementation factors that may be important in operating a patrol. Finally, Chapter VI describes further relevant research on patrols, including the problems of conducting various evaluations of patrols, and Chapter VII gives our conclusions.
II. A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING PATROL ACTIVITIES

A. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Although residents in many cities have undertaken some form of patrol activity, the patrol organizations vary substantially in the functions that they perform. In addition to the diversity of activities, there appears to have been a systematic change during the past decade in the patrol ideologies and functions that have prevailed nationwide. During the late 1960s, the major problems faced by patrols included protecting racial and ethnic minorities against criminal activity and persecution, monitoring police behavior and service provision, and controlling and abating civil disorders. Current groups, however, have tended more frequently than earlier patrols to focus on residential crime and security and the more common problems of burglary, robbery, and vandalism. As one result, the contemporary patrols communicate with the police to a far greater extent than did their predecessors.

For the most part, previous research on resident patrols has reflected this change in emphasis from riot-cooling to residential security. The early reviews by Brown (1969), Knopf (1969), and Marx and Archer (1971, 1972, and 1973) tended to deal with concerns related to urban disorders and riot control. Knopf (1969), for instance, studied 12 youth patrols that operated in the late 1960s, mainly in ghetto areas. Similarly, Marx and Archer reviewed the experiences of more than 20 patrols, classifying them according to their relationships to police authorities. As a reflection of the social divisiveness marked by the urban disorders, these earlier studies examined mainly the advocate or adversary nature of the patrols—i.e., the extent to which a patrol was supported by the residents of the community and whether the patrol acted as an adversary to the police. The patrols always faced the possibility that either the residents or the police would not support their activities: The residents often perceived the patrols to be representatives of the police, acting as in
a riot-cooling (and hence riot-suppressing) capacity, whereas the police often perceived the patrols as troublemakers.¹

In contrast, the more recent studies by Heidt and Etzioni (1973), Sagalyn et al. (1973), and Washnis (in press) have examined the role of patrols as one of several alternatives for citizen crime prevention efforts. These studies more appropriately reflect the rising concern with residential crime, a problem that is not limited to central cities, much less ghetto areas. For instance, Heidt and Etzioni (1973) developed case studies of four resident patrols in New York City, mainly in middle-class and upper-class neighborhoods. Similarly, Sagalyn et al. (1973) considered the relative benefits and social dysfunctions of three types of patrols: citizen patrols in residential neighborhoods, tenant patrols in public housing, and private security guard services.

In general, little of the previous research on resident patrols, whether related to urban disorder or residential crime, has attempted to assess the patrol efforts. Besides the studies already mentioned, most of the other available materials are anecdotal discussions of a few types of patrol operations (Cizanckas, 1974; Russell, 1975; Johnston, 1975; and Bird, 1969).² The weakness of the available evidence from this evaluative perspective stems from both a failure to design a sampling procedure for identifying the patrol or guard projects to be studied and a lack of reliable measures for assessing the issues of concern. For example, most of the existing studies of more than one patrol (e.g., Knopf, 1969, Sagalyn et al., 1973; and Washnis, in press) provide few formal statements of their methodologies for defining the projects studied or for identifying the means by which the sample of projects was selected.

¹A similar point is made by Ponting, 1973, in relation to rumor control centers.

²In only a few cases has there been an actual evaluation study—e.g., Lipstein, 1975; Clancy, 1972; and Nash, 1968—but these studies have been purely local efforts related to the funding of specific projects and have suffered from an inadequate research design, a poor choice of outcome measures, or both.
As a result of these shortcomings, the available research provides little guidance for assessing resident patrols. The following sections therefore attempt to develop an assessment framework. This will be done first by developing a typology for clustering patrols into similar categories and then by discussing potential outcomes and their measurement.

B. TYPOLOGY OF PATROLS

Need for a Typology

Chapter 1 provided four criteria for defining a resident patrol. To qualify as such, a patrol had to: (1) follow a specified patrol or surveillance routine, (2) function mainly to prevent criminal acts or apprehend criminals, (3) operate under the control of a group of citizens, and (4) concern itself primarily with safety in residential as opposed to commercial areas. Various types of resident patrols—armed or unarmed, supplementing or opposing the police, paid or volunteer, uniformed or plain clothes, on foot or in automobiles, and mobile or stationary (although strictly speaking, an entrance guard, for example, is not a patrol)—fall within these definitional constraints. Included are:

- An armed community-protection group;
- A volunteer automobile radio patrol;
- A volunteer foot patrol;
- An escort service staffed by youths;
- A uniformed private police force;
- Hired guards patrolling in marked automobiles;
- A public housing vertical patrol;
- A public housing stationary patrol; and
- Elderly watchmen and gatekeepers at a retirement village.

To evaluate these patrol efforts, it is necessary to partition the patrols into a few analytically useful groups. Such grouping helps to develop generalizations about the various patrol efforts and to
facilitate the application of the appropriate evaluative criteria to each patrol. For instance, a patrol that precludes its members from intervening in a crime in progress should not be assessed by the number of arrests that its members make, whereas a private police force with special arrest powers may be appropriately assessed by such a standard.

Possible Criteria for a Typology

The ideal typology would be one that classified all patrols on the basis of some simple characteristic and that led to the clustering of patrols that have had the same experience. The particular characteristic could come from one of several aspects of patrol operation. For example, at the crudest level, any patrol involves: a crime problem, an organization to lead and carry out crime prevention activities, a set of goals, a patrol routine or activity, an implicit (if not explicit) relationship to the police, and some outcome. Patrols may vary in any of these components. For instance, the crime problem may be chronic or transitory, the organization may be based on an existing residential association or on an entirely ad hoc organization, the patrol activity may call for paid guards or resident volunteers, and so on. The characteristics of any one of these components could potentially be used as the basis for a typology. However, some components hold more promise than others.

A typology based on either the problem or the outcome does not permit the analyst to group patrols for purposes of evaluation or policy intervention. For instance, any classification by outcome is unmanageable because the outcome represents that which one wants to learn about a posteriori—i.e., a dependent variable. The requirement for a patrol typology, in contrast, is a need for some a priori means of grouping patrols. Classification by the problem is similarly unhelpful because crime problems are not necessarily stable. Thus, for purposes of policy intervention, it would be unwise to develop a set of procedures for some crime problem, only to have the nature of the problem change as implementation takes place.
Grouping patrols by organizational structure is a feasible approach, but raises another issue. The organizational structure may vary in ways that are unrelated to the main efforts of a patrol. Complex, bureaucratic structure, for instance, may be found among either stationary or mobile patrols, and an evaluation of patrols would be more relevant if it accounted for this difference in function rather than the degree of bureaucratization.

The goals of a patrol effort constitute an attractive but deceptive basis for classification. The patrol ideology may be poorly stated or even misleadingly represented, as the stated goals of an organization may bear little or no relation to the actual activities of the group (Wilson, 1973). For example, in the case of patrols in which the monitoring of another group of residents is a covert objective, formal statements of goals are apt to be misleading.

The patrol's relation to the police presents analogous difficulties for classification, although the nature of such relations has been used in the past to classify patrols (e.g., Marx and Archer, 1972). First, definitional problems are likely to arise over whether a patrol enjoys an adversary, supportive, or neutral relationship with the police. The empirical assessment of such relationships is difficult, especially in light of the occurrence of cooptation tactics in conflict-ridden communities. Second, the choice of the appropriate respondent to classify the patrol as an adversary or supporter also poses a problem, as the opinions of the police and patrol members may differ.

Patrol activities, in contrast, are a more attractive basis for creating a useful typology. First, the activities are observable and hence potentially measurable. Second, patrol activities are susceptible to policy intervention (e.g., federal support could be offered to or withheld from patrols that do not follow a prescribed set of activities). For these reasons, distinctions among patrol activities appear to be a useful foundation on which to develop a patrol typology.

Types of Patrols Based on Activity Differences

The main set of decisions related to patrol activities has to do with: (a) whether the police are also the object of patrol monitoring,
(b) the type of area being patrolled, and (c) whether the patrol engages in other than crime prevention activities (see Fig. 1).

Regardless of their other activities, patrols that monitor the police-called community protection patrols—are considered a distinct type of patrol. The usual reason for such monitoring is that residents (or at least the patrol members) perceive themselves to be victims of poor police service, or even of unreasonable harassment and persecution. This type of patrol is distinguished because of its differential impact on patrol outcomes, over and above such questions as the type of area the patrol covers.

A second important aspect of deployment is the type of area covered. Among the patrols that perform crime prevention activities only, building patrols1 are organized mainly to protect residents of

---

1This term will be used throughout to refer to patrols that cover a single building, a housing project, or a well-defined residential compound.
a specific building or group of buildings and usually operate as stationary guards or foot patrols. The universe of residents being protected by building patrols is easily identified, and the residents often form a tenants' or homeowners' association (the public housing authority can serve in this capacity as well) that directly represents the residents and supervises the patrol. Neighborhood patrols cover a less well-defined group of residents and a much larger geographic area, and the patrols usually operate on foot or in automobiles. Further, whereas building patrols have little obvious need for coordination with the police (the local police are seldom concerned with the protection of specific buildings or private residential compounds), this is not the case with neighborhood patrols, where the activities of the patrol overlap, at least in theory, with those of the local police.

Finally, one variant of both building and neighborhood patrols is important enough also to be treated separately. This is a social service patrol, which may cover either a building or a neighborhood, but engage in community service functions other than crime prevention, e.g., civil defense or sanitation, or the employment of youths as part of a job opportunity program. Although the social service patrols are a variant of both building and neighborhood patrols, they will be treated separately because a different set of outcomes may be associated with them.

C. PATROL EVALUATION

Evaluative Criteria

The few studies that have addressed the issue of evaluation have suggested a variety of standards by which patrols might be assessed. Marx and Archer (1971), for example, specify several potential criteria for patrol evaluation, but they neither present evidence nor
speculate on the observed outcomes for the patrols in their study. Among the type of data Marx and Archer felt to be useful were "reports of crime, cessation of civil disorders, complaints against police, citizen feeling of safety, attitudes toward the group by the police, and patrol abuses." Knopf (1969) also specifies three outcomes of patrol activities—outcomes mainly applicable to patrols that operated during civil disorders in the late 1960s. The criteria she selected were the reduction or cessation of violence, the handling of crowds, and the reduction of community tensions.

Heidt and Etzioni (1973) largely leave aside the question of the effectiveness of patrols in preventing crime and focus mainly on patrol responsibility (i.e., the extent to which patrols are noninterventionist and act in accord with civil libertarian principles) and stability (i.e., the capacity of organizations to maintain themselves and their memberships over time). Although some mention is made of the perceptions of patrol members and police regarding group efficacy in preventing crime, Heidt and Etzioni direct their attention mainly to organizational dynamics and not to outcomes.

Finally, among the evaluations of individual patrols that we have identified, the criteria most frequently cited are: reduction in rate of reported crimes (e.g., Lipstein, 1975; and Calvin College, 1972); residents' and officials' attitudes toward the patrol and perceptions of its effectiveness (e.g., Lipstein, 1975; and Carman et al., 1972); members' perceptions of patrol effectiveness (e.g., Arnold, 1974; and Carman et al., 1972); police attitudes toward the patrol and perceptions of its effectiveness (e.g., Carman et al., 1972; and Nash et al., 1968); incidents intervened in or reported (e.g., Nash et al., 1968); and dysfunctional aspects of patrol behavior (e.g., Carman et al., 1972; and Nash et al., 1968).

From among the numerous evaluative criteria mentioned in previous research, we identified six outcomes of resident patrol activity by which patrols may be usefully assessed, although not every type of patrol is concerned with every outcome. These six outcomes are:
Crime reduction; ¹
Increase sense of security on the part of residents;
Improved police and community relations;
Improved police coverage;
Absence of vigilantism; and
Increased citizen participation. ²

Assessing Outcomes

To measure and assess the accomplishments of patrols, we must first render the relevant outcomes operational. It is necessary, however, to distinguish among three sorts of measures—those that one would ideally like to use in an extensive and comprehensive study of resident patrols, those proxy measures that may be used but nevertheless still require data to be collected for a period of time, and reports about patrol activities made on the basis of one-shot interviews. Although our study relied mainly on the last type of measure, the following discussion covers all three, to indicate how more comprehensive studies might be conducted.

Crime Reduction. Ideally, the assessment of a patrol’s crime preventive effect should be based on victimization data for a clearly defined area. Reported crime would not be a substitute for such victimization data, because the crime statistics reflect only crimes actually reported to the police. Even the direction of changes in reported crimes is less than helpful. For example, improved police and community relations due to the patrol’s efforts might augment the tendency of residents to report crime, thus producing an apparent increase in crime as a result of the patrol. In the same area, victimization data might simultaneously decline despite the apparent increase in reported crime.

¹Crime reduction is viewed as either a decrease in crime or a decline in the rate of increase. Further, crime reduction is measured only in terms of those crimes that a patrol might deal with, and excludes, for example, fraud.

²This list omits any outcome related to the cessation of civil disorders. Although riot-related activities are of historic interest, their virtual cessation led to the exclusion of riot-pacification as an outcome of the study.
In the absence of any victimization data, the crime preventive capacity of patrols might be reflected in (1) the number and types of incidents reported or intervened in by the patrol, or (2) the most serious incident handled by the patrol. These data might be collected by a patrol over a period of time, or in the case of our study, merely reported on the basis of an interview by someone knowledgeable about the patrol. Such measures convey at least a rough indication of the level and seriousness of patrol activity in relation to crime reduction.

**Increased Sense of Security.** The effect of a patrol in increasing residents' sense of security might best be examined by means of extensive observations of changes in the crime preventive behavior of residents (e.g., Do women walk the streets after dark? Do children appear on the streets alone?). Such behavioral data might usefully be supplemented by interviewing residents about their crime preventive behavior and their attitudes concerning local crime. Collection of either behavioral or attitudinal data from residents has not been carried out in previous studies; the only substitute (though a poor one) is anecdotal reports by residents.

**Improved Police and Community Relations.** The most straightforward way to assess changes in the relations between the police and the citizenry may be to observe their behavior towards each other. Changes in the frequency of both physical and verbal conflict and friendly and cooperative overtures between residents and police would be relevant. Attitudinal surveys might also be used to supplement the behavioral evidence. Such behavioral observations or attitudinal surveys were again not conducted in any previous studies. A substitute measure of police and community relations is the number of complaints by residents against the police.

**Improved Police Coverage.** Police coverage is related to a number of characteristics. Some, such as the quality of police response, are difficult to assess; others, such as the number of police deployed or the actual response time, are often used as measures of police coverage. Focusing on the latter characteristics, we note that a police department may revise its patrol patterns in a community where resident patrols are active. If there are decreases in coverage, the
resident patrol may be said to have had a negative effect to the extent that the overall protection for the neighborhood may have declined. The effect of patrol activities on police deployment patterns could be studied by collecting data on changes in the deployment of police manpower. But such deployment data are usually not made available by the police to any outside group. Thus, the only information currently available on this point consists of anecdotes regarding the apparent effect of patrol activity on police deployment patterns.

Absence of Vigilantism. The term vigilantism is used in our study to refer to illicit behavior, such as harassment or violation of civil liberties of residents by patrol members. A thorough analysis of vigilante behavior would involve participant observation of patrol activity, as well as contact with a large number of patrol members, and has been beyond the scope of virtually all previous studies. A potential proxy for measuring patrol vigilantism is the number of complaints by police and residents about the patrol.

Increased Citizen Participation. The central question concerning citizen participation is whether resident patrols contribute in some enduring way to the community in which they operate. The notion is that residents who participate in patrols may be more disposed and better equipped to respond to other problems. To answer this question fully, it would be necessary to know the number of participants in community activities, the intensity of their involvement, the development of new leaders, and the formation of new and active community groups. Previous studies have at best only partially covered those topics. Cruder but more readily available measures of citizen participation are the number of residents involved in the patrol efforts or the patrol's development of splinter groups that perform other community services.
III. METHODS OF GATHERING EVIDENCE ABOUT PATROLS

Two methods of gathering evidence about patrols were considered at the outset of the study. The first was to rely mainly on existing studies of patrols, including formal evaluations of individual projects, and to supplement this literature with a small amount of validating fieldwork. The second was to rely mainly on the evidence gathered directly as a result of fieldwork and to supplement this evidence with other citations from the literature. The general concern in distinguishing between these alternatives was to maximize the amount of information gathered about patrols within the resource constraints of conducting an exploratory study.

The result of an exhaustive search for existing studies indicated that the first alternative was not feasible. There is little written information about resident patrols. Our study therefore uses data collected mainly from interviews with patrol personnel at 16 sites, supplemented by a few citations from the literature. The following three sections describe briefly our search for existing studies, the fieldwork procedures that were followed, and the type of analysis that was employed.

A. EXISTING STUDIES

To locate the studies that had been done and to identify existing patrols, an extensive literature search was conducted and a variety of federal agencies, national organizations, research firms, and knowledgeable individuals were contacted.

Literature Search

The literature search probed four major sources of potential information. First, major libraries specializing in community
organization or crime prevention were explored.¹ A second source in the search was journal indexes. Guides examined were: Crime and Delinquency Literature Abstracts; Guide to Legal Periodicals; Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature; and Social Science Index. Computerized information retrieval systems constituted the third main source explored. The systems included: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grants Management Information System; National Criminal Justice Reference Service; National Technical Information Service; and The New York Times Information Bank. Systematic examination of bibliographies of materials on hand constituted the final source.²

Individual Contacts

To explore further the existing evidence about resident patrols, contacts were made with staff of various national organizations, private security and real estate management firms, government agencies, and individual experts in the field. Contacts were selected on the basis of their involvement in crime prevention, community organizations, or urban affairs, or because they were referenced in the existing literature on resident patrols. (Appendix C contains a complete listing of all these contacts.)

¹Libraries included: American Sociological Association Library, George Washington University Library, George Washington University Law Library, International Association of Chiefs of Police Library, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Library, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Library, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials Library, National League of Cities Library, and Urban Institute Library. In addition, the Rand Corporation libraries in both Washington, D.C., and Santa Monica, California, and Rotch Library at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Massachusetts, were searched. The International City Management Association and the National Association of Police Community Relations Officers were also contacted for patrol-related materials, although they do not have libraries.

²The list of search words used in searching through all the sources included the following: patrol (citizen patrol, private patrol); crime prevention (community crime prevention, citizen crime prevention); vigilante; police (private police, special projects, police volunteers); burglary (burglary protection); security (private security); and neighborhood.
The national organizations that were contacted include the National Sheriff's Association, NAACP, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and National Council on Crime and Delinquency. In general, staff at these organizations were unfamiliar or uninvolved with the patrol aspect of residential crime prevention. Those few who were familiar with resident patrols, however, did identify a number of interesting patrol projects. Several private security and real estate management companies were contacted to determine whether they provided private guard services for residential communities. Two of the largest national security companies, Burns Security Services and the Pinkerton Company, both indicated that they provide residential guard service; however, they stipulated that their guard services are provided to only a few upper-income communities. Residential security services appear to represent only a very small percentage of their total business.

Two federal agencies, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, were probed for information regarding resident patrols. HUD was selected because it supports several operational and research programs pertaining to residential crime prevention including: the Federal Crime Insurance Program, research studies on physical security design and measurement, and security programs operated by public housing authorities. Within HUD, there have been increased research efforts for new methods of upgrading residential security in public housing projects.1 Similarly within HUD, the Target Project Program (TPP) has been established to focus on public housing projects beset by chronic maintenance, security, or other problems. The TPP program provides money to ameliorate project conditions through the pursuit of specific objectives, including security.2

---

1Specifically, the Housing Management Innovations Program (HMIP) provides funds to public housing authorities to develop innovative approaches to management problems. The Hawaii Housing Authority, for instance, has used this funding exclusively to set up a tenant security guard program.

2Some of the housing authorities using TPP funds to reduce crime include: the Chicago Housing Authority, Atlanta Housing Authority, New York City Housing Authority, Charleston Housing Authority, Jersey City Housing Authority, and Birmingham, Alabama, Housing Authority.
In addition to supporting its own programs, HUD also collaborates on projects with other federal agencies. The Department of Labor, in conjunction with HUD, supports the Comprehensive Employment and Training Assistance Act (CETA), which provides money to housing authorities for a variety of purposes, one of which is the training of security guards.\textsuperscript{1} In another cooperative effort, HUD and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) jointly sponsor the HUD-HEW Cooperative Contract for Support of Residential Services in Public Housing. This program can provide money for protective services in public housing.\textsuperscript{2} In general, the Pittsburgh public housing projects, Boston's Bromley-Heath housing project, and the New York City public housing projects were frequently cited by HUD staff and other individuals as examples of innovative security programs that use these funds to involve tenants of the projects in crime prevention.

Within LEAA, contact was made primarily with the staff of the Citizen Initiative Program. That office reported that it is not involved currently with any projects concerning resident patrols.

Several individuals who had done research or been involved in an expert capacity in the field of residential security were also consulted. They too noted the dearth of recent research on resident patrols.

The conclusion of both the literature review and the contact experience was clearly that little previous study had been done on resident patrols.

\textbf{B. FIELDWORK}

Given the paucity of prior research, the main objective of this study was to locate various types of patrols throughout the country and to collect available evidence about them. This was done over a

\textsuperscript{1}The housing authorities of Las Vegas, Nevada; Bristol, New Britain, and New Haven, Connecticut; Kansas City, Kansas; and Albany, New York, are among the recipients of CETA funds for this purpose.

\textsuperscript{2}The housing authorities of Anne Arundel County, Maryland, and Philadelphia and Fayette Counties, Pennsylvania, use this source of funding for increased security in their projects.
four-month period, July through October 1975, using the field procedures described below. Sixteen sites were studied and approximately 400 informants contacted.

Overview of Field Procedures

Since resources did not permit us to study all of the patrols identified, a sample of projects was systematically selected for study. That sample may be briefly described as geographically clustered, meaning that a sample of urban areas was chosen; then, within each urban area, a sample of patrol projects was selected.¹

For each project in the sample, a series of personal and telephone interviews was conducted with individuals responsible for coordinating each patrol, patrol members, and local police. For each of the sampled projects, basic descriptive information was obtained on an instrument called the patrol profile.

The patrol profile is a three page, structured checklist covering such basic project information as patrol duties, hours, size of membership, funding, and goals. This instrument was used for all field and telephone interviews; 109 profiles were completed. (The patrol profile form is shown in Appendix D.)² In the course of conducting the fieldwork for this study, it was decided that, given the crime prevention nature of patrol activities, the identities of patrols and individual respondents should be treated as confidential. Therefore, any information about individual patrols presented in this report gives the actual names of the cities but fictitious names for the patrols and the individual respondents.

In addition, up to four detailed interviews were conducted at each geographic location, depending on the time available to the interviewer. These interviews were usually conducted in person and resulted in a complete, written narrative about the project, covering

¹Details of the process are presented in a later section of this chapter.

²A single-page summary of the key information collected on each of the patrol profiles is presented in Robert K. Yin et al., Patrolling the Neighborhood Beat: Residents and Residential Security (Case Studies and Profiles), R-1912/2-DOJ, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, March 1976.
more topics than were included in the profile, and a chart depicting the history of the project. The narratives covered a variety of topics, which were identified by key words rather than structured questions.¹ (The key word checklist is also shown in Appendix D.)

Site Selection

The geographic areas within which patrols were sampled were selected to represent different regions of the United States² and different types of urban areas.³ In classifying urban areas, we relied on the work of Keeler and Rogers (1973), which divides the 125 largest American urban areas into ten groups⁴ according to such characteristics as density, rate of growth, educational level of the population, amount of welfare and unemployment, and degree of contrast between the central city and its suburbs. We sought to choose at least one urban area from each of the Keeler and Rogers groups and to consider it as being representative of the others in the group.

We began with a pool of urban areas, each of whose central city had at least one of the following characteristics: (a) it was one of the 15 largest cities (according to 1970 population), (b) it was a city in which a criminal victimization survey had been conducted, or (c) it was an LEAA Impact city. As not every Keeler and Rogers group was represented in this pool, it was expanded by adding a random member of the missing groups. The resulting list contained 26 urban areas, listed in Appendix E. The list was then cut to 18. Elimination was random, except that we insisted on retaining at least one member of each Keeler-Rogers group in the sample and at least three sites from each geographic region. This means, for example, that if an urban area selected

¹A structured questionnaire pretested in the first interviews proved unnecessarily confining and was replaced by the checklist.

²The sites were selected to represent as evenly as possible the major geographic regions of the United States as defined by the Census Bureau (Northeast, South Atlantic, North Central, South Central, and West).

³We assumed that resident patrols would be few in number or difficult to find in nonurban areas.

⁴The groups are called clusters by Keeler and Rogers (1973).
for elimination was the only remaining member of its Keeler and Rogers group, it was retained. The sites finally selected are listed below by region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>North Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Atlantic</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of these urban areas (Dallas, Detroit, and Los Angeles) were then selected randomly for study of their suburban areas, rather than of their central city. For Dallas, Dallas County was selected; for Detroit, Macomb and Wayne counties; for Los Angeles, the city of Compton. In Detroit, the time available to the interviewers permitted data to be collected in the central city as well. In Washington, both the central city and two suburban counties (Montgomery and Arlington) were selected. In New York, it was decided to select one borough, Brooklyn, rather than attempt to cover the entire city. Although we had hoped to be able to collect data in all 18 sites, the time and resources available to the project forced us to terminate interviews without covering Indianapolis or Memphis.

**Identifying the Universe of Patrol Projects**

At each selected site, the first step of the fieldwork consisted of contacting four organizations by telephone for information about local patrols and for referrals to other contacts in the area:

- The chief executive's office (e.g., mayor's or county executive's office);
The police department (e.g., community relations officer or crime prevention specialist at headquarters);

- The public housing authority (e.g., security director or director of tenant relations); and
- The local newspaper (e.g., crime reporter).

Once appropriate contacts had been identified, appointments were made to meet them in person at the start of the site visit (if there was to be one) and the information they provided was used to select patrols for detailed narratives. Later, during the site visit, an effort was made to elicit additional information about other patrols from the persons previously contacted by telephone and from the coordinators and members of the patrols previously scheduled for detailed interviews. At the end of this process, a final list of known patrols was constructed; this list constituted the universe from which the sample of patrols for patrol profiles was taken.

At each site the patrols in the universe were listed in random order for inclusion in the sample, and as many were chosen for interviews as were feasible for the interviewer. However, if a large number of projects was found to belong to a single program, i.e., if a collection of similar projects was coordinated or administered by a single organization, such as a public housing authority, no more than five projects were sampled from such a program. An attempt was then made to contact the coordinator of each sampled project by

---

1 We recognize that a possible bias toward highly "legitimate" or officially funded patrols is introduced by our dependence on centralized sources of information. However, constraints of time and money preclude a more diffuse search.

2 For five locations--Dallas, Houston, St. Louis, Chicago, and Norfolk--all interviews, including the detailed project interviews, were conducted by telephone.

3 The method by which this selection was made is described below.

4 Not more than 15 interviews, including those for the detailed narratives, were to be conducted in any location. If a narrative had already been prepared for a patrol farther down the list than the last one in the sample, such a patrol was not considered to be part of the random sample, although the data were, of course, retained for other purposes.
telephone for the purpose of completing the patrol profile (unless he or she had already been interviewed in person). It sometimes happened that additional patrols were identified during this last round of telephone conversations, but such patrols were not added to the survey universe.

The size of the universe and sample in each geographic location is shown in Table 2. Although our intent was to locate only currently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Order in Which Contacted</th>
<th>Size of Universe</th>
<th>Size of Random Sample</th>
<th>Other Dataa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas (suburb)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit (suburb)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (suburb)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (Brooklyn)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (suburb)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (suburb)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Sample           | 109                      |

aSome patrols selected for narratives, but not included in the random sample, are counted as "other data," and included in the total sample.

1In a few cases, all such attempts were unsuccessful, leading to a possible bias in the final sample; this is typical of any fieldwork.
active patrols, some of those in the sample were subsequently found to be defunct. Therefore, the size of the universe should not be interpreted as the number of active patrols in each city.

No general pattern emerged regarding the usefulness of various sources in locating patrols. In many cities, the police proved to be the most valuable; in one city, however, despite a special effort, the police department refused to cooperate or to give any information at all, on the basis that it does not cooperate with or aid any LEAA-sponsored efforts. By and large, patrol respondents were willing and in most cases eager to discuss their patrol and its activities. Only one individual flatly refused to be interviewed.

Selection of Patrols for Detailed Narratives

When patrol projects were identified in the course of the initial telephone conversations, an attempt was made to obtain sufficient demographic information so that certain patrols could be selected for detailed interviews. The objective of these interviews was to provide complete information about at least one example of each different kind of project.

For this purpose, projects were classified according to a twodimensional scheme that reflected (a) the nature of the persons constituting the patrol (paid residents, volunteers, or hired guards) and (b) the characteristics of the buildings or neighborhoods in which they were located. A project was chosen for a detailed

---

1Since the informant was relied upon to estimate the type of the project, errors sometimes occurred in classifications. As a result, detailed interviews were occasionally assembled for patrols that did not fit into the original sampling scheme.

2The categories of neighborhoods used for this classification were as follows: public housing; ethnically mixed (substantial subgroup of the population consists of an identifiable ethnic group, such as Spanish-speaking, Italian-American, etc.); upper-income (median annual household income over $20,000); middle-income racially mixed (more than 30 percent black, median income between $10,000 and $20,000); middle-income white (less than 30 percent black, median income between $10,000 and $20,000); low-income racially mixed (more than 30 percent black, median income under $10,000); and low-income white (less than 30 percent black, median income under $10,000).
interview if no project in a similar neighborhood had previously been selected for this purpose. Of course, in the first urban areas visited, this process was essentially random; but later the choices depended on what types of projects had already been covered. As often happened, when it was not possible to select projects in neighborhoods of types not previously visited, detailed interviews were still conducted. As a result, more narrative descriptions were obtained for the most common types of project and neighborhood combinations than for others, but not in proportion to their relative numbers. Suppose, for example, that in the third urban area visited by the research team we knew in advance about (1) a volunteer patrol in a public housing project and (2) a hired guard patrol in an upper-income area. If detailed interviews with volunteer public housing patrols had already been conducted in the first two urban areas, the hired guard would have been selected for the next detailed narrative.

Procedures for Detailed Interviews

In general, detailed interviews were conducted by pairs of field-workers, and an attempt was made to identify as many of the following respondents as possible for inclusion in the interviews:

- The coordinator of field operations;
- Two or three patrol members;
- A policeman who patrols the neighborhood where the patrol operates; and
- A member of the housing authority or homeowners', tenants', or neighborhood association responsible for supervising the patrol effort in cases where such organizations maintained a patrol.

At the conclusion of the fieldwork, narratives had been completed for 32 projects. The breakdown of these projects, according to the two-dimensional scheme described above, is presented in Table 3.
Table 3

DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN OF PATROLS WITH NARRATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Composition</th>
<th>Paid Residents</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Hired Guards</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income racially mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income white</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income racially mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income white</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. DATA ANALYSIS

The sources of evidence collected about resident patrols were therefore of three types: (a) existing studies of patrols, (b) profiles of 109 patrol projects, based on an original set of interviews, and (c) detailed narratives of 32 patrol projects, also based on original interviews. These sources were analyzed in the following manner.

The data for each of the 109 profiles were weighted according to the number of projects the profile represented. These data were then used to answer several questions about patrol characteristics, including the age, size, cost, and location of patrol projects. The 32 narratives and the existing studies were combined, but not quantitatively, to form the basis for our discussion of the four types of patrols (building, neighborhood, social service, and community protection) in terms of patrol outcomes and the factors that appear to affect those outcomes. The narratives and existing studies were also used to develop our findings on the implementation process.

1For example, the five patrols not selected as part of the random sample, but for which data were collected, were assumed to represent only themselves and were assigned a weight equal to 1.
Because of the exploratory nature of the study, we believe that this approach to data analysis is appropriate. In general, the findings and conclusions of our study are thus more of a hypothesis-generating than hypothesis-testing nature. Because so little has been known about resident patrols up to this time and because resources were not available to conduct a definitive evaluation of specific projects or a larger sample of them, we believe this approach to be more useful than any premature quantification of important issues (as might follow, for instance, from a content analysis of the narratives).
IV. THE PATROL EXPERIENCE

This chapter integrates the lessons learned from our fieldwork and from previous studies of resident patrols. One point that should be remembered throughout the analysis, however, is that our discussion is not intended as an assessment of patrol activities, but only as a review of existing information about patrols and the further research that might be relevant.

Our informal survey of LEAA state planning officials, referred to in Chapter I, uncovered several common questions about resident patrols, including:

1. How many patrols exist, and how old are most of them?
2. In what types of neighborhoods do most of these patrols emerge?
3. What level of costs do most patrols incur, and what, if any, is their organizational affiliation?
4. How many members do the patrols have, and are the members paid or voluntary?
5. To what extent has LEAA supported such patrols?
6. What type of equipment and training do most patrols have?
7. What relationship to the police do most patrols have?
8. What has been the effect, if any, of the patrols?

We have tried to assess the available information about patrols in terms of these questions in the hope of making the analysis as useful as possible to SPA officials. Estimates for the first five of these questions were derived from the universe of patrols and the 109 project profiles. The last three questions, however, were difficult to answer on the basis of the profiles and therefore were responded to using information contained in the 32 narratives.
A. UNIVERSE OF PATROLS

Through our field procedures, 226 patrols were identified in 16 urban areas. We collected data on 109 of them, of which 104 may be considered to be part of a clustered and stratified random sample. By weighting each patrol in the sample according to the size of the group from which it was selected, we derived an estimate of the number of currently active\(^1\) patrols at each site. This estimate is given in Table 4, along with the 1970 population of each area, the number of patrols per 100,000 population,\(^2\) and type of urban area according to the Keeler-Rogers classifications.

As one might expect, the table shows that suburban areas tend to have lower patrol/population ratios than cities.\(^3\) In addition, when the sites are ranked according to patrols per population and compared with their Keeler-Rogers group, we observe that the distinctions among urban areas as captured by the Keeler-Rogers group number appear to be related to the formation of resident patrols. All the highest-ranked sites are in Keeler-Rogers groups 7, 10, or 1, with other groups having substantially lower patrol/population ratios.\(^4\) The sites with few or no patrols were searched as carefully as the others; therefore we believe the difference among sites to be real rather than an artifact of our fieldwork procedures. Group 10, having a high patrol/population ratio, consists of cities similar to the older cities of the northeast with a strong manufacturing base.\(^5\) Group 7, also high, 

---

\(^1\) The estimates for Tables 4, 10, 11, and 12 are thus based on active patrols (N = 193). Other estimates are either based on the patrol profiles (N = 109) or the universe of patrols we identified (N = 226).

\(^2\) Although later population estimates were available to us, our sampling design was based on 1970 characteristics of urban areas, and the patrol/population ratio would not have been affected much by updating.

\(^3\) The exception, a Los Angeles suburb, resembles a central city more than it does most suburbs.

\(^4\) Data were not collected in any cities in Keeler-Rogers groups 3 or 4.

\(^5\) These brief descriptions are somewhat simplistic and do not do justice to the wealth of information used by Keeler and Rogers in their cluster analysis.
Table 4
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF ACTIVE PATROLS BY SITE
RANKED ACCORDING TO PATROLS PER POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Patrols</th>
<th>1970 Population (1000)</th>
<th>Patrons per 100,000 Population</th>
<th>Keeler-Rogers Group Number&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington city</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (Brooklyn)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles suburb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit city</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington suburb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit suburb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas suburb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>193</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The number denotes the Keeler-Rogers (1973) cluster in which the city falls.

<sup>b</sup>n.a. = not applicable.

consists of big cities with large black ghettos ringed by prosperous white suburbs. Group 1 consists of relatively old southern cities, less dense than the average, with differentiated suburbs. Prosperous growth cities had few patrols; the same was true for Worcester, which was selected as an example of northern cities with a declining white population.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Of course, these urban characteristics also tend to be related to crime rates, and it might well be that a comparison between crime statistics and patrol formation would reveal a stronger match than a comparison with economic and demographic characteristics. Our data collection was not ideally suited to such a study, since we were more
To make rough estimates of the total number of resident patrols in urban areas of the United States, we applied the average number of patrols per population for groups 7, 10, and 1 to the central-city population of other cities in the corresponding group, and we applied the average number of patrols per population for all other study cities to the remaining central-city population. (Although some sample sites had no active patrols, it is not realistic to conclude from this that none of the cities in their cluster had any patrols, so for this estimate we used the average patrol/population ratio for clusters 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9.) This schema is shown in Table 5.

The resulting estimate for the total number of patrols is 835. This figure is somewhat conservative because of the two assumptions on which it is based: (1) that there are no patrols outside the 125 largest urban areas (i.e., that 40 percent of the population of the United States lives in areas with no patrols) and (2) that cities in the two Keeler-Rogers groups for which we did not collect data (cities like South Bend and Knoxville) have, on the average, 0.24 patrols per 100,000 population. A less conservative estimate is obtained from assuming that by averaging the patrol/population ratio for all the cities we studied we obtain a suitable estimate for the two missing groups. This assumption yields an estimated total of 892 patrols.

Various other methods used to estimate the total number of patrols\(^1\) yielded approximately the same result. Thus, it is reasonable interested in the details of patrols than in their numbers. However, a cross-sectional analysis of the correlates of patrol formation would be useful future research. It would entail determining the total number of patrols in more cities than we studied, and collecting crime data concerning the particular neighborhoods in which the patrols are located. In the cities with few patrols, our contacts in police departments and other units of government usually indicated that these agencies do not actively foster the formation of patrols. Thus, activities of such agencies may well be a primary explanatory factor.

\(^1\)Other methods included: (a) applying the sample estimate for a Keeler-Rogers group (even if it is zero) to all other cities in the group, and (b) assuming the patrol/population ratio in suburban areas is a fixed fraction of the ratio for the corresponding city.
Table 5
ONE METHOD OF ESTIMATING THE NUMBER OF PATROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Sites</th>
<th>Average Number of Patrols per 100,000 Population</th>
<th>Applies Also to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (city)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (Brooklyn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jersey City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York (other boroughs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Orleans

|                      | 1.69                                             | Augusta                          |
|                      |                                                  | Columbia                          |
|                      |                                                  | Baton Rouge                       |
|                      |                                                  | Greensboro                        |
|                      |                                                  | Beaumont                          |
|                      |                                                  | Greenville                        |
|                      |                                                  | Birmingham                        |
|                      |                                                  | Jackson                           |
|                      |                                                  | Charleston                        |
|                      |                                                  | Jacksonville                      |
|                      |                                                  | Charlotte                         |
|                      |                                                  | Mobile                            |
|                      |                                                  | Chattanooga                       |
|                      |                                                  | Nashville                         |
|                      |                                                  | Oklahoma City                     |

Houston
Norfolk
San Diego
San Jose
Worcester

|                      | 0.24                                             | All other central cities in urban areas with over 250,000 population |

Suburbs in sample

|                      | 0.39                                             | Parts of urban areas not in central cities |

\[1\] This estimate implies that in our fieldwork we identified over 20 percent of them and collected data for over 10 percent of them.
larger than has been suggested by any previous studies and indicates that resident patrols are a fairly common phenomenon.\(^1\) Such a universe has important implications for any national evaluation of resident patrols. There is no central source of information about these patrols, as there is for nationally coordinated programs such as Neighborhood Watch; therefore, each site would have to be studied individually, and the search procedures would take a substantial amount of field effort and time.

\[\text{B. PATROL CHARACTERISTICS}\]

**Life Expectancy of Patrols**

For each patrol in our sample we determined the year in which it began operations and, if defunct, the year it ended.\(^2\) It is possible to estimate the life expectancy of patrols on the basis of the current age of active patrols. For this purpose, one needs to determine the cumulative distribution of the ages of patrols, which

---

\(^1\)To supplement our site-specific search for patrols, we examined a number of articles in newspapers, as well as national and city magazines and compiled a list of resident patrols. To be included in the list, the crime prevention activity had to fall within the definitional constraints described in Chapter I. Much of the information was too sparse for an easy decision as to whether or not the activity should be included in the list; in such cases, the activity in question was included in the final list. The 66 patrols identified on this basis are cited in Appendix F. Three cities—New York, Chicago, and Washington—have many more listings than the other cities; this is probably attributable in part to the nature of the articles, many of which came from sources in these cities, i.e., *The New York Times* and *New York, Chicago, and Washingtonian* magazines. This exercise also suggested the existence of many more patrols than are commonly mentioned in the literature.

\(^2\)While the defunct patrols are the only ones for which we know the total lifetime, data from such patrols are unsuitable for making lifetime estimates for all patrols, first, because there were few defunct patrols in our sample and, second, because they were not randomly selected. In fact, for the most part we avoided collecting information about patrols known to be defunct and excluded them from our universe.
is the function

\[ F_A(t) = \text{Prob} (\text{age} > t). \]

Since our interviews were conducted approximately three-fourths of the way through 1975, we assumed roughly that all active patrols started in 1974 and earlier were more than 0.75 years old, all those started in 1973 and earlier were more than 1.75 years old, etc. In other words, the data can be interpreted as providing observations on \( F_A(t) \) for \( t = 0.75, 1.75, 2.75, \text{etc.} \) Table 6 shows how many of the 85 active patrols in our sample were in existence in each year.

**Table 6**

**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF ACTIVE PATROLS IN SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Started in Year</th>
<th>Number Started in Year or Earlier</th>
<th>Fraction Started in Year or Earlier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 is a graph of the numbers in the last column of Table 6 (shown on semilog coordinates). The data reveal an approximately exponential decrease in \( F_A(t) \) for \( t \) between 0 and 15 years (an exponential decrease is a straight line in the graph), followed by a much slower rate of decrease for \( t > 15 \) years. This finding can be interpreted in several ways:

1. The age distribution of the patrols is actually exponential with the slope indicated by the data from 1960-1975, but the data from earlier years happen (by chance) not to fit the distribution very well.

2. The nature of patrols formed prior to the early 1960s was substantially different from those formed in recent years, or the rate at which patrols were formed was different. In this case, we should simply ignore the data for earlier years in estimating the lifetime of current patrols. (This interpretation is consistent with what is known about the rise of resident patrol activities in the early 1960s.)

3. Among the patrols now forming are a small number that are similar to the still active pre-1960 patrols and will have a much longer average lifetime than most patrols. Thus, patrols consist of two groups, each with its own exponentially distributed lifetime.

Under either of the first two interpretations, we would conclude that currently forming patrols have an age distribution of the form

\[
F_A(t) = e^{-t/T},
\]

where the constant \( T \), determined from fitting the data (as shown by the straight line in Fig. 2), is approximately 5.4 years. In this case it can be shown that the distribution of lifetimes is exactly the same as the distribution of ages. Thus, patrols last an average of 5.4 years, and the probability of lasting longer than any specified number of years can be read from Fig. 2. Selected values from the graph are given in Table 7.
Fig. 2 — Age distribution of active patrols
Table 7

ESTIMATED LIFETIME DISTRIBUTION
ASSUMING EXPONENTIAL AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years (N)</th>
<th>% of Patrols Older than N Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the lifetime $L$ is determined from the age distribution by assuming that patrols are started at the same rate in every year.\(^1\) (If the rate of occurrence of patrols had varied substantially over the last decade, for example, rising rapidly and then dropping, we would not have found an exponential distribution of current ages of patrols.) Under this assumption, it follows from principles of renewal theory (see, for example, Kleinrock, 1975) that the lifetime distribution is related to the age distribution by the equation

$$F_A(t) = \int_t^\infty F_L(x) \frac{dx}{\bar{L}} ,$$

where $\bar{L}$ is the average lifetime. In case $F_L$ is exponential, the equation shows that $F_A = F_L$.

However, if we adopt the third interpretation above, namely that there are two groups of patrols, then the lifetime distribution has the form

$$F_L(t) = \beta e^{-t/\tau_1} + (1 - \beta) e^{-t/\tau_2} ,$$

---

\(^1\)Technically, this means that patrol starting dates constitute a Poisson process with a fixed occurrence rate. This, of course, is only approximately correct.
where \( \beta \) is the fraction of patrols in the group with the short average lifetime \( T_1 \). Performing the integration to obtain \( F_A \) yields

\[
F_A(t) = a e^{-t/T_1} + (1 - a) e^{-t/T_2},
\]

with \( a = \beta T_1 / [\beta T_1 + (1 - \beta) T_2] \).

It can be seen from Fig. 2 that for \( t > 23 \) the term \( a e^{-t/T_1} \) must be so small that it can be ignored; therefore the data points for \( t > 23 \) years on this figure follow the curve \( (1 - a) e^{-t/T_2} \). By fitting these data, \( a \) and \( T_2 \) can be determined. Then the data points for \( t < 23 \) years determine \( T_1 \). The result is

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha &= 0.9 \\
T_1 &= 3.9 \\
T_2 &= 45.8
\end{align*}
\]

From this one can calculate that \( \beta = 0.99 \). In other words, 99 percent of patrols are from a group having an average lifetime of 3.9 years, and 1 percent are from a group with an average lifetime of 45.8 years.\(^1\) This interpretation leads to a good fit to the data, as shown in Fig. 3, and therefore appears to be more persuasive than any other interpretation.

The average lifetime according to this interpretation is \( \beta T_1 + (1 - \beta) T_2 = 4.3 \) years, and the distribution of lifetimes is as shown in Table 8. Having examined the data under three different interpretations, we believe that patrols last on the average around 4 to 5-1/2 years, more than half cease to operate within 4 years, and fewer than 15 percent of them survive for more than 10 years.

**Patrol Origins**

The patrols emerged from a variety of neighborhood conditions and as a result of a variety of resident motivations. Many patrols

---

\(^1\)The calculation points out that long-lived patrols can constitute a fairly sizable proportion of all the patrols found by sampling (about 10 percent in our data), but are actually atypical of the patrols that form in any given year (only 1 percent by our estimate).
Fig. 3 — Age distribution of active patrols with fit curve

\[ F_A(t) = 0.9e^{-t/3.9} + 0.1e^{-t/45.8} \]
Table 8

ESTIMATED LIFETIME DISTRIBUTION
ASSUMING TWO GROUPS OF PATROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years (N)</th>
<th>% of Patrols Older than N Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ........</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ........</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ........</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ........</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ........</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ........</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 ........</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ........</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were initiated because of serious crime problems in the neighborhood; others were started where residents wanted to maintain a prior level of low crime incidence. In a few cases, the patrols were begun after residents had checked with the police and decided that a patrol activity was the only available course of action. In other cases, the patrols emerged out of a natural interest among residents having citizen-band radios. We believe this is important because the burgeoning interest in citizen-band radios suggests there may be more patrols of this nature in the future. The most often encountered precondition for the initiation of a particular type of patrol effort appeared to be the level of crime prevailing in a given area. Generally, except in the case of public housing, building patrols tended to emerge for preventive purposes in relatively low crime areas, whereas neighborhood patrols more frequently emerged in areas that were experiencing a rash of crimes or a serious, chronic crime problem.

Table 9 shows the distribution of patrols according to the racial composition and general income levels of the neighborhood, based on the respondent's best estimation of these characteristics. The figures in the table are our estimates for the study universe of 226 patrols (not the United States universe of 800 to 900 patrols).  

\[1\]

---

1A tabulation for the active patrols is basically similar and may be determined from the "Total" column in Table 12, below.
Although 35 percent of the patrols were found in public housing (and hence low-income) projects, just about half were found in middle-income and high-income neighborhoods. Similarly, there were roughly equal numbers of patrols located in white neighborhoods and neighborhoods with large black minorities (or a black majority). Naturally, these findings may be biased by the sites selected, mainly large central cities, but a tentative conclusion from this distribution is that patrols can be found in neighborhoods of all income levels, both white and racially mixed.

Table 9

DISTRIBUTION OF PATROLS BY NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS
(estimate for all patrols in study sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Neighborhood</th>
<th>General Income Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially mixed(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically mixed(^b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined or unknown (^c)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Inclusion in this category indicates an estimate that at least one-third of the residents are black.

\(^b\) Inclusion in this category indicates an estimate that at least one-third of the residents are members of a white ethnic group.

\(^c\) Inclusion in this category indicates an estimate that both racial and ethnic minorities are present, or that pockets exist within the area patrolled, each of which is inhabited by a different type of minority.
Type of Patrol

We classified the study patrols into the categories of building, neighborhood, social service, and community protection patrols, as defined in Chapter II. Although we found no active community protection patrols in this study, we obtained a narrative for a defunct one. Furthermore, two active patrols included in the sample would at early stages of their history have been classified as community protection patrols. Among those in the building patrol category, we estimated that half covered a single building only, while the other half covered several buildings (including, in some cases, the area adjacent to the buildings). Three-fourths of the latter were public housing projects; the remainder were private streets in middle- or upper-income white neighborhoods.

The relative frequency of each of these categories varied substantially by geographical region, as is shown in Table 10. Social service patrols were most common in the South Atlantic area, and building (more particularly, public housing) patrols were most common in the Northeast. No active social service patrols were found in the South Central region.

Table 10
THREE TYPES OF PATROLS BY REGION
(estimate for active patrols in study sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Type of Patrol</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Entries do not add to totals due to estimation procedure and rounding.
Data showing whether patrol members were paid or volunteers exhibited even more striking variations by geographical region (see Table 11). Twelve of the 13 paid resident patrols were found in the South Atlantic region, and all patrols in the South Central states were hired guards. This distribution strongly suggests that any study conducted in only one geographical region would have little applicability elsewhere, an observation that is important for designing a national evaluation.

Table 11

PAID VS. VOLUNTEER PATROL MEMBERSHIP BY REGION
(estimate for active patrols in study site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Nature of Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total^a</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aEntries do not add to totals due to rounding.

In Table 12, we break down the types of patrols by neighborhood characteristics. This is similar to Table 3 (p. 33), which applies to the narratives only. By comparison, the extent to which patrols with narratives are not collectively representative of all patrols may be observed.

Cost and Organizational Affiliation

The average annual costs of patrol operations are difficult to estimate. We asked each respondent to estimate the annual costs (excluding major capital expenditures), and in a few cases the
Table 12
PAID VS. VOLUNTEER PATROL MEMBERSHIP
BY NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS
(estimate for active patrols
in study sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Description</th>
<th>Nature of Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially mixed low-income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White low-income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially mixed middle-income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White middle-income</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined or unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondent had records to corroborate the estimate.1 For the most part, the estimates we used should be considered rough ones. Because of the uncertain nature of the data, we did not attempt to attribute sample characteristics to the universe. Table 13 shows these estimates for the 109 patrols studied, along with the distribution of the patrols according to their organizational affiliation, if any. The cost estimates suggest a bimodal distribution—many patrols incur few costs (less than $1,000 per year), but other patrols may be quite expensive (more than $10,000 per year). As might be expected, the most expensive patrols included a preponderance of

1 Any future research on resident patrols will have to develop better methods.
hired residents or guards. About half of the patrols were part of some neighborhood association; patrols without organizational affiliation were usually those with low costs.

Table 13
PATROL EXPENDITURES AND ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION
(tabulated from patrol profiles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Annual Cost ($)</th>
<th>Organizational Affiliation of Patrol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 to 5,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 to 10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patrol Membership

The size of patrol membership is one indicator of the scale of the patrol effort. However, patrol size is a complex concept not entirely reflected by the number of members, since patrols may operate for different amounts of time each day and for different days of the week. In addition, the membership of many of the patrols may be quite informal, so that the number of members itself is not an easy figure to define. Subsequent research should develop a measure of the scale of the patrol effort based on the total patrol time worked by each patrol member.

Our data concerning patrol size showed that organizations that paid residents or hired guards usually had under 10 members, and always under 20. Volunteer patrols fell roughly equally into the following categories: under 25 members, 26-50 members, 51-75 members, and over 75 members.
LEAA and Other Financial Support

Only six of the patrols indicated any financial support from LEAA. Ten or so indicated financial support from the mayor's office, some of whose funds may have come indirectly from LEAA. Overall, however, the profiles suggest that most of the patrols are carried out without any direct support from public sources. Even some public housing patrols were organized on a volunteer basis and hence incurred nominal costs. Most of the patrols relied on association fees, voluntary contributions, or fund-raising drives to provide financial support.

C. PATROL OUTCOMES

The remaining questions posed by the SPA officials deal with more complex facets of the patrol experiences, including training, equipment, and the relationship to the police, but focusing mainly on the outcomes of the patrol efforts. We have chosen to deal with these issues by relying on the information from (1) the 32 patrols that were interviewed intensively and (2) existing evaluation reports. The discussion is organized according to the patrol typology described in Chapter II: building patrols, neighborhood patrols, social service patrols, and community protection groups. These four types of patrols appear to produce different types of outcomes. Table 14 lists the patrols in this study by type, project name and location, and source of information (i.e., one of the 32 narratives\(^1\) or one of the available evaluations). Throughout the discussion of each patrol type, these patrol projects will be referred to (in parentheses) as illustrative examples\(^2\) of points being made in the text. The outcomes to be reviewed are the six identified in Chapter II: crime reduction, changes in the residents' sense of security, police-

\(^1\)See R. K. Yin et al., R-1912/2-DOJ.

\(^2\)These references do not include all narratives that support a given point, but merely provide examples of cases that support the argument being made.
Table 14
PATROLS DESCRIBED IN INTERVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS
BY TYPE, NAME, AND LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Patrol</th>
<th>Field Interviews</th>
<th>Evaluations&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building patrols</td>
<td>Belle Isle (New Orleans)</td>
<td>Cuyahoga (Cleveland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brigadoon Manors (D.C.)</td>
<td>Low-Income Towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadmoor (Baltimore)</td>
<td>(New York City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burbank Mews (New Orleans)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casa Vargas (Boston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenwick Lane (Baltimore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor View (Boston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayberry Glen (D.C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis Housing Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Rosa (San Diego)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood patrols</td>
<td>Avalon (Chicago)</td>
<td>Beachview (N.Y.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azalea Hills (Norfolk)</td>
<td>Childguard (N.Y.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belmont (Baltimore)</td>
<td>Loch Raven (Baltimore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomfield (New Orleans)</td>
<td>Safeblock (N.Y.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boonton (St. Louis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burwick (D.C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian Observation (Chicago)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Hills (Houston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Park (Detroit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millbank (Brooklyn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangefield (Boston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stapleton Place (Boston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thornton Heights (Baltimore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voorsted Park (Brooklyn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54th Ward (Brooklyn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>Bay Youth (D.C.)</td>
<td>Bromley-Heath (Boston)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrols</td>
<td>Caldwell Township (Detroit)</td>
<td>Community Patrol (N.Y.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Neighborhood Safety Team (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>Hartford Security (Hartford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORPS (Detroit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livingston (Detroit)</td>
<td>WEFF (Grand Rapids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triquonic (Newark)</td>
<td>Youth Courtesy (D.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community protection</td>
<td>Alliance for Safety (New Orleans)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The full citations to these evaluation reports are given in the site-specific section of the Bibliography, listed under the name of the appropriate city.
community relations, police coverage, dysfunctional outcomes, and effects on citizen participation.

Building Patrols

The main objective of building patrols is the protection of specific buildings and their adjacent grounds or of private residential compounds. The buildings or compounds protected may vary from high-income, high-rise dwellings (Santa Rosa, Harbor View) to low-income housing for the elderly (Broadmoor Towers, Fenwick Lane) to detached houses whose only access is from a private road (Burbank Mews). The patrol may operate on foot, only within and immediately around a building (Broadmoor Towers, Santa Rosa), or may use a car to cover an entire residential complex (St. Louis Housing Authority).

Whatever the physical setting, building patrols are a distinctive type of resident patrol for several reasons. First, the patrols operate in an area in which local police activity is minimal. Local police are seldom concerned with the protection of specific buildings; this means that a building patrol may be expected to have little field contact, if any, with the police. Second, the building patrol is generally supervised by an official organization that in some way represents the tenants of the buildings being protected. Such organizations include public housing authorities, tenants' associations, homeowners' associations, and management services that maintain the building on behalf of a tenants' association. In one case, a housing authority had organized over 800 volunteers to serve in 20 high-rise projects (Cuyahoga).

Third, the main duties of the patrol are related to the goal of preventing crime and keeping unwanted strangers out of buildings or the immediate area. Surveillance is often made easier by the existence of fences, walls, natural barriers, or isolation from the surrounding community (Brigadoon Manors). The patrol typically involves a guard stationed at a building entrance or gate who admits (signs in and checks credentials of) visitors and watches for suspicious activities, often with the aid of television monitors and other electronic aids. Fourth, except for public housing projects, patrol
members are usually paid guards. Paid guards may be selected from among residents (Brigadoon Manors, St. Louis Housing Authority), or they may be furnished on a contractual basis by a private security firm (Casa Vargas, Harbor View).

These four distinctive features of building patrols appear to make a difference in the types of outcomes that can be expected from the patrols, as well as to provide some explanation for the outcomes reported in our project narratives.

**Crime Reduction.** Because the patrols operate around specific buildings, and because their main purpose is to protect the residents of these buildings, the crime reduction impact of a building patrol is, in principle, not difficult to measure. In other words, measurement is facilitated by the fact that the universe of residents being protected is well defined.

At the same time, most of the building patrols in our study were not formed in response to a crime problem in the building. Only a few of the buildings (Casa Vargas, St. Louis Housing Authority) had any serious residential crimes before their patrols were formed. In the other cases, the patrols emerged as a preventive measure and were able to maintain a fairly crime-free environment. Prevention appeared especially important when the building was located in a neighborhood that was perceived to be unsafe. The lack of a prior history of crime problems within a building, however, makes it difficult to assess most of these building patrols on the basis of reductions in crime incidents, or even on the basis of the seriousness of any single crime incident. Most building patrols had encountered no crime-related incidents (Broadmoor, Fenwick, Santa Rosa, Burbank Mews, Brigadoon Manors, Cuyahoga). Others reported such minor incidents as calling the police to remove a drunk (Casa Vargas, Harbor View). Only two patrols reported dealing with domestic quarrels and other confrontations of a more serious nature (St. Louis Housing Authority, Mayberry Glen).

As a result, there was little effort in the available evaluations of building patrols to assess the actual levels of crime or victimization among the residents. Generally, crime reduction was
simply not a relevant outcome. Even in those few cases where the patrols had been initiated because of crimes or vandalism in the building, there was still no systematic attempt to assess the effect of the patrol, although the patrol coordinators and local police usually felt that crime had declined (St. Louis Housing Authority).

Few experiences among the patrols suggested any factors consistently related to crime reduction. A possible exception was the level of publicity received by the patrol and the visibility of its members. The patrols were generally uniformed and conspicuous by virtue of being stationed at the building entrance. Furthermore, in most cases the patrols were on 24-hour duty. Because a building area is fairly confined, intensive and visible patrolling can be carried out by a small patrol and hence need not involve high costs. The regular police occasionally commented that, because of patrol visibility, crime was less likely to occur (Burbank Mews, Fenwick, Harbor View).

One characteristic that was definitely difficult to relate to effective crime reduction or prevention was the degree to which the patrol members were armed. In most of the patrols in our study, the guards were reported to be unarmed, carrying neither firearms, billyclubs, nor even handcuffs. The ability of patrol members to intervene in a crime was thus no greater than that of any other witness; most guards were instructed to call the manager's office or the police in response to an incident. The unarmed patrols were generally to be found where crime had not been a serious problem. Patrols whose members carried some weapon, in contrast, usually had been formed as a result of crimes in the buildings (St. Louis Housing Authority, Casa Vargas, Belle Isle).

Sense of Security. The well-defined universe of residents being protected again makes it possible, in principle, to measure improvements in residents' sense of security.\(^1\) Our study made no formal survey of residents' attitudes; patrol personnel and police, however,

\(^1\)In some cases, the residents of a building may include the perpetrators of crime in that area. It is, of course, not the sense of security of the perpetrators but that of the victims of crimes and of other residents which patrols seek to improve.
indicated that the building patrols were often able to serve as an immediate source of assistance when residents needed help (Fenwick Lane, Santa Rosa). In one project (Fenwick Lane), residents could use an emergency switch in each apartment to call the patrol.

The visibility of the building patrols, both in their predictable deployment at some desk or station and in their uniformed presence, appeared to be a positive factor in increasing the residents' sense of security. The only complaints mentioned by our respondents were related to patrol behavior that only marginally affected residents' sense of security. Sleeping or drinking on the job, discourtesy, and incompetence were among the most frequent complaints (Burbank Mews, Harbor View, Casa Vargas). These complaints, it should be pointed out, probably resulted from the fact that many of the patrols were paid guards from whom better service had been expected.

Police-Community Relations and Police Coverage. These outcomes are discussed together because with one major exception, neither appears to be important in assessing building patrols. Inasmuch as the local police do not, as a rule, protect specific buildings, they are not usually consulted when the building patrols are established. Moreover, once the patrol has begun operations, there is minimal contact in the field between the patrol members and the regular police. This general lack of contact at either the planning or operational level is one reason that few changes in coverage are also likely to be minimal.

The one major exception has to do with large public housing projects that have had some history of apparently inadequate coverage by the local police (Casa Vargas, St. Louis Housing Authority, Mayberry Glen). In these situations, the patrols had been formed in part because of inadequate police coverage and because police-community relations had not been satisfactory. Racial or linguistic differences between the residents and the police might have contributed to this poor relationship. Under these circumstances, according to a few reports, the formation of a building patrol had helped to improve police-community relations. In one case, the
police undertook responsibility for training the patrol members at the police academy (St. Louis Housing Authority); in return, the police felt that they could call on the building patrol to assist them when they responded to a call in the project. These reports, of course, are based on only fragmentary evidence; further research on this particular outcome would be helpful.

**Vigilante Behavior.** The building patrols had few reports of vigilantism (e.g., reports of citizen harassment or overzealous activity by the patrol). Most of the complaints about these patrols, as noted above, had to do with the unsatisfactory performance of duties by patrol members; in at least one case, the result was that the private security company hired for the service was replaced (Casa Vargas). In one case (Belle Isle), there was a complaint that the guard was too aggressive, but the complaint referred only to his attempts to reduce radio and television noise in the building.

The lack of vigilantism may be attributable in part to the fact that building patrols are usually sponsored by an organization officially representing the residents or tenants. This auspice provides the patrol with a degree of legitimacy that reduces the likelihood of the patrol's being unwelcome; the continued supervision of the patrol by the organization means that the residents have some control, although sometimes only indirectly, over the patrol members' behavior and tenure. These conditions appear to reduce the likelihood of dysfunctions and to result in few complaints of patrol abuse or vigilantism.

**Citizen Participation.** Possibly because building patrols tended to be organized by an existing citizen organization or public housing authority, the formation of the patrol appeared to have little, if any, effect on citizen participation. There were no instances among our cases where the formation of a building patrol eventually led to other organized activities or projects on the part of the residents.

**Conclusions.** Building patrols attempt to regulate access to specific buildings chiefly by stationing a guard at the entrance; only occasionally do they include foot or automobile patrols among their duties. The most significant finding regarding building patrols is
the scarcity of evidence from previous research regarding their outcomes. However, on the basis of incident reports and other anecdotal accounts, and despite the paucity of evidence, a few tentative conclusions may be drawn. First, building patrols may reduce crime and increase residents' sense of security. The fact that areas protected by building patrols are small and enclosed may facilitate the effective screening and identification of intruders or potential troublemakers. Further, although previous research includes no extensive survey research or behavioral observations, anecdotal evidence suggests that residents feel safer in the presence of visible building patrols. Public housing raises a few exceptions dealt with below.

Second, building patrols are the subject of few complaints or reports of vigilantism. The fact that building patrols are frequently sponsored by organizations representing the residents being protected appears to legitimize these patrols in carrying out their work. The findings of previous research and the fieldwork for this study were in agreement that virtually all complaints regarding these patrols were minor and that paid guards who performed poorly were replaced.

Third, changes in police coverage and police-community relations did not generally ensue from building patrol activity. Because these patrols operate in areas in which the police tend not to patrol, there is little reason for the patrol to maintain contact with the police and little, if any, prior police coverage is likely to be affected.

Fourth, public housing patrols raise a few exceptions both in terms of the crime problem they face and the relation between residents and the local police. The crime problem in public housing, unlike that in wealthier areas, may be largely an internal one (Fairley and Liechenstein, 1971). Although some crime is perpetrated by intruders and can be prevented by monitoring the access to a building, additional measures may be required to abate crime effected by residents themselves. Further, public housing patrols sometimes do affect police-community relations and police coverage. In several projects, patrols were called to assist local police when a crime was reported. By mediating encounters between police and residents, patrols appear to have helped to ease relations, with the result
that police encounter less hostility from residents and respond more readily to calls from the project.

**Neighborhood Patrols**

Neighborhood patrols, in contrast to building patrols, usually have a poorly defined area of surveillance. The area may cover many blocks, may not have strict boundaries, and may not be patrolled as intensively as are buildings. Few neighborhood patrols, for instance, are on duty 24 hours a day. Moreover, because neighborhood patrols cover mainly the streets and other public areas rather than buildings, the patrols frequently coordinate their activities with those of the local police, and there is likely to be more field contact between the patrol and the police. Finally, because of the neighborhood patrol's difficulty in distinguishing residents who belong to the area from those who are strangers, it also must operate somewhat differently from the building patrol. Whereas the building patrol may concentrate on screening strangers and keeping them off the premises, the neighborhood patrol can focus only on observed behaviors that appear undesirable or suspicious, a task that requires more judgment; the task may also easily lead to the reporting of embarrassing false alarms to the police or to the perception by other residents that the patrol has been unnecessarily provocative.

Beyond these general characteristics, neighborhood patrols can take a wide variety of forms. The patrols are found in neighborhoods of different income levels and ethnic composition. The patrols may be on foot or in cars. The patrol may cover certain areas in relation to such activities as children walking to and from school (Childguard), or the patrol may watch the streets from a strategic vantage point inside an apartment (Safeblock). In most cases, however, neighborhood patrols cover their beat in an automobile. The car may be marked or unmarked, manned by a volunteer or a private security guard, and follow a regular or irregular routine. In most cases, when the patrol observes a suspicious incident, it merely reports the observation by radio to a base station or to the police (Thornton Heights, Boonton, Millbank, 54th Ward, Stapleton Place,
Civilian Observation Patrol). In some cases, an armed patrol will itself intervene (Lincoln Park, Bloomfield, Forest Hills, Burwick). In one case (Rangefield), the patrol covered a small area; on observing a suspicious incident, the patrol would blow a whistle to call the police.

These characteristics of neighborhood patrols both distinguish them from building patrols and establish constraints on any evaluation of them. More of the six outcomes are relevant than was the situation with the building patrols.

Crime Reduction. The majority of the neighborhood patrols emerged in relation to a chronic or severe crime problem in the neighborhood (e.g., burglaries, purse snatchings, and undesirable juvenile activities). One high-income neighborhood had been the scene of robberies, rapes, and even murder (Bloomfield). The patrol was formed as part of a neighborhood association, and extra fees were collected to hire guards through a private security company. In another case, an increase in crime or perceived danger in the neighborhood led citizen-band radio buffs to organize a mobile patrol that took advantage of their radio expertise (Civilian Observation Patrol).

There were a few cases in our study, however, where neighborhood patrols had begun even though there was no crime problem, with the patrol emerging because of a desire to prevent any increase in crime (Boonton, Burwick, Azalea Hills, Lincoln Park).

The nature of the area covered by the neighborhood— in contrast to the building—patrols makes it difficult to assess changes in crime incidence. First, the area patrolled is usually smaller than and not coterminous with areas for which police statistics are kept. Second, even if the boundary problem could be overcome, any changes in crimes reported to the police would be difficult to interpret because successful patrol efforts could result in an increase or a decrease in the proportion of crimes reported. Third, in most cases the patrols have operated for too short a period or too intermittently to expect that their effects would be measurable by any
aggregate statistics.\textsuperscript{1} Fourth, the universe of residents being protected is not well defined as it was in the case of the building patrols, and any victimization survey might not cover the right respondents. For all these reasons, it is not surprising that only a few of the existing patrol evaluations made any attempt to analyze the patrol's effect on crime reduction. One evaluation found no effect on the crime rate in the area, but the evaluation was faulty to the extent that the crime rates in the other areas of the city were not presented, so that the analysis did not establish any baseline expectation for the crime trends in the neighborhood (Loch Raven).

An alternative way of examining the neighborhood patrol's effect on crime is to determine the types of incidents that the patrol has encountered. The patrols in our study had intervened in numerous incidents, often quite serious in nature. Many had intervened in burglaries in progress (Millbank, Lincoln Park, Bloomfield, Forest Hills, Belmont, Safeblock). Two (Bloomfield, Civilian Observation Patrol) claimed frequent calls to the police (one or two per night), as well as responses to police calls for assistance for an officer in distress. Other patrol activities included dealing with vandalism and theft, dispersing teen gangs, and settling family disputes. Since the patrols usually receive no feedback from the police regarding the disposition of an incident reported to the police, whether the patrol called the police directly or via a base station (Boonton), the actual frequency and severity of incidents validly reported cannot be satisfactorily documented. In one case (Civilian Observation Patrol), a patrol member reported seeing a suspected rapist on the street (the police had previously circulated a picture of the suspect); he read the next morning in the newspaper that the rapist had been apprehended, but never found out whether his tip had been the correct one. The provision of such feedback would certainly raise the incentives for patrol members, as well as provide guidance about the quality of the patrol's work. In summary, however, there was little evidence on which to base the patrol's overall effect on crime reduction.

\textsuperscript{1}In one existing evaluation, the analysis sought differences in crime rates for a small area on the basis of a patrol that had operated for only four days (Community Patrol Corps).
In spite of this inability to assess formally the overall effect, one can point to a few features of patrol operations that may influence a patrol’s success in preventing crime. Close supervision of the patrol and direct accountability to a residents’ organization or association seem to enhance a patrol’s crime reduction capability (Lincoln Park, Forest Hills, Burwick). Systematic training of patrol members in the procedures for observing and reporting incidents (as opposed to those situations where the members are merely trained by riding around with a more experienced member) may also improve the crime reduction capability. Similarly, the use of an unmarked car by a mobile patrol may increase the likelihood of the patrol’s having the opportunity to intervene in a crime such as burglary. However, the use of weapons again does not appear to be a consistent correlate of the patrol’s ability to deal with most types of residential crime, as both armed (Bloomfield) and unarmed (54th Ward, Stapleton Place) patrols reported having dealt with serious incidents.

**Sense of Security.** A neighborhood patrol may have either of two quite different effects on the residents’ sense of security. On the one hand, the patrol may increase the sense of security of its members. This appears to occur especially in those cases where the patrol was initiated by a small group of residents who themselves had been the victims of crime, or felt they were directly threatened by increases in crime (Safeblock, Thornton). The patrol activity in such cases appeared to lead to a heightened sense of security because the patrol provided a systematic way of calling for help. On the other hand, the same patrol may have a neutral or even negative effect on the sense of security of the other residents of the community (Safeblock, Thornton, Belmont). This may be reflected in complaints by the residents that the patrol unnecessarily stirs fears, harasses residents, or otherwise acts in a suspicious, vigilante-like manner (Azalea Hills, Voorsted Park).

There was, however, no systematic evidence regarding changes in the sense of security of either the patrol members or the residents. Many patrols had received complaints about their activities from
residents: In one case, residents disapproved of the overzealous behavior of one patrol member (who was subsequently suspended); in another case, teenagers objected to the patrol's breaking up teenage street gatherings. Although such complaints were in the minority in our interviews, the informal comments regarding the increased sense of security attributable to the neighborhood patrols were not as uniformly positive as they had been in the case of the building patrols.

Police-Community Relations. The neighborhood patrols generally did not appear to have a direct effect on police-community relations. One exception (Childguard) occurred when the patrol operated openly and had frequent contact with police in the field. In this case, it was claimed that contact with patrol members eventually led the police to get to know other residents also, and police-community relations thus benefitted. Another exception (Rangefield) occurred when the patrol was able to channel resident complaints to the police, encouraging residents to report suspicious activities and thereby assist the police in their work.

The patrols usually do have a direct effect, in contrast, on patrol-police relations, and to the extent that the patrol represents the community, this relationship may then affect police-community relations. There are several aspects of patrol-police relations. First, if there is little coordination between the patrol and the police, the police may simply be indifferent to or ignore the patrol (Boonton, Millbank); on the other hand, a neighborhood patrol that makes no attempt to coordinate its activities with the police may be perceived by the police to be a potential vigilante group (Safeblock). Second, in some cases where there has been good coordination with the police in the planning and operation of the patrol, the result may be perceived by the residents as following unnecessarily harassing tactics (Thornton). Third, if the patrol is active and assertive, the police may consider it a competitor and may react either by treating the patrol members condescendingly (Lincoln Park), or by trying to recruit patrol members into an auxiliary police unit (54th Ward). Fourth, if the patrol is subservient or plays the role of companion
to the police, the police may perceive the patrol as a buff group rather than as a serious patrol (Azalea Hills).

These subtleties suggest the complex nature of police-patrol relations. We made no attempt to analyze or assess the relations between the patrols in our study and the police. Perhaps the most important aspect of such relations, however, is that the police—by giving or withholding endorsement—can either provide the patrol with a degree of legitimacy or raise questions about its activities.

**Police Coverage.** Once again, the fact that neighborhood patrols operate in the same territory covered by the local police means that these patrols, unlike building patrols, may have some effect on police coverage. As was to be expected, virtually no evidence was available concerning police deployment patterns, either before or after the patrol was formed. In one case, however, it was claimed that patrol activities had helped to educate residents to complain effectively to the police and that as a result an extra policeman had been assigned to the neighborhood on Friday nights (Rangefield). In another case, the police admitted that their coverage of the neighborhood had been curtailed as a result of the effectiveness of the patrol (Stapleton). In a third case where the patrol had apparently been effective, the police claimed that there had nevertheless been no decrease in their coverage of the neighborhood (Bloomfield).

**Vigilante Behavior.** Although for the most part neighborhood patrol activities were accepted by the residents, several patrols were the subject of complaints alleging physical violence or the violation of individual rights. One patrol, seriously criticized by residents for harassing teenagers, was opposed by the local press as being a vigilante group (Azalea Hills). Another patrol (Lincoln Park) learned that it had recruited the leader of a radical rightist group only when the police refused him a concealed weapons permit. Other groups were perceived as having overzealous members who would unnecessarily harass pedestrians (Voorsted Park), antagonize other community groups (Thornton), or irresponsibly use dangerous weapons (Safeblock).

One factor possibly related to these complaints of vigilantism was that the patrol members had generally been recruited on the basis
of clique or friendship. In contrast, the more a patrol had been organized under a broad organizational auspice, the fewer the complaints about vigilante-like behavior. Quite possibly, patrols based on cliques tend to produce this type of behavior because the members use the patrol to pursue narrow self-interests that may conflict with the self-interests of others in the neighborhood, whereas organization-recruited patrols must pursue policies that represent the common interest.

Another possible factor had to do with changes in the crime problem over time. If the patrol had originally been formed in response to a rash of crimes and if the crimes subsequently subsided but the patrol continued to function, the patrol activity often became boring, and total membership dropped. Under these circumstances, however, the remaining patrol members may have been more susceptible to vigilantism (e.g., harassing teenagers) because there was little else to do.

Citizen Participation. Neighborhood patrols appeared to have little effect on citizen participation in other neighborhood activities.\footnote{This was due partially to our separating social service patrols—many of which patrolled neighborhoods—from neighborhood patrols.} A few patrols, however, had some interesting experiences. In one case, participation ultimately increased as the patrol activity was completely preempted by the formation of a neighborhood association, and the patrol voted itself out of existence (Safeblock). In another case, the patrol was one of several functions of an existing neighborhood organization; the patrol maintained signs announcing its presence throughout the neighborhood, helped to educate residents about crime prevention practices, and was able to raise a substantial amount of money to purchase a patrol car and to support the office costs of operating the patrol (Millbank).

Conclusions. Neighborhood patrols operate in broader, less clearly defined areas than building patrols. Although some neighborhood patrols are limited to stationary watch or foot patrol duties, most also include automobile patrolling. The evidence about
neighborhood patrols from previous research is as sparse as that on building patrols. The patrols constitute a small marginal increment to police protection and are distributed thinly over large areas. It is not always clear what resident population should be specified for a patrol evaluation, whether the patrols have a measurable impact, and whether any impact measured could be attributed to the patrol rather than to other influences. On the basis of informal evidence, however, the following tentative statements may be made about the outcomes of neighborhood patrols.

First, it is unclear to what extent neighborhood patrols reduce crime or increase residents' sense of security. Anecdotal evidence suggested that patrols do report to the police numerous crime incidents ranging from assaults and robberies to juvenile pranks. The patrols, however, rarely receive feedback from the police about the disposition of the incident and are often uncertain about the outcome of the report. The anecdotal evidence suggested, regarding residents' sense of security, that neighborhood patrols occasionally generated more unease than did building patrols, primarily because the nature of the patrols' duties was unclear to the residents.

Second, information regarding changes in both police coverage and police-community relations was largely inaccessible. No previous systematic research on these topics was identified. On the basis of the fieldwork, it appears that neighborhood patrols may have no direct effect on police-community relations. Although there is an intermediate outcome in terms of police-patrol relations, the relationship appears to be a complex one requiring further study.

Third, in relation to vigilante behaviors, more serious complaints were raised regarding neighborhood rather than building patrols. Among the factors frequently associated with such behavior were: recruitment on the basis of friendship and operation of voluntary patrols in low crime areas. In the latter case, members tended to grow bored and to seek out more interesting although sometimes illicit activities.
Social Service Patrols

Social service patrols are building or neighborhood patrols that perform social service functions. The main reason for attempting to distinguish this variant type of patrol is that social service patrols tend to have other than crime prevention functions that go beyond the immediate objectives of building or neighborhood patrols.

These functions fall into two main categories. First, the social service patrol may be organized around a variety of community responsibilities, among which patrolling may be only one. The patrol may, for instance, operate an ambulance service (Triquonic), perform civil defense functions, such as giving assistance during a tornado (Livingston, WEFF, Caldwell), or be formally involved in other community projects, such as beautification and clean-up, youth placement, family counseling, food co-ops, and collective gardens (Bromley-Heath). Second, the social service patrol may be organized as much to provide employment opportunities for youths as to perform crime prevention functions (Bay Youth, Community Patrol, Hartford Security). There may be a purposeful attempt to recruit as patrol members youths who are suspected of causing some of the neighborhood's crime problems. In the words of one coordinator, "We try to take the baddest kids on the block and turn them around." Again, although a building or neighborhood patrol's main function may be to reduce crime, its potential employment and cooptation objectives in dealing with youths are sufficiently different to warrant placing it in a different category.

Another reason for separating out these social service patrols is that police and community residents may actually perceive these patrols in a different manner from building or neighborhood patrols. One social service patrol, for instance, had been so active in its civil defense activities that the police claimed not to perceive the patrol's purpose primarily as crime prevention (Livingston). Another patrol, organized as part of the Model Cities program (Hartford), might again have been viewed as part of a community development rather than strictly crime prevention effort.

Because many of the anticipated outcomes of social service patrols are similar to those of building or neighborhood patrols, the following
discussion focuses more on the effects that appeared relevant only for social service patrols.

**Crime Reduction.** The patrol's effect on crime reduction is first related, of course, to whether it operates as a building patrol (Bromley-Heath, Hartford) or as a neighborhood patrol (Livingston, California Neighborhood Safety Team, Bay Youth, Community Patrol, WEFF, CORPS, Youth Courtesy). The same problems of measurement and anticipated effects that were previously discussed in relation to building or neighborhood patrols are relevant, and in this respect the social service patrols did not appear to have had experiences that were significantly different from those of building or neighborhood patrols.

A second major effect on crime reduction was, however, related specifically to social service patrols. Since social service patrols had in a few cases deliberately recruited youthful troublemakers as patrol members, it might be argued that these patrols would have a potentially greater effect on crime reduction than would building and neighborhood patrols. There was little evidence, however, with regard to this potential effect on crime reduction. For example, there was no instance in which youths recruited for the patrol and those eligible but not ultimately recruited were compared for their subsequent criminal activities. Such an analysis could have shed some light on the patrol's presumed effect on crime reduction.

**Sense of Security.** Two existing evaluations of social service patrols had informally sampled residents' attitudes—one by means of retrospective survey questions and the other through comparative analysis of two paired neighborhoods, only one of which was patrolled (Youth Courtesy, WEFF). This information suggested that the visible presence of the social service patrols and their escort services had enhanced residents' feelings of safety, especially among the female respondents. In another case (Triquonic), the existence of a white ethnic patrol may have enhanced feelings of security among the residents of the same ethnic group.

In most cases, the social service patrols might be expected to have a positive effect on residents' sense of security, since the
patrols' duties include emergency assistance and other community services in addition to the patrol function. In these other duties, the patrol members are likely to become acquainted with a larger group of residents, and the residents may perceive the patrol in much the same way that they perceive Red Cross volunteers or other community service groups. To this extent, feelings of security, not only in relation to crime but also in relation to other community hazards, might increase (Livingston, Caldwell).

Police-Community Relations. As with neighborhood patrols, the important effect of social service patrols is not on police-community relations directly, but on patrol-police relations, which in turn may have an effect on police-community relations.

The patrol-police relationship can take both positive and negative forms. Where the social service patrol helped the local police to enter a hostile housing project or neighborhood, the patrol appeared to have had a positive effect on police-community relations because the police felt safer and the residents felt that the police were more responsive (Bromley-Heath). In other cases (Bay Youth, Community Patrol), such police-community hostilities were not overcome, and because the patrol members were accused of being snitches or stoolies, the existence of the social service patrol may only have aggravated relations. In one such case (Community Patrol), field contact between the patrol members and the police was discouraged because of fears that the patrol would become too closely identified with the police.

Another nuance existed in the relationship of one social service patrol and the police, where it was felt that the policemen on the beat enjoyed good relations with the patrol (indeed, some of the policemen were members of the patrol in their off-hours), but the police headquarters disapproved of the patrol and suspected it of having vigilante tendencies. (Other patrols could have had the reverse situation: approved by headquarters police but not welcomed by the precinct police.) Finally, there was one case of potential competition between the patrol's activities and policemen's
opportunities to work overtime (Livingston). These examples all suggest again the complexity of patrol-police relations and the difficulty of drawing any general conclusions about police-community relations on the basis of existing data.

**Police Coverage.** Social service patrols would be expected to have little effect on police coverage, and none of the police interviewed in our study admitted to any changes in deployment patterns as a result of the patrol. Concrete evidence on changes in police deployment patterns, much less analysis of patterns before and after the emergence of a patrol, appeared not to have been included in any previous studies of social service patrols.

**Vigilante Behavior.** Some of the social service patrols appeared vulnerable to the same vigilantism as the neighborhood patrols. In particular, when a patrol had been organized informally by close friends or within one segment of a heterogeneous community, and when there was little formal coordination between the patrol and the police, the patrol was accused of excessively harassing other residents and hence acting somewhat as a vigilante group (Triquonic).

The social service patrols were also vulnerable to another type of problem that appeared related to the youth orientation of the patrol—i.e., that the formation of the patrol could lead to antagonisms between the youths in a neighborhood who had been chosen to join the patrol and those who had not. Because of their knowledge of neighborhood problems and people, the youths who became patrol members could in one sense perform patrol duties more responsively than the local police; but in another sense, the youths could take advantage of their patrol membership to harass other youths in the community. There was no direct evidence that such situations occurred, nor were there any complaints by residents about patrol members' behavior. However, in neighborhoods where there is internal conflict among groups of neighborhood youths, the patrol members may find it difficult to maintain a neutral posture if they have been recruited from these very groups. Alternatively, should they manage to achieve a neutral position, they may become a source of controversy among youths in the neighborhood as some groups harass or assault them.
Citizen Participation. There appeared to be two outcomes concerning citizen participation. The first had to do with the employment function of the youth patrols and the fact that paraprofessional employment is usually regarded as a form of citizen participation. To the extent that the patrols raised hopes among the youths for permanent employment or for opportunities for more advanced positions in doing police work, the social service patrols may have suffered from some of the same problems as other social welfare programs such as Model Cities and manpower programs. In two cases (Hartford, Community Patrol), the patrol members expressed the opinion that the patrol duties should have been permanent or on a full-time basis.

Second, the very classification of a patrol in this group indicates that the patrol had become an organizational nucleus that supported one or more citizen efforts to provide services to their communities.

Conclusions. Social service patrols perform functions similar to those of building and neighborhood patrols; in addition, they undertake tasks not connected with crime prevention, such as community beautification, flood control, and youth employment. As in the case of building and neighborhood patrols, previous research offers little information regarding social service patrol outcomes. The tentative conclusions about this type of patrol, however, are as follows.

First, the evidence about crime reduction or increases in residents' sense of security due to social service patrols is limited in essentially the same fashion as that regarding the two other types of patrols. One important distinction is that social service patrols occasionally attempt to reduce crime by recruiting youthful offenders into their ranks and redirecting the energies of those youths toward crime prevention. Unfortunately, the anecdotal reports contained in the fieldwork do not provide sufficient evidence to comment on the efficacy of this strategy. Previous research on social service patrols did include two informal evaluations that touched on residents' sense of security. These studies suggested fairly widespread familiarity of the social service patrols on the part of
residents and generally positive effects on residents' sense of security. However, in other cases where the patrols were involved mainly with activities other than crime prevention, residents as well as the police may have perceived the patrol as a social service and not genuine crime prevention effort.

Second, evidence concerning patrol effects on police coverage and police-community relations was again inaccessible. Although the fieldwork revealed a complex dynamic of police-community relations, the main possibility appeared to be that, perhaps because of the greater visibility of the social service patrols, both positive and negative outcomes may have been more extreme than in the case of other patrols.

Third, the fieldwork suggested some vigilantism potentially distinctive to social service patrols: Where such patrols had recruited from among the youth factions in the neighborhood, the patrol experience had the potential to become one more occasion for strife among the factions.

Community Protection Patrols

Community protection groups are distinguished by the fact that, in addition to serving as either building or neighborhood patrols and in addition to other social service activities that they may undertake, the groups also monitor the police. The monitoring is carried out because of the group's fear of harassment by the police, based on previous incidents or on a generally antagonistic relationship with the police.

The emergence of community protection groups has been associated mainly with the civil rights movement and urban riots during the 1960s. In particular, several black patrols were formed in Southern cities, often in response to urban disorders, to protect themselves and other black residents from recriminations from the white community. Our fieldwork, however, did not uncover any existing community protection groups at the sites contacted, although community protection groups may well exist among black as well as other inner-city residents. For future research, special efforts would have to be made to locate such groups, as few would easily admit to such activities.
We located the leader of a defunct community protection group and wrote a full narrative about his patrol (Alliance for Safety). The patrol was mainly active in the mid-1960s during the civil rights movement; patrol members were armed to protect black leaders and residents against attacks by the Ku Klux Klan, other white residents, and the police. The patrol, operating as a mobile radio patrol, dealt with constant threats of assassination, as well as harassment. Although the patrol felt that the police were a source of harassment, the current police chief (who was a member of the force at the time) told us that the police provided adequate protection for black residents. Because it is difficult to generalize about community protection groups from this one case, we will not attempt to develop any hypotheses about the outcomes resulting from these efforts.
V. IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of a resident patrol must be analyzed for two reasons. First, implementation factors determine in large measure what outcomes can be expected.\(^1\) Second, an understanding of the implementation process can help policymakers to decide how and when to help resident patrols if it is decided that assistance is appropriate. Earlier studies of resident patrols have largely ignored the implementation problem. Patrols generally have been viewed at a single point in time and as static operational entities. In contrast, this chapter treats several aspects of the implementation experience of resident patrols. The issues considered are the organizational characteristics of the patrol (i.e., factors distinguishing one patrol from another at the same point in time) and organizational change (i.e., factors distinguishing the same patrol at two different points in time). In all cases, our evidence stems from the narratives or other case studies and our comments can be considered suggestive rather than conclusive.

Organizational Characteristics

**Personnel.** The size and the composition of a patrol are important determinants of the coverage the patrol can provide, its legitimacy in the eyes of the community, and its members' proclivities toward vigilant behavior.

The patrols in our sample ranged in size from one to several hundred members. Small patrols frequently tended to be staffed by paid residents or hired guards, and occasionally volunteers. The size of a patrol is directly related to the amount of coverage that is possible. If a patrol uses volunteers, it is especially important to limit coverage so that volunteers are not required to contribute large amounts

\(^1\)Although this may seem to be an obvious point, it has nevertheless been overlooked in a recent study of Project Identification which assessed the program in terms of the observed outcomes and concluded that Project Identification had failed (Heller, 1975). The study failed to make the distinction between conceptual failure and implementation failure.
of time (Thornton Heights, Boonton, Millbank), because excessive demands may cause voluntary members to terminate their participation. The reverse situation, where patrol membership exceeds coverage needs, may pose a special difficulty for patrols that emerge in response to a rash of incidents or a chronic crime problem (Rangefield, Boonton, Safeblock). As the crime problem subsides, members of such groups often become bored and discontented and in some cases, have turned to vigilante-like activities, such as car chases or harassment of teenagers (Azalea Hills, CORPS).

The composition of the patrol is important to its credibility. Patrols that represent cliques within a community or that are not well known may be viewed with suspicion by residents and the police. Two ways in which patrols seem to develop such factional memberships are by recruiting privately through social channels or by selecting applicants purely on the basis of personal preference. The relatively homogeneous cliques that develop in this manner often hold uniform values that may foster vigilante behavior.

Leadership is another personnel feature that affects a patrol's ability to realize its goals. Members of several patrols mentioned erratic and disorganized leadership as a cause for discouragement and attrition (Safeblock, Low-Income Towers, CORPS). A single, hard-working, strong leader appears to be important, especially where stable leadership is not provided by an institutional source, such as a housing authority (Shaw, Triquonic, Livingston). This leadership style is not without its drawbacks, however, since it often fosters personal rather than organizational allegiance among members and can lead to problems of attrition when the leader ultimately leaves the patrol.

Organizational Affiliation. The organizational affiliations maintained by a patrol may influence its capacity to operate effectively. Specifically, community affiliations tend to legitimize the patrol, to enhance patrol accountability to the residents, and to provide the patrol with access to resources and new members. For instance, patrols that are affiliated with broad-based community organizations may be viewed by residents as more deserving of community support than patrols that are not (Santa Rosa, Forest Hills, Stapleton).
Affiliation with a community organization also facilitates patrol recruitment and provides the patrol with access to community resources. In many cases, patrols recruit through their organizational affiliates (Thornton Heights, Stapleton). A community affiliate may also link the patrol with slack resources or established neighborhood fundraising networks (Brigadoon Manors, Burwick, Santa Rosa). Occasionally, the administrative support of an affiliate may also afford a patrol the opportunity to reduce or suspend operations temporarily while the affiliate continues low-level maintenance activities. In some cases, the affiliate may provide patrol members with alternate community activities if patrolling is no longer of interest.\(^1\)

**Bureaucratization.** Bureaucratization of patrol administration seems to enhance a patrol's capacity to operate over a sustained period of time. For example, Heidt and Etzioni (1973) mention the bureaucratization of Childguard as a major factor accounting for the stable and productive nature of that program.

Bureaucratization may involve a formal training course, a partially paid director, maintenance of logs and other records, and prearranged scheduling. Occasionally, patrols have multilevel hierarchies with different personnel performing different tasks (Childguard, Caldwell Township). In such instances, power and information do not tend to be concentrated in the hands of one or a few persons on whom the patrol depends heavily, and such groups tend not to need strong leaders for continued survival. Similarly, the payment of a salary (for an administrative assistant if not for the director), the use of logs, and formal schedules all increase a patrol's ability to operate without relying on one or more special people.

Formalized training procedures (or the use of a private security company) help to ensure continuity of service despite turnovers in patrol membership. Among the patrols in our study, the training procedures varied from informal indoctrination procedures to intensive

---

\(^1\)Although community affiliates generally seem conducive to patrol survival, in a few cases they had the reverse effect. In one case, a community organization subsumed the allegiance of patrol members and redirected the members to other community activities (Safeblock).
teaching sessions given by the police, fire, and health (ambulance and
first aid) departments.

Financial Resources. Financial resources are a critical constraint
on the capacity of many patrols to accomplish their objectives. Money
is generally needed at the outset for equipment, uniforms, and other
furnishings. Later on, funds may be needed for part-time administra-
tive help to maintain patrol records and an office. Where patrol mem-
bers are also paid, the need for financial resources escalates. Based
on the available evidence, it does not appear to be important, however,
to provide funds so that volunteers can eventually be paid. Members
of volunteer patrols frequently cite social rewards and feelings of
community service among their reasons for participating in the patrol
and may even oppose being paid (54th Ward, Childguard). The volunteer
patrols can nevertheless be strengthened if funds are made available for
walkie-talkies, citizen-band radios, or gasoline.

Patrol Relation to the Police. Generally, some form of contact
between the patrol and police seems important, since patrol members
frequently mention police appreciation of patrol efforts as major
sources of satisfaction (Childguard, Caldwell Township). Just as posi-
tive interactions with police enhance patrol operations, negative con-
tact may dampen members' enthusiasm.

Regardless of their contact with a patrol, the police must either
support or oppose the patrol. Police support may be material or psy-
chological and may include provision of an office, funds, obsolete po-
lice equipment, or the assignment of a police liaison officer. Often-
times, police support has the effect of increasing police influence
over patrol operations (Livingston, Caldwell Township, WEFF). Police
opposition, on the other hand, seems to have an effect similar to but
stronger than negative police contact. For example, groups criticized
by the police as vigilantes may be pressured to disband. While a co-
operative relation between the patrol and police usually enhances pa-
trol operations, in some instances it may have the negative effect of
stigmatizing members as "cop lovers" and informers with the result that
some members resign.
Organizational Change

Most organizations undergo some changes over the course of their histories. Resident patrols are no exception. In fact, patrols are by nature especially susceptible to the vicissitudes of voluntary associations. Like the patrol features mentioned above, these processes of organizational change affect the patrols' capacity to pursue their goals. Generally, the organizational modifications involve adjustments in the level and nature of patrol activity.

Previous research has largely ignored this question of organizational change and has adopted instead a static view of patrol efforts. Virtually the only acknowledgments of an underlying paradigm of organizational process are the notations made by most authors about the transiency of patrol organizations. For example, Marx and Archer (1971) note that "perhaps the most striking feature of the [patrol] group involves the large number of organizational and operational difficulties they [sic] face and the related phenomenon of the relatively short life span that many groups experience." Subsequently, Marx and Archer (1973) observe that "the effectiveness of such groups, and their ability to survive, depends greatly on how successfully they can be incorporated into existing political structures." Terry Knopf (1969) calls the demise of large numbers of youth patrols of the 1960s "regrettable." Sagalyt et al. (1973) cite the "short-lived" nature of resident patrols as one of their major disadvantages. Almost all previous studies therefore assume the transiency of patrols to be a shortcoming and an obstacle to effectiveness.

In contrast, the crime problem and the type of solution sought by a community may render full-time patrol coverage unnecessary. In many cases an alternate model of organizational activity may be more appropriate—the model of an intermittent organization. Etzioni (1961) cites three distinguishing attributes of an intermittent organization. First, he notes, it addresses "tasks that require a very considerable change in amount and pace of activity over time." Sometimes there may be long periods of time during which no activity on the part of the organization is necessary. Second, intermittent organizations periodically shift "from a dormant state to an active state," rather than
shift the types of incentives offered to members. Third, intermittent organizations "apply various reinforcing structures and processes to maintain the commitment of their members in the dormant period," including: planning activity, clerical roles for record keeping, and communication roles required for keeping alive the dormant social structure. The intermittent organization model may be appropriate for some patrols. While minimizing resource requirements, an intermittent group could sustain an organized infrastructure and a capacity to mobilize quickly in response to a problem.

Recognizing the tendency of patrol activities to fluctuate over time, we created for each patrol interviewed a chart documenting the major changes the patrol made in the level and types of activities it engaged in. The charts characterize patrol organizations\(^1\) according to three attributes: size of patrol, level of patrol coverage and other organizational efforts, and types of activities undertaken by the patrol, including specific patrol duties performed.

The patrols were then classified according to their level of activity during each major phase of their history and charted accordingly. Each major phase was classified according to whether it represented: full activity, moderate or reduced activity, minimal activity, or inactivity. A patrol in full activity is one that is sustaining the maximal level of planned activity. Moderate or reduced activity implies either that an organization's level of activity is below that planned for the organization or that its activity has been reduced from higher levels. Minimal activity refers to the activity of a patrol that is operating on a tentative basis or has experienced serious problems. Inactivity means that a patrol is permanently or temporarily inactive.

Patrols are displayed on the charts according to their levels of activity over time, and the factors contributing to those changes in

\(^{1}\text{Patrol organization may refer to at least two types of organizational entities. If a patrol group is part of a larger organization, then patrol organization refers to that component. If the patrol is an independent organization, then, of course, that independent organization is the unit referenced.}\)
levels are indicated. Samples of the main types of organizational histories are shown in figures 4–8. These charts enable us to understand the developmental history of the organization.

Perhaps the most frequent response of virtually all patrols in the face of resource or volunteer shortages is to operate at a reduced level of activity. This reduction may take the form of cutbacks in the days or hours patrolled, or in the manning of a given shift (Thornton Heights, Rangefield, Triquonic). In a few cases members patrolled only during high crime seasons (Childguard, Belmont).

A second strategy adopted by some patrols is to cease all except minimal organizational maintenance activities for a period of time. This may be considered a dormant state of operation (CORPS, Azalea Hills). During periods of dormancy, some minimal planning and communication activity may be carried on to ensure that permanent attrition of members does not occur and that the organization can be reactivated when necessary. It is this characteristic of patrols that makes them an intermittent institution. In 1972, the Azalea Hills patrol determined that the local crime situation did not warrant a patrol on a continuous basis and ceased regular operations. It is currently reactivated only at residents' requests or for special events.

In the extreme case, a patrol may adjust to the organizational problems it encounters by disbanding. It is often hard to distinguish termination of this sort from dormancy, because patrols often cease operations, state that they have terminated, but then may be reactivated when another crisis arises. The Alliance for Safety in New Orleans is one such group. In 1968, the Alliance terminated its operations because its members felt that crime and racist violence in the neighborhood had subsided. However, in 1974, community leaders remobilized the group on a purely trial basis and found that virtually the entire organization responded.

Instead of reducing the level of their activity, patrols may also attempt to resist declines in membership by expanding the types of activities undertaken. Such differentiation may be to other emergency and safety activities, or even to social activities that are rewarding to members. A few groups undergo a complete metamorphosis and change
**Fig. 4—Organizational history chart showing reduced level of patrol activity**

**PATROL NAME:** THORNTON HEIGHTS RADIO WATCH  
**LOCATION:** Baltimore, Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MODERATE OR REDUCED ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MINIMAL ACTIVITY</th>
<th>NON-ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A murder is committed and residents hold an urgent meeting to discuss safety in the area.</td>
<td>Review of the patrol's funding application by municipal officials is delayed. Many members fail the citizen band radio licensing test; others lose interest.</td>
<td>Membership of the Thornton Heights Neighborhood Association solicits and receives help from local community organizations in starting a residential patrol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership: 7 ACTIVITIES: Members patrol in cars and report suspicious activity to the police. Coverage: Three cars patrol 5 to 7 evenings a week.</td>
<td>The patrol is funded and recruitment begins again. An administrative aide is hired.</td>
<td>Membership: All members terminate except the original organizer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding runs out and members are discouraged by lack of observed criminal activity.</td>
<td>Membership: Less than 15 persons. Coverage: Weekends only.</td>
<td>t₁ = 1972 t₂ = 1973 t₃ = Spring 1974 t₄ = Fall 1974 t₅ = Spring 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP: 90 ACTIVITIES: Only organizational activity occurs. No patrol yet operates.</td>
<td>Membership: MEMBERSHIP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fig. 5---Organizational history chart showing patrol dormancy**

**PATROL NAME:** CORPS  
**LOCATION:** Detroit, Michigan

| FULL ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: 150  
ACTIVITIES: Observe and report riot behavior.  
COVERAGE: 125 cars daily. | MEMBERSHIP: 25-30  
ACTIVITIES: Crime prevention patrol and assistance at natural disasters.  
COVERAGE: Weekend evenings. |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| MODERATE OR REDUCED ACTIVITY | The riots end.  
As a result of reorganization a patrol begins operation. |
| MEMBERSHIP: 6-12  
ACTIVITIES: Patrol is discontinued. Minimal organizational activity occurs; a new constitution is drafted.  
COVERAGE: None. |
| MINIMAL ACTIVITY | Treasurer is accused of embezzling funds. Morale drops.  
ACTIVITIES: Crime prevention patrol and emergency assistance.  
COVERAGE: Weekend nights; number of cars varies. |
| NON-ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: 10-15  
ACTIVITIES: None.  
COVERAGE: None. |

\[ t_1 = July 1967 \]  
\[ t_2 = October 1967 \]  
\[ t_3 = Spring 1969 \]  
\[ t_4 = Summer 1975 \]  
\[ t_5 = Late Summer 1975 \]
### Organizational History Chart Showing Patrol Termination

**Patrol Name:** Alliance for Safety  
**Location:** New Orleans, Louisiana

| FULL ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: 80-90  
ACTIVITIES: Alliance members provide food, shelter and protection for civil rights workers.  
Racial hostilities subside. |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| MODERATE OR REDUCED ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: 30-40  
ACTIVITIES: Armed members patrol in cars and intervene to protect black leaders and residents from crime.  
COVERAGE: 10-20 cars staffed by 2 to 4 men each.  
Racial hostilities largely abate; the civil rights movement shifts to the courts. |
| MINIMAL ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: 15-20  
ACTIVITIES: Recruitment and organizational preparation for patrol start-up.  
COVERAGE: None. |
| NON-ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: Alliance is disbanded.  
ACTIVITIES: None.  
COVERAGE: None. |

- $t_1 = $ Spring 1965  
- $t_2 = $ Summer 1965  
- $t_3 = 1966$  
- $t_4 = 1967$  
- $t_5 = 1968$
**Fig. 7—Organizational history chart showing patrol differentiation**

**PATROL NAME:** TRIQUONIC CITIZENS PATROL  
**LOCATION:** Newark, New Jersey

| FULL ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: 300  
ACTIVITIES: Armed members patrol by auto 7 nights each week.  
COVERAGE: 20–30 cars staffed by two or more men each night.  
CRIME is reduced.  
ECONOMIC situation makes it difficult for members to afford gas.  
MEMBERSHIP: 60
| MODERATE OR REDUCED ACTIVITY | MEMBERSHIP: 40  
ACTIVITIES: Members patrol on foot and perform riot control.  
COVERAGE: Varies.  
MEMBERSHIP: 50  
ACTIVITIES: Community services are added including: an ambulance squad, blood bank and food depository.  
COVERAGE: 8–15 cars every night.  
No cause of the increase was apparent.
| MINIMAL ACTIVITY |  
Newark riots begin. Three residents plan patrol activities and begin recruitment.  
<p>| NON-ACTIVITY |<br />
| $t_1 = \text{Summer 1967}$ | $t_2 = \text{Late Summer 1967}$ | $t_3 = 1969$ | $t_4 = 1975$ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL ACTIVITY</th>
<th>For the first time members are requested to perform traffic control and emergency assistance in the aftermath of a tornado.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE OR REDUCED ACTIVITY</td>
<td>Recruitment begins and applications are received from residents who learn of the patrol through publicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP: 30 or 40 ACTIVITIES: Organizational activity and patrol mainly at the request of police and merchants. COVERAGE: Very occasional; two men per car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-ACTIVITY</td>
<td>A local citizen band radio operator organizes the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_1$</td>
<td>January 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_2$</td>
<td>March 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_3$</td>
<td>June 1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 8**—Organizational history chart showing patrol metamorphosis

**PATROL NAME:** LIVINGSTON EMERGENCY TEAM

**LOCATION:** Detroit, Michigan

**COVERAGE:** Patrol achieves a new legitimacy and increases organizational activity, training, and fund raising in support of its civil defense efforts.
the focus of their activities entirely. Perhaps the most striking example of such a transition is the Livingston Patrol, which changed from a crime prevention patrol into a unit that handles civil defense and emergency assistance.

The main lesson is that organizational changes reflect a patrol's response to alterations in the local crime problem. Many of the voluntary groups began as a result of serious crime problems. Once the problems have been alleviated or appear to be alleviated, the patrol activity is difficult to maintain. The available evidence suggests that this is a period in patrol history when patrolling becomes boring and vigilante behavior may occur. At such a stage, a patrol should be encouraged to go dormant, terminate, or turn its attention to other activities.

A major policy implication of these changes over time is that if patrols do receive outside funds, timing can be an important factor. Specifically, both the point in a patrol's history at which funding is made available and the delays in the processing of applications or actual disbursement of awards can affect patrol operations. In the case of one patrol (Thornton), the processing of a funding application was delayed for several months while patrol membership dwindled to zero. In another case (Belmont), funds actually awarded were never disbursed. In terms of timing, it appears that funding may serve a more useful purpose when awarded at the outset of patrol activity, rather than later on. Since patrols often emerge in response to a severe crime problem or rash of incidents, members must initially pay their patrol expenses out of pocket. By the time patrols begin to seek subsidies, the crime problem has often waned, and along with it the interest of some members.
VI. FURTHER RESEARCH ON PATROLS

This chapter discusses the alternatives for further research on resident patrols. The bulk of our discussion is given to the possible ways of evaluating patrols to determine their effectiveness. Other research is also proposed, however, that deals with topics of importance independent of the evaluation issue.

A. EVALUATION RESEARCH: STUDY DESIGN

Purpose of an Evaluation

Three groups of policymakers are the potential beneficiaries of an evaluation of resident patrols. The first group consists of those who fund, or might fund, resident patrols. For them, an evaluation should answer at least some of the following questions:

- Are resident patrols effective? If so, in regard to what measures of performance are they effective? What types of patrols are effective in various neighborhoods or circumstances?
- What costs and disbenefits must be incurred to achieve a specified level of effectiveness and how do they compare in magnitude with the benefits?
- What groups of citizens are the primary recipients of the benefits and disbenefits of resident patrols?
- What alternatives are available for producing the same benefits as resident patrols? Are any of these options less costly for the same level of benefit?
- In what ways does interest, encouragement, or financial support of outside groups add to or detract from the effectiveness of a patrol?

The second group of policymakers consists of those who plan, organize, or administer resident patrols, or who might do so. An evaluation would be useful to them if it could answer the question:
What characteristics of size, organization, training, equipment, visibility, patrol routine, recruitment, and so forth are associated with increased effectiveness or decreased dysfunction for resident patrols?

The third group consists of criminal justice planners, legislators, and members of the public who are concerned with the legal status of resident patrols and the possibility of the government's licensing, monitoring, or otherwise regulating the activities of such patrols. They are primarily interested in the questions:

- How do regulated patrols or those with peace officer status differ in effectiveness or dysfunction from the others?
- What regulatable characteristics of resident patrols (e.g., training, background characteristics, authorization to carry weapons or wear uniforms) are related to their effectiveness or dysfunction?
- What procedures for dealing with or interacting with patrols are actually successful in bringing about desired changes in patrol behavior? (For example, would an attempt by a police department to enforce a regulation be likely to cause an increased cohesion among the patrol members in favor of continuing the proscribed behavior?)

Only a costly and exhaustive evaluation could satisfy all three of these groups inasmuch as, independent of the research design adopted, more than 200 patrols would have to be examined. Such a large sample would be required for the following reasons:

- The questions listed above suggest at least a dozen independent variables as being of interest for policy purposes.
- Many of the variables (e.g., the peace officer status of patrol members and the type of neighborhood in which the patrol operates) cannot be experimentally manipulated within a single patrol.
A number of independent variables of little interest for policy purposes may nevertheless be related to the degree of effectiveness or dysfunction of a patrol; the evaluation would have to control for these.

We do not recommend that an "all-purpose" national evaluation be conducted, because its importance and utility do not appear to be commensurate with its necessarily high cost. However, it is useful to explicate the possible objectives so that we may continue to explore the feasibility of evaluations that might serve some objectives but not others.

The Relationship between Outcomes and Evaluation Feasibility

Many evaluations of social programs are intended to determine whether the program is a success or a failure. While such an approach may be taken for evaluating an individual patrol, it presents certain problems for an aggregate national evaluation of resident patrols. We have observed many obstacles to determining what it is that each patrol is trying to accomplish, including the following:

- Many patrols have numerous or diffuse objectives.
- A patrol's stated objectives may not be its actual objectives. There is considerable danger that a patrol leader will describe objectives that he thinks the evaluator wants to hear.
- Some patrols have never formulated what their objectives are, or, as voluntary organizations they may rightly refuse to explain their objectives to outsiders.
- Patrol objectives may change over time.

For these reasons, an evaluation that attempts to distinguish success from failure on the basis of patrol objectives is probably

---

1Such variables include the presence or absence of a strong leader, the circumstances that precipitated the formation of the patrol, and the age of the patrol.
neither meaningful nor practical at the national level. Instead, in
the context of an aggregate study, the outcomes of patrol activities
should be indicated, without necessarily identifying them as intended
or unintended. Such a study might answer nearly all of the policy
questions listed earlier.

The present study has already identified six relevant outcomes
and indicated the relative importance of each of the outcomes to the
different types of patrols (see Chapters II and IV).

In developing measures of the degree to which each outcome is
achieved, we must distinguish among measures that are (at least in
principle) quantifiable or semiquantifiable and those that are either
qualitative or require some value structure or political process for
their interpretation. Quite clearly, crime reduction and improved
police coverage can be quantified (although we will discuss later the
difficulties of doing so). Increased sense of security is semiquantifi-
able, because survey instruments can be and have been developed to
capture at least part of this outcome in numerical form. Improved
police-community relations and increased citizen participation consti-
tute a primarily qualitative outcome, and an assessment of the nature
of these relations or participation cannot lead to an interpretation
of whether the outcome is good or bad, except by imposing a value
structure. Some patrols, for instance, might consider their effective-
ness increased in proportion to the amount of conflict between them
and the police. Absence of vigilantism serves as a good example of an
outcome that, although quantifiable, requires a political interpretation.

A formal aggregate evaluation appears to be an unnecessarily
complicated approach to learning more about these outcomes that lack
a clear quantitative interpretation. We have already collected by
interview and by review of available information an array of anecdotal
and impressionistic information about police-community relations and
dysfunctional outcomes, but in many ways it is ambiguous or self-
contradictory. More careful analysis of data of this type, together
with studies having limited focus, for example, participant observation
of interactional processes in a single patrol, are likely to add more
to our understanding of these outcomes than a national evaluation.
A corollary to this observation is the fact that types of patrols whose primary outcomes are unrelated to crime reduction and sense of security are unsuitable targets for a major evaluation study at this time. This applies particularly to social service patrols and community protection groups. Our discussion, then, can focus on the feasibility of an aggregate evaluation of building and/or neighborhood patrols.\(^1\) In regard to building patrols, the only outcomes of genuine interest are crime reduction and sense of security, since the present study suggests quite strongly that there is little likelihood of their having an impact on the other listed outcomes. In regard to neighborhood patrols, all six outcomes are relevant.

**General Principles of Evaluation Design**

The most generally accepted or "classical" evaluation design (see, for example, Suchman, 1966) involves the selection of two sets of sites—in this case, buildings or neighborhoods—one to be the experimental set and the other the control set. Suitable procedures, such as random assignment, must be used to select the two sets. Then, prior to initiation of the intervention to be tested—in this case, a resident patrol—data are collected in all the study sites for each of the outcomes to be measured. Next, the intervention is carried out at the experimental sites, but not the control sites. Finally, while the intervention is in progress, outcome data are collected at all the sites.

Such a design is clearly impractical for an aggregate evaluation of resident patrols. By their very nature, such patrols cannot be initiated at a time and place of the evaluator's choosing, nor can they be prevented from forming in the control neighborhoods. This problem arises in the attempt to evaluate any program conducted by volunteers, another example of which was discussed by Mattick and

\(^1\)By focusing an evaluation on building patrols and neighborhood patrols, we would implicitly obtain information about part of the activities of social service patrols, namely the part related to the criminal justice system.
Reischl (1975). Basically, the evaluator is faced with a choice between abandoning random assignment or limiting his attention to resident patrol projects that can be initiated under circumstances that he controls.\footnote{The purpose of randomized selection is to control for the effects of variables that are unknown to the evaluator. If all the relevant variables were known, then randomization might not be necessary or even desirable (Harville, 1975), because differences in the average values of the variables between control and experimental groups may occur by chance with random selection. A design in which the groups are matched on all variables that might affect the outcomes (other than the presence of a resident patrol) could prevent such differences from arising and might be preferable to the classical design.}

However, a classical evaluation could be conducted if the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration wished to fund resident patrols and required that the grant recipients not begin operations until baseline data had been collected. The results of such an evaluation could not be statistically generalized to citizen-initiated resident patrols, but only to those that wished funding from LEAA and were willing to abide by the specified conditions. Nevertheless, we recommend that LEAA consider such an intervention and evaluation approach. Moreover, there is reason to believe that such patrols might not differ substantially in their experiences from citizen-initiated patrols and might thus be of considerable policy interest.

We conclude, however, that no design approaching the rigor of a classical evaluation of resident patrols can be conducted for citizen-initiated patrols. To explore further the evaluation possibilities for these patrols, we must consider alternative quasi-experimental designs (Campbell and Stanley, 1966; and Campbell, 1969). The results of such designs are usually subject to challenge on the grounds that observed effects can be attributed to causes not controlled for, but they may nonetheless be satisfactory if the inherent ambiguities do not alter the policy implications of the evaluation. (For an excellent discussion, see Cochran, 1965.)

Given the realities of uncontrollable patrol initiation, it appears most practical to accept the fact that patrols have already been operating at some sites but not others. This limits the
evaluator to posttreatment designs, meaning that no attempt is made to determine a time series of outcome measures before as well as during the operation of each patrol. Instead, the evaluator selects some sites with patrols for study and also selects suitable comparison sites. This can be done in one of two ways:

1. The evaluator selects a large number of comparison sites and, from the data collected at these sites, models the influence of all variables other than the presence of a patrol on the outcome measures. This means that, for the experimental sites, he derives equations permitting him to calculate the values of the outcome measures if there had been no patrol. He then compares these values with the observed values in the experimental sites, using suitable statistical tests, to find the effect of the patrol.

2. For each experimental site, the evaluator selects one or more matched sites. "Matched" is used here to mean that comparison sites appear to be identical to the experimental site in regard to all characteristics the evaluator deems relevant to the outcome measures. He then studies the differences in outcome measures, possibly assessed at several different points in time, between the experimental sites and their matched comparison sites.

A brief review of some of the relevant independent variables rapidly reveals that to pursue the first approach, the evaluator must answer most of the central questions in research related to crime control as part of his evaluation study. For example, in regard to crime incidence alone, the findings for the comparison sites must answer the questions:

- How are demographic and socioeconomic variables related to crime rates?
- How is the proximity of a neighborhood to high crime areas related to its crime rates?
o How is the presence of security hardware of various types related to crime rates?
  o How is the level of police patrol in an area related to the crime rates there?

Even these few examples reveal that it would be unrealistic to expect the evaluator to pursue the first approach successfully.

Turning then to the second approach (matched posttreatment), we find that the requirements of matching by the evaluation may interact in an undesirable way with the policy questions to be answered. For example, for two sites to be considered matched for the purposes of measuring crime rates, the level of police patrol (among other things) must be the same in both locations. But one of the policy questions to be answered is whether a resident patrol affects the level of police patrol. Similarly, the two sites have to be matched on the nature of police-community relations, which is at the same time an outcome measure. Thus, a matched design forces the evaluator to abandon his desire to answer some of the policy questions of interest and prevents his studying some of the interactions among outcome measures. This difficulty is least troublesome in the case of building patrols for which, as we have noted, the relevant outcome measures are "crime reduction" and "sense of security." The design problems for neighborhood patrols are much more subtle, and we do not have a solution to suggest at this time.

A Feasible Evaluation Design: Building Patrols

To show that an evaluation with a matched posttreatment design is useful as well as feasible for the case of building patrols, we review here the policy conclusions that can be drawn from such a study. Suppose that building patrols have been divided into types, distinguished perhaps by the nature of the patrol, the time it is on duty, the nature of the building, and the size of the patrol. The basic nature of the conclusions that can be drawn from the indicated design are as follows:
A building with a patrol of type B has an incidence of crime of type C (or a measure of sense of security) that is X percent lower (or higher) than that in similar buildings without patrols.

Is such a conclusion policy-relevant? Let us suppose that X is always zero (i.e., the presence of a building patrol does not affect crime rates or sense of security). Such a finding would be of considerable interest for policy purposes. It can be attacked (because it is counterintuitive) on the basis that the comparison sites must have had some alternative anticrime procedures that were as effective as building patrols, or that they were somehow "different" from the buildings with patrols. But if the matching is sufficiently exact (which is as much a function of the existence in the real world of matched buildings as it is of the skill of the evaluator), this argument will fail. The finding can also be attacked on the grounds that random variations in crime rates have obscured the true effects of patrols. This argument can be countered if the sample sizes are large enough.

Suppose next that some of the X's are positive, while others are zero. This would mean that certain types of patrols had been found to be effective in regard to certain measures of outcome, while others, perhaps, were not effective. This, too, is of considerable policy-relevance, as it indicates the correlates of effectiveness among patrols. It is similarly resistant to criticism if the implementation of the research design has been careful enough. What if some of the X's are positive while others are negative for the same type of patrol? This means that the indicated type of patrol has mixed outcomes, which may well be a fact of life to be reckoned with.

What types of policy questions remain unanswered after such an evaluation? Primarily, if any effect of the patrols is found, the design does not permit identifying the effect as having been caused by the patrolling activities. Rather, the possibility remains that some other characteristic of patrols (e.g., a spirit of cooperation among residents) is responsible for the observed effect. This limitation may prevent generalizing the findings to types of patrolling not studied, but should not otherwise dilute the policy implications
that specified outcomes are associated with the presence of a resident patrol.

Summary of Feasibility Discussion

We have noted that any social program subject to initiation at times and places beyond the control of an evaluator is not a suitable subject for rigorously controlled pre- and posttreatment evaluation designs. This applies to existing resident patrols, but a possibly interesting subset of patrols—those deliberately initiated for evaluation purposes—could be evaluated by such a design.

Among the citizen-initiated patrols, community protection patrols are few in number and, as with social service patrols, have numerous outcomes that make evaluation extremely difficult. Research of a nonevaluative nature could add more to the understanding of such patrols at the present time than could an evaluation. Of the remaining two types of patrols, our feasibility analysis indicates that building patrols will be easier to evaluate than neighborhood patrols. A relevant evaluation design is matched posttreatment. Thus, a national evaluation of building patrols could be conducted. Such an evaluation is worth considering because building patrols, if proven effective, are important for the following reasons:

- The patrols often operate in public housing projects that are actively seeking more effective ways to reduce crime;
- Building patrols can help the police to save manpower and resources, since in the absence of a building patrol, police might be called more frequently by residents to respond to crimes; and
- Even in buildings with previously low rates of crime, patrols seem to make residents feel more secure, and such feelings may be more important in relation to one's own home than any other location.

An individual evaluation of any type of patrol, in contrast to a national evaluation, is possible if collection of baseline data can be arranged.
B. EVALUATION RESEARCH: MEASURING CRIME REDUCTION AND SENSE OF SECURITY

In this section we discuss how one can measure the effects on crime rates and sense of security of an anticrime program, with particular reference to building and neighborhood patrols. These issues have been summarized well by Maltz (1972 and 1975a) and are in no way particular to resident patrols.

Assessing Crimes at a Specific Site

The first step is to identify the types of crimes of interest and the geographical area within which the occurrence of crimes is to be measured. The types of crimes to be considered are those (1) that may be affected by the program in question, and (2) whose degree of incidence can be measured. For example, a patrol that operates entirely within a building will not, in principle, have any effect on automobile theft, unless the building contains a garage. In the latter case, only those automobile thefts that occur within the garage should be considered. The capability to measure the degree of incidence distinguishes primarily crimes with victims from victimless crimes, with the former substantially more measurable than the latter. For example, the degree to which gambling, prostitution, or possession of narcotics occurs within a building may conceivably be influenced by the presence or absence of a resident patrol, but no reasonably reliable instrument can be developed to measure the level of these illegal activities.

How finely crimes are to be divided into types represents a trade-off between legal precision and statistical inference. If the crime types are defined narrowly (e.g., distinguishing breaking and entering from burglary from theft), the number of crimes in each type may be so small that any comparison between experimental sites and matched sites will reveal no statistically significant differences. On the other hand, defining the crime types broadly will prevent the identification of those crimes for which patrolling is a particularly effective anticrime program. A practical approach is to retain fine distinctions among crime types during data collection and then to aggregate later to a level appropriate for analysis, in accordance
with the numbers of crimes actually observed. It must be anticipated, however, that the level of aggregation required in an evaluation of patrols may permit only gross distinctions, such as crimes against persons versus crimes against property.

In regard to the geographical area to be studied, building patrols are uniquely suited to an unambiguous and carefully circumscribed definition of the geographical area in question, namely, the particular structure(s) patrolled, or the structures and grounds patrolled, or the privately owned property within which the patrol operates. Neighborhood patrols, by contrast, differ in the specificity with which their geographical domain of activity can be circumscribed. In general, for such patrols it may be necessary to divide the neighborhood into subneighborhoods that appear to receive substantially different amounts of patrolling activity over the course of time. The largest area within which the patrol ever operates would have to be included in the experimental site, or at least excluded from being any part of a matched site.

Several difficulties should be pointed out in assessing all crimes that occur within the geographical site. First, the total victimization experience of residents of the site is not of direct interest, because the residents may be the victims of crimes that occur outside the site. Therefore, data-collection instruments must define the site clearly and obtain information about only those crimes that occur within the site. Second, visitors or persons passing through the site may be the victims of crimes. Unless these are reported immediately and at the location of occurrence, determining that the crime occurred and is relevant for the evaluation may be impossible. This is particularly true for such crimes as pocket picking, because the victim may not know precisely where and when it happened.

Third, typical crime-reporting mechanisms are frequently imprecise as to the location of incidents, especially if one wishes to distinguish among particular buildings. For example, a police crime report

---

1A patrol may affect crime rates outside its site. However, these effects are considered secondary to the main concerns of an evaluation and are discussed below as matters to be taken into account.
may indicate the address of the person reporting a crime or suspicious incident, but he or she may be across the street from the actual incident. This leads to possible errors of two kinds: a crime reported from within a study site may appear to be included in the sampling universe when in fact it is not, or a crime reported from elsewhere and unnoticed by residents of the site may escape the attention of the evaluator. Fourth, a troubling category of incidents (from the point of view of an evaluator) consists of those that may or may not have been crimes or attempted crimes, with the issue never fully resolved. It is particularly likely that in an area covered by a resident patrol the residents will be more cognizant of suspicious incidents that fall in this category than they will be in an unpatrolled area.

Techniques for Counting Crimes

A phenomenon that has become well known through victimization surveys is that some crimes occur but are not reported to the police. Equally important is the phenomenon that, for one reason or another, some crimes are not reported to the interviewer in a victimization survey (Turner, 1972; Kalish, 1974; and Maltz, 1975b).¹

Some of the crimes that will not be reported in a victimization survey will have been reported to the police, and vice versa, while other crimes will remain unreported no matter what technique is used. To minimize the number of crimes not detected in an evaluation, three primary sources of crime data will be needed: (a) crimes reported to the police, (b) a victimization survey, and (c) crimes observed by or reported to the patrol. The victimization survey also provides an opportunity to collect information concerning sense of security at the same time, and in fact nearly all existing victimization survey instruments contain questions related to sense of security (Census Bureau, 1971 and 1974). To make statistically valid comparisons among

¹This effect is entirely separate from the possibility that some victims of crimes at the site (e.g., visitors) will not be included in a victimization survey of practical size conducted in connection with an evaluation.
sites, around 100 household units would have to be included in a victimization survey at each site.

Overt versus Subjective Measures of Security

A respondent's sense of security can be determined by either asking him directly about his opinions or feelings, or by inquiring about specific actions that he has taken in response to crime conditions. In the first category are such questions as "How likely do you think it is that you will be the victim of a robbery during the coming year?" or "How safe is this building as compared with nearby buildings?" In the second category are questions that ask whether the respondent has installed locks or burglar alarms, carries a weapon, owns a dog for protection, or has stayed in his apartment because he was afraid to leave.

Both types of questions should be included on the evaluation survey instrument. To the greatest extent possible, they should be identical to the wording of questions in the instruments for the National Crime Survey conducted by LEAA and the Census Bureau (1974) or for previous evaluations of team policing or preventive patrol activities (Kelling et al., 1975). The use of standardized questions allows the evaluator to benefit from previous research showing the intercorrelation of particular questions or appropriate means of converting the responses into scaled measures of sense of security. Only in cases where the questions on a previous instrument were found to have ambiguous interpretations should they be reworded or replaced by other questions of similar intent.

Other Outcomes Related to Crime Incidence

We have noted that the presence of a resident patrol may affect the police department's patrol coverage and response times to crime calls, as well as the quality of information about crimes and suspicious incidents provided to the police by citizens. If so, then these outcomes presumably have an effect on crime rates which may be distinguished conceptually from the direct effect of the patrol. While it is our strong belief, on the basis of the interviews
conducted during this study, that building patrols are quite unlikely to influence police practices, it would be prudent in a national evaluation to check the validity of this assumption in at least a few sites.

Appropriate measures of preventive patrol coverage are the average number of times per hour that a police patrol car and a foot patrol officer pass a randomly selected point (the automobile and foot patrol frequencies). Since most building patrols operate in areas where the public police do not go unless called, an appropriate nearby point must be selected for this measurement. Neighborhood patrols, of course, cover areas also patrolled by the police, so the selection of relevant points presents no problems. One is interested in determining both the temporal changes in patrol frequencies during the study period and also the differences in patrol frequencies between a study site and its matched site(s).

Because police departments generally do not keep track of where a given police patrol car is at a given moment, police data usually do not reveal police automobile patrol frequencies. However, several departments have installed automatic vehicle locator (AVL) systems, at least for experimental purposes. By selecting a few study sites in areas covered by such systems, it is technically possible to obtain extremely accurate automobile patrol frequencies. Some AVL systems would require an elaborate data-processing task; others operate in such a way that a counting sensor could be placed at the selected locations. We recommend that the evaluator explore the possibility of choosing some sites with AVL systems.

In the absence of an automatic vehicle locator system, automobile patrol frequencies can be determined by (a) special data collection by patrol officers, (b) placing observers in patrol cars, or (c) placing an observer at the randomly selected points. Either of the first two is likely to produce distorted data, because the patrol officer

---

1 Average frequencies for an area several miles on a side can be estimated using mathematical models, but we are concerned here with frequencies at a specified point.
will almost surely be aware of the locations of study sites and make a point of passing by these spots. The third is feasible but possibly expensive.

The locations of foot patrol officers are generally known by police departments to an accuracy adequate for making fairly good estimates of foot patrol frequency. (In particular, it is easy to determine if no foot patrolman is assigned to the area of interest.) If observers are used to determine automobile patrol frequencies, they can also determine foot patrol frequencies.

The response time of police to crime calls is measured from the time the police are notified until the time they arrive at the scene. While in principle this should be easy to measure, in fact the radio traffic in many police departments is too great to permit officers to call their dispatcher routinely when they arrive at the scene. Thus response-time data are not always available, and even when available, they may not be accurate.\(^1\) Furthermore, identifying the records that apply to study sites may require substantial data processing. A response-time experiment is currently being conducted in Kansas City by some of the same investigators who carried out the preventive patrol experiment. Improved procedures for measuring response time may be known from this work prior to any evaluation of resident patrols. In addition, some AVL systems may be suitable for determining response times.

The extent to which crimes are reported by citizens will be determined by the design already proposed, but the quality of crime reporting is more subtle. Since this is at best a secondary outcome of resident patrols, it seems preferable to leave the exploration of reporting quality and its relationship to crime rates to an evaluation that focuses more particularly on programs designed to influence crime reporting, such as Neighborhood Watch (Bickman et al., in progress).

\(^1\)The dispatcher may not record the information promptly, or the police officer could conceivably announce his arrival time while he is still traveling.
C. EVALUATION RESEARCH: PITFALLS TO BE AVOIDED

Any evaluation of patrols should be alerted to several complicating factors: temporal effects, displacement, and magnitude of the intervention.

Temporal Effects

It is well known that the incidence of crime varies by time of day, day of the week, and season of the year, as well as displaying secular trends. Certain temporal effects are of particular concern for an evaluation of resident patrols.

1. Regression to the mean. Resident patrols are often initiated in response to a sudden spate of crimes. However, it is in the nature of stochastic time series that a period of above-average incidence will, with high probability, be followed by a period of lower incidence, whether or not any intervention is undertaken. (For a good discussion, see Campbell, 1969.) This phenomenon, called regression to the mean, implies that crime incidence in the period immediately after the formation of a patrol should not be taken as a measure of the patrol's effectiveness, except in the context of a longer time series of incidence data.

2. Phantom effects. A resident patrol may have deterrent effects at times and places when it is not operating. This phenomenon is hypothesized to occur because potential criminals do not necessarily comprehend the details of the patrol's deployment (Chaiken et al., 1974). Therefore, it is not appropriate to segregate crime incidents according to whether they occurred when the patrol was operating or not and to compare the results. Such a segregation would be of interest, in comparison to the matched sites, to determine the extent of the phantom effect (crime reduction when no patrol is operating), but this is a separate matter from evaluating effectiveness.
3. **Time delays.** The deterrent effect of a patrol, if it exists, may take time to develop. Thus a patrol (having an unchanging mode of operation) may be more effective a year after it is formed than a month after it is formed. Conversely, the effectiveness of the patrol (again assuming an unchanging mode of operation) may wane as criminals learn how to circumvent it. In general, the implication is that crime data must be collected for a period of more than a year, and an attempt must be made to identify secular trends as well as average crime incidence over the study period.

4. **Interaction between independent and dependent variables.**

A common story told by patrol members to our interviewers was that the patrol was initially successful, leading to such a low incidence of crime that the patrol members became bored with their duties and dropped out of the organization. Then, with a reduced (or nonexistent) patrol, the lowered crime rate may have continued (a phantom effect), or it may have rebounded, leading to a reinstitution of the patrol. In any event, this story suggests an interaction between the independent variable (level of patrol activity) and the dependent variables (crime rate and sense of security). It is not clear whether the patrol activity is affecting the crime rate, or the crime rate is, with some time delay, affecting the level of patrol. Should this phenomenon occur in some of the study sites, a clear interpretation of the data may not be possible. Careful collection of process data, showing the nature and extent of patrol activity at different points in time, will be needed to draw any conclusions in comparison to the matched sites.

**Displacement**

One possible effect of a resident patrol is to displace crime to times or places (presumably nearby) where it is not operating.
Temporal displacement will be captured by the design already proposed. Geographical displacement will not be identified by this design. Although it can be argued that a publicly funded anticrime program that merely results in shifting crime around the city is ineffective, the same argument has little validity when applied to a voluntary or private program like most resident patrols. It does not reflect negatively on the effectiveness of a building patrol to say, "Yes, crime decreased in the building, but somebody else was the victim of the crimes that otherwise would have occurred here."

The displacement phenomenon is important to consider in selecting matched sites, because the evaluator must make some estimates of the distance to which displacement might occur. For example, it is inappropriate to select a matching site adjacent to an experimental site. Should such a matched site prove to have a higher crime rate than its neighboring site with a patrol, displacement might be the explanation. The finding would support the hypothesis that the patrol has an effect on crime, but would not permit estimating the magnitude of the effect in comparison with the absence of the patrol.

**Magnitude of the Intervention**

We know from the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (Kelling et al., 1975) that modest degrees of change in the amount of patrol activity by the police cannot be detected as having a statistically significant effect on crime rates (as measured by reported crimes or victimization survey) or sense of security, even when a true controlled design is used (i.e., in the Kansas City study the experimental and control sites were selected randomly, rather than matched after the fact as is more frequently the case). Thus, it is prudent to assume that the effect of resident patrols will be similarly "invisible" within the typical random variations in crime rates unless the amount of patrol is considerably more concentrated than typical levels of police patrol in Kansas City.

Since most neighborhood patrols do not appear to satisfy this condition, an aggregate national evaluation of them might reasonably be rejected on the sole grounds that nothing is likely to be learned.
Considering also the complexities of the victimization survey that would be required for such an evaluation and the design problems mentioned earlier, we do not recommend an aggregate evaluation of neighborhood patrols. An individual evaluation of a neighborhood automobile patrol might be interesting if the frequency with which the patrol passes a randomly selected point is high (for example, more than once every 10 minutes).

D. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

An aggregate evaluation of the effect of building patrols appears to be feasible and potentially of policy interest. An aggregate evaluation of any other type of existing patrol appears either infeasible or unsuitable at this time, although evaluations of individual projects may be both feasible and useful.

The evaluation of building patrols requires the selection of a substantial number of existing patrols for study, the exact number depending on the characteristics of the patrols deemed worthy of study, but in any event probably not less than 50 sites. For each selected patrol, one or more matched sites must be selected with the following characteristics:

- No resident patrol existing or forming;
- Same jurisdiction (i.e., police department);
- Approximately the same size (i.e., number of households, area, height of buildings);
- Approximately the same physical security (age of buildings, access control, locks, barred windows, fire escapes, etc.);
- Approximately the same demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of residents;
- Approximately the same crime rates in the surrounding neighborhood; and
- Not within one-half mile of the study site to which it is matched (our estimate of a reasonable displacement distance).
Data concerning incidents of crimes with victims must be collected for more than a year in each site (experimental or matched) via police records and victimization surveys of residents, and (in the experimental sites) interviews concerning observed incidents must be conducted with patrol members. The victimization survey must include questions related to both subjective and overt measures of sense of security. To the greatest extent possible, the wording of questions on the survey must be identical to that used in prior or existing surveys, except that it is necessary to define the site of interest and to request information about only such incidents as occurred within the site whenever possible. The approximate date and time of day of the incident should be determined. During the study period, process data must be obtained in the experimental sites to describe the nature and extent of patrol activities over time.

Analysis will proceed by statistical comparison of suitably normalized crime rates (either by household or by person, as appropriate) between experimental and matched sites, with crimes aggregated into groups having large enough numbers of incidents so that meaningful statistical tests can be performed. The possibility that the differences show a secular trend over time must be analyzed at the aggregate level. In addition, for patrols that do not operate continuously, a separate comparison for the period(s) when the patrols operate would be of independent interest.

E. OTHER RESEARCH

In addition to assessing the feasibility of various approaches to the evaluation of resident patrols, this study also pointed up several important issues for future research.

Conditions of Patrol Emergence

The first question raised by the current study is the circumstances under which resident patrols emerge. It may well be that examination of the relation between crime statistics and patrol formation would reveal an association at least as strong as that
between demographic or economic attributes of the neighborhoods patrolled and patrol formation. Inasmuch as the current study focuses mainly on the detailed dynamics of patrol operation, the data collected are not well suited to a study of patrol emergence. Further research on emergence will involve determining the patrol population of several additional cities and collecting crime data specific to the neighborhoods where patrols operate. The policies of governmental agencies toward resident patrols may well be an additional important factor that fosters or impedes the development of patrols and one that should be examined.

**Legal Status of Patrols**

A second important prelude to any further large-scale research about resident patrols should be the investigation of legal issues bearing on both the authority and the potential liability of patrol members. Our own study did not cover this topic, nor was it raised by any of the patrols we interviewed. However, the issues are important not only for the patrol members but also for organizations that might either employ patrols or support patrols through financial contributions. The issues include:

- The legal protection, if any, for a member of a resident patrol (or other private security guards);
- Legal cases, if any, that have tested the law of citizen arrest in terms of the rights of the arresting citizen;
- The liability of any employer of a resident patrol member;
- The liability of an organization that administers a patrol or supports one through financial or in-kind contributions; and
- The legal protection, if any, that is afforded by licensing.

**Coordination of Citizen Crime Prevention Activities**

Resident patrols are but one of many crime prevention activities that currently engage the efforts of citizens and police across
the country. At a minimum, both residents and police departments will profit from learning whether there is any benefit to be derived by including patrol activities as part of a more formally organized, though still voluntary, effort that includes a variety of other crime prevention activities. Various forms of organized crime prevention efforts can be studied. At present, crime prevention projects (e.g., Operation Identification, Neighborhood Watch, and resident patrols) exist independently in some neighborhoods, with little interproject coordination or even communication. In other neighborhoods, a single organization, performing for community safety a role similar to that of PTAs in education, may support or coordinate a variety of activities.

Among the criteria in terms of which the effectiveness of citizen crime prevention activities operating under different organizational arrangements may be assessed are input costs and project outputs. Input costs includes: volunteer hours expended, extent of police coordination, and amount of equipment or training required by participants in such activities. In addition, such projects can roughly be assessed in terms of activity outputs such as: number of arrests resulting from citizen reports, number of hours a neighborhood is patrolled, number and types of incidents reported by participating citizens to the police, and amount of property marked. The activity outputs may then be examined in relation to the inputs they necessitated.

Such a study would probably be best served by a series of case studies of citizen crime prevention activities operating under crime conditions, levels of police service, and organizational configurations that were varied according to plan. One means of identifying citizen crime prevention activities for study is a telephone search of four to six sites selected to provide variation in crime conditions and police services. Alternatively, crime prevention projects may be selected from the universe of projects identified by studies of specific activities like Neighborhood Watch or Project Identifi-

1The factors discussed earlier in this chapter that preclude a full scale, general purpose evaluation of resident patrols also impede a comparative evaluation of citizen crime prevention activities.
cation. The first approach provides variation on major control variables mentioned above, while the limited number of sites helps to ensure that numerous other situational variables can be held constant. Alternatively, the second approach helps to ensure that the required number of crime prevention projects of desired types are located, although substantial intersite variation in situational factors may interfere to overpower somewhat the effects of the variables whose variation was being planned. Case studies for each type of citizen crime prevention activity may also be aggregated and examined for lessons relating to the implementation of that generic type of crime prevention activity. Output and implementation analyses can then form the basis for recommending the best organizational configuration for administering citizen crime prevention activities.

Social Service Patrols

A final issue raised by the current study of resident patrols is the usefulness of a strategy employed by some social service patrols—that of recruiting or hiring as patrol members neighborhood residents who have themselves been perpetrators of crime. One patrol coordinator referred to the strategy as "taking the baddest kids on the block and turning them around." Although the available evidence did little to shed light on the payoffs or problems associated with this approach, the strategy might raise such difficulties as conflicting loyalties on the part of the rehabilitated patrol members, attempts by the patrol members to extort money or favors from their former cronies, or the taunting and harassing of patrol members by their erstwhile peers on the street. Any further study of this topic should also attempt to assess the effect of participating in a patrol on the criminal careers of those recruited. Such an assessment would involve comparison of the criminal histories of delinquents or adult offenders before, during, and subsequent to their patrol participation.
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. MAJOR FINDINGS

Most of the conclusions that we can draw regarding resident patrols are from our exploratory fieldwork. There have been few evaluations of patrol activities, and those that exist are poorly designed. Our study, though it does not assess the patrol experience in a rigorous fashion, does provide important information that has previously been unreported.

First, contemporary resident patrols share a general emphasis on residential crime prevention. This emphasis contrasts to the riot pacification functions highlighted by much of the previous literature.

Second, there appear to be numerous patrols across the country, in neighborhoods of varied income and racial composition. Our fieldwork alone turned up 226 patrols at 16 sites. The search at each site focused on either the central city or a major suburb; it is likely that a search of the entire metropolitan area would have indicated the existence of many more patrols. Based on the universe of patrols identified, it was estimated that about 850 resident patrols are currently active in urban areas in the United States.

Third, contemporary patrols vary widely in cost, but most are operated on a small budget and on a volunteer basis. The major expenditures are related not to arms, but to citizen-band radios and other communications equipment, uniforms, gasoline and maintenance for patrol cars, and the administrative costs of maintaining records and files. Most of the patrols, other than those organized by public housing authorities, receive no public financial support. The main implication is that if the patrols are at all effective they are likely to be a desirable citizen crime prevention alternative because of their low cost.

Fourth, patrols may usefully be divided into four types in order to consider their effectiveness: building, neighborhood, social service, and community protection patrols. The relatively small and
contained areas covered by building patrols facilitate an evaluation of their effect on crime, and in most cases, though we made no formal evaluation, building patrols seemed to be effective in preventing crime. Since building patrols are often formally sponsored by resident or tenant organizations, the patrol operations tend to be highly visible and legitimized, factors that may contribute to their efficacy. In contrast, although there is some evidence that neighborhood patrols perform valuable services, the broad and ambiguously defined areas they protect make any assessment of their impact difficult. Furthermore, the neighborhood patrols are the subject of more residents' complaints than are building patrols. As for social service or community protection patrols, a general lack of evidence about them precludes any major conclusion as to their crime prevention capability.

Fifth, contemporary resident patrols are occasionally susceptible to vigilantism, with neighborhood patrols appearing to be more inclined to vigilantism than building patrols, particularly when members were recruited selectively from within a friendship group (e.g., a citizen-band radio group) or on the basis of social compatibility with the patrol leader or members. In such cases, the patrol, often representing a splinter group within the community, was the subject of a greater number of residents' complaints and more serious ones than other patrols. Vigilantism may also emerge when patrol and surveillance becomes dull, a situation that may occur particularly when crime abates; in the absence of other rewarding organizational activity, neighborhood patrol members may tend to engage in novel, but dysfunctional ventures (e.g., harassment of teenagers and chasing speeders).

Sixth, public housing patrols differ slightly from others to the extent that the crime problem in public housing may include some perpetrators from among the residents themselves. In this situation, access monitoring to screen outside intruders may have to be supplemented by additional patrol activities or other crime prevention strategies if crime is to be effectively abated. In addition, public housing patrols sometimes affect police-community relations and police
coverage, especially in housing projects where the relation had been hostile or strained prior to the patrol's existence. By mediating encounters between police and residents, patrols in several cases appear to have eased police-community relations, often with the consequences that the police encounter less harassment and respond more readily to calls from the project.

Finally, several implementation factors influence a patrol's ability to operate and to achieve its goals: personnel, organizational affiliation, and bureaucratization. Those patrols appear to operate best whose personnel are matched to the level of coverage the patrol seeks to provide, that is, members feel that they have neither too much nor too little to do. Recruiting and maintaining this supply of personnel is a major organizational task. Patrols that carefully screen and train their applicants appear to engender a commitment among their members that reduces attrition. The recruitment and screening procedures employed by a patrol also seem to influence members' general proclivities for vigilantism.

Patrols that maintain neighborhood organizational affiliations also tend to operate more effectively. A patrol of this kind is frequently more representative of the community it patrols, is viewed by residents as more legitimate, can be monitored by the residents, receives financial resources from the neighborhood organization, and may even be able to rely on the organization to perform maintenance activities during periods when the patrol operates at a reduced level. Bureaucratization, involving a paid administrator, maintenance of logs and other records, prearranged scheduling, and quality control of members' behavior in the field, is a third implementation factor that seems to enhance a patrol's ability to operate effectively.

B. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Further Research

Our examination of the problems of designing and conducting evaluations of patrols has led to the following conclusions. The evidence gathered indicates that a national evaluation of building
patrols, but not other types, would be feasible. We recommend such an evaluation be considered because building patrols, if proven effective, have the following advantages:

- The patrols often operate in public housing projects that are actively seeking more effective ways to reduce crime;
- Building patrols can help the police to save manpower and resources, since in the absence of a building patrol, police might be called more frequently by residents to respond to crimes; and
- Even in buildings with previously low rates of crime, patrols seem to make residents feel more secure, and such feelings may be more important in relation to one's own home than any other location.

However, the type of study to be undertaken would be constrained in several ways. By its very nature, any social program initiated under circumstances beyond the control of an evaluator is not amenable to evaluation using rigorous, controlled pre- and posttreatment evaluation designs. A feasible evaluation design would be a "matched" posttreatment design.

As for the other types of patrols, community protection patrols appear to be scarce and, as with social service patrols, have numerous outcomes, some of which are either unrelated to the criminal justice system or idiosyncratic and difficult to measure. At present, research that is nonevaluative and focuses on qualitative evidence would be likely to add more to an understanding of such patrols than could a formal national evaluation. Neighborhood patrols also raise severe measurement problems and would be difficult to match on a posttreatment basis, leaving building patrols as the only existing type of patrol that is suitable for a national evaluation.

One new type of patrol could be evaluated using a classical, controlled, pre- and posttreatment design. In this case, a new type of patrol would be initiated by external agencies and not residents.
For example, a classical evaluation could be conducted if LEAA wished to fund resident patrols and required that the grant recipients not begin operations until baseline data had been collected. The results of such an evaluation could not be statistically generalized to citizen-initiated resident patrols, but only to those that wished funding from LEAA and were willing to abide by the specified conditions. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that such patrols might not differ substantially in their experiences from citizen-initiated patrols and might thus be of considerable policy interest. We recommend that such an approach be tried. Both building and neighborhood patrols might be included in such an evaluation.

In addition to evaluation, our exploratory study also suggests several topics for more general research. For example, little is known about the conditions under which resident patrols emerge, and neither previous research nor the present study has focused on that question. In particular, the role of crime and police activity in fostering or retarding patrol emergence may be at least as central as that of demographic or economic attributes of the neighborhoods patrolled, and an inquiry into this role seems useful—if for example, police and other officials are to know whether patrols emerge in areas where they are needed.

A second issue raised is that of the legal authority and potential liability accruing to patrol members. A related concern is the legal position of those who employ patrols or who support them with financial or in-kind contributions.

Third, resident patrols, along with numerous other crime prevention efforts, are being undertaken by citizens and police across the country. In some communities, these projects operate independently of each other with little communication or coordination. In other neighborhoods, an organization has occasionally adopted the role of integrator and fulfilled for neighborhood safety a coordinating function similar to that of a PTA in education. Information as to what organizational arrangements optimize the effective operation of these crime prevention activities seems a
major but as yet unanswered question. Several different kinds of organizational variations might be compared in terms of input costs: e.g., how many volunteer hours, how much police coordination, and how much equipment or training is required for the various activities? The inputs could then be related to activity outputs: e.g., how many patrol hours, how quick a response to crisis, and how much property marked for Project Identification functions? Such comparisons could then form the basis for recommending the best organizational configuration for administering citizen crime prevention activities.

A last issue raised by this study concerns the value of efforts by some patrols to recruit or hire as members former delinquents or offenders among neighborhood residents with the hope of rehabilitating them. While the evidence on this topic is minimal, the strategy seems to hold out the possibility of conflicting loyalties or extortion on the part of the newly recruited patrol members, as well as harassment or assault of those members by their former cronies. The costs and benefits of the high-risk approach seems a final useful avenue of inquiry.

Governmental Support of Patrols

Our study provides a basis neither for judging the effectiveness of patrols, nor for recommending whether or not there should be governmental support of patrol activities. However, it is clear that with or without public support, large numbers of patrols are, in fact, operating. The evidence of this study suggests tentatively that if there is to be government support for resident patrols, such support might be most effective if the patrols were to report incidents, but not to intervene unless the patrol members are professional guards.

Whatever type of patrol is supported, the patrols should be encouraged to report incidents but, because of the legal penalties that may be involved and the dysfunctions that may result, not to intervene in such incidents unless the patrol members are professional guards. Neighborhood and social service patrols (but not necessarily building patrols) should be urged to plan their
activities with the local police, and the police should provide all types of patrols with systematic feedback on the disposition of any incident reported by a patrol.

Any support of patrols should also be made through tenant or neighborhood organizations, thereby creating a broader base for the patrol's accountability to the community. Financial support should be used mainly for training programs, the initial equipment or uniforms for the patrol, and administrative expenses. In fact, the patrols should be encouraged to develop administrative practices (e.g., maintaining logs, scheduling patrols' routines, and systematizing the procedures for substituting for absent patrol members) that will lead to less dependence on an individual leader or small clique. Financial support, however, should probably not be used to subsidize patrol members' salaries. Volunteers can operate effectively as long as the patrol routine does not require an excessive amount of time and effort from any single individual.

When financial support is provided, a major problem seems to be that of timing. Patrols often emerge in response to a rash of incidents that impels members to pay their own expenses. By the time a group applies for funding, the problem may have subsided, resident interest may have waned, and the patrol may have begun to outlive its usefulness. Patrol activity may become uneventful and dull, and vigilantism is more likely to occur at this time. It is therefore extremely important that public funds, if made available, be readily awarded and disbursed while crime is at a crisis level. When crime subsides or the crime problem is perceived by residents to be within the range of acceptable levels, governmental support may be withdrawn or used to encourage the group to undertake new activities. The ability to become dormant or shift to other activities is therefore an important component of patrol structure. Continuing support, in other words, may be offered for other activities and if and when crime escalates again at a later date, then for subsequent patrol activity.
### DIFFERENT TYPES OF CITIZEN CRIME PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block Security Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to improve residents' awareness and education concerning public safety, and may also assign surveillance or assistance responsibilities to specific individuals such as block mothers. These programs are very diverse and may include actual patrol activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockwatchers and Neighborhood Watch Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to improve citizen reporting of crimes and suspicious events in the neighborhood. Residents are sensitized to signs of criminal activity and are given specific names or numbers to call in case of emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Volunteer Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce crime pressure in the community at large. Typical activities are aimed at: improving educational and employment opportunities for youths, providing recreation services, and providing counseling and rehabilitation services. Many programs cover courts and corrections activities and not just police-related activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Alert Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to improve citizens' education about public safety and ability to report crimes. Typical emphasis is on disseminating information about physical security for the home and giving citizens a specific name or number to call in case of emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Radio Watch</td>
<td>Attempts to improve citizen reporting of crime and other emergencies. Business firms or private citizens with vehicles having two-way radios are encouraged to report incidents to their dispatchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Officers</td>
<td>Attempt to improve communications between police and community. A neighborhood youth is trained by the police to perform community services. The services do not necessarily involve serious crime prevention responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort Services</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce vulnerability to crime. Residents escort children to school or elderly persons when collecting and cashing checks. Escort service follows specific routine and time of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Security Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce vulnerability to crime. Citizens are encouraged to install new and more effective security devices to protect their homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Alarm Systems</td>
<td>Attempt to provide improved reporting of crimes in progress. In some cases, citizens carry special devices that transmit digital signals indicating need for help. In other cases, special alarms are installed in adjoining homes so that neighbors can help each other out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-Community Councils</td>
<td>Attempt to increase informal contact between citizens and the police. Resident groups may be organized as an advisory body, meeting at intervals with the local police. The meetings increase communications in both directions, with residents having an opportunity to voice complaints and the police having an opportunity to explain regulations and other departmental changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-Community Relations Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to increase informal contact between citizens (mostly youths) and the police. Typical activities are: officers speak at school functions, officers and youths go on outings, and youths ride in police cars to get exposed to the officer's world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Reserve Units</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce vulnerability to crime. Volunteers undergo extensive training and devote specific periods to police work. Volunteers may be considered part of an auxiliary police group, and the activities of such groups are fully controlled by the local police authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Identification</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce vulnerability to crime. Citizens are encouraged to mark property and to report registration numbers to police so that property may be more easily traced if stolen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Patrols</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce vulnerability to crime. Residents actively monitor specific physical locations, either by patrolling or by observing for a given period of time. Locations may involve either streets and outdoor areas or hallways and corridors within housing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Witness Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to increase information from citizens about criminal activities. A community organization or newspaper may offer monetary rewards for information from anonymous callers regarding a particular crime or specific lawbreakers, including pushers or fences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Guards</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce vulnerability to crime. Citizens hire guards to patrol specific areas, usually a residential block or a housing project. Guards may operate in isolation or may be part of a professional security service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting Programs</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce vulnerability to crime. Brighter street lights are installed in public areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilante Groups</td>
<td>Attempt to enforce laws and administer own justice. Volunteers exist outside of the regular public safety network and carry out both surveillance and apprehension activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Patrols</td>
<td>Attempt to reduce tensions in times of neighborhood disorders and to reduce crime vulnerability. Volunteers circulate within the community, especially during times of civil unrest, and attempt to reduce hostilities among residents and between residents and police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

SPA OFFICIALS CONTACTED AND THEIR COMMENTS

SPA OFFICIALS CONTACTED

CALIFORNIA: Jonas Minton
            California SPA
            Sacramento

CONNECTICUT: David R. Sherwood, Assistant Director of Planning
              Margo Callahan, Public Information Officer
              Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration
              Hartford

FLORIDA: Ray Graves, Law Enforcement Science Advisor
         State of Florida
         Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance
         Tallahassee

ILLINOIS: Gerald Gersey, Crime Prevention Specialist
         Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
         120 S. Riverdale Plaza
         Chicago

MASSACHUSETTS: Robert F. Cole, Evaluation Director
               Committee on Criminal Justice
               Boston

MICHIGAN: Glen Bachelder, Director of Planning
          Tom Johnson
          Office of Criminal Justice Programs
          Lansing

NEW JERSEY: Donald J. Apai, Assistant Director
             Thomas J. O'Reilly, Chief, Police Programs
             State Law Enforcement Planning Agency
             Trenton

NEW YORK: Jerome McElroy, Chief of Planning
          Michael Cummings
          Division of Criminal Justice Services
          New York City

OHIO: Colonel Montgomery
      Administration of Justice Division
      Columbus

Pennsylvania: Gerald M. Croan, Evaluation Planner
              Governor's Justice Commission
              Harrisburg
TEXAS: Frances S. Dodd, Director of Planning
           Jan Younglove, Planning Assistant
           Texas Criminal Justice Division
           Austin

COMMENTS

New Jersey. In New Jersey, the SPA has provided funds in the
past for patrol units to be established in public housing projects in
high-crime, densely populated areas. Projects have been funded in
Trenton, Orange, Camden, and Elizabeth. In addition, Newark has been
funded by LEAA (the Impact Program) for public housing security-patrol
units. The SPA has encouraged the use of residential patrols, usually on
an informal basis in conjunction with the housing security guards.
The SPA requested that the following information be collected during
site visits:

- Relationship of the patrols to the police department;
- Duties of the patrols;
- Size and deployment of the patrols;
- Size and demographic features of the population served by the
  patrols; and
- Training of the patrols at all stages of development.

Michigan. In Michigan, there were no known residential patrol
projects other than two projects in Detroit in the 1960s. One was a
"good" patrol: the other patrol eventually turned into a vigilante group.
Concern that the patrols might turn into vigilante groups has been cited
as one reason why state administrators have not funded any residential
patrol projects. The SPA expressed interest in: (1) any demonstrated
effect of residential patrols in reducing crime and (2) the legal ramifica-
tions of private groups attempting to carry out police work.

Massachusetts. Springfield, Fall River, and Boston all have public
housing projects with security components. In addition, Worcester has
two types of security projects: (1) in the high crime security area,
citizen-based patrols have been established and (2) a split-force patrol has been created that consists of para-police working with sworn officers and 35 police service aides (PSAs) who deal with basically non-criminal activities. This latter patrol is funded with a "Mini-Impact" grant.

The Massachusetts SPA suggested that the following factors be considered in the study of residential patrols:

- Type of neighborhood patrolled and its influence on the nature of the crime problem (middle class, blue collar, public housing project, etc.);
- Group that sponsored the project and the degree of cooperation of public agencies (police department, housing authority) with that group;
- Nature of the planning process that went into the selection of one citizen patrol model over another, types of modifications to the model experienced over time, reasons for these changes;
- Identification of factors that led to citizen organization of the patrols, of how leaders emerged or were encouraged to participate, and of the effect of leadership types on the administration of the patrols.

Pennsylvania. Housing projects in Pittsburgh and McKeesport have been funded to a limited extent for security activities. The SPA has also funded block organizations in Philadelphia. Specific information that the SPA thought should be learned about residential patrols included:

- How many patrols there are today;
- What type of training they have received;
- How long they have been in existence;
- What kinds of weapons and hardware patrols should use;
- How effective patrols are in reducing the crime rate and the fear index [NOTE: The Pennsylvania SPA is presently initiating a contract for the design of a fear index.];
o What the usual relationship with local police departments is:

o The effect of giving patrols police or quasi-police status; and

o What collateral programs are needed with patrols, i.e., what type(s) of community organizing should occur to prevent citizen antagonism toward patrols.

Texas. The Texas Criminal Justice Division is not involved with and does not fund residential patrols. It therefore did not have any questions on the subject.

Illinois. In Illinois, a state amendment has recently been passed that authorizes the purchase of citizen band radios by private citizens' groups. Funds have not been allocated for this purpose to date. There are numerous residential security patrols in the state. The following are questions and concepts that the SPA staff would like to see explored in our study:

o Development of a meaningful typology for residential patrols, i.e., how can we categorize patrols? How many are in each type of category and which type is most successful?

o What is the organizational basis of patrols?

o What are the various mechanisms for initial and maintenance funding?

o How long have various types of patrols been in existence?

o What are the criteria for successful development and maintenance of a patrol?

Florida. To answer our questions, the Florida SPA police contacted various departments. According to these sources, the majority of residential patrols in the state are police auxiliaries. All the policemen responded that they viewed residential patrol efforts with great skepticism and suspicion. The term "vigilantism" was mentioned repeatedly. In light of this attitude, the SPA concluded that it was difficult to get any interest in residential security patrols. The SPA would like to learn more about the "positive examples" of residential patrols.
New York. Various security projects have been funded for the New York City Housing Authority and the Auxiliary Police. The SPA staff was interested in obtaining information on the techniques that contribute to the prevention of crime and on the methods of supporting the regular police in "these times of tight budgets." Our discussion with the New York SPA was about residential patrols that supplement police activity and not about citizen-based patrols that exist without police involvement.

California. California currently has no residential patrol projects. The SPA officials, however, are continually asked to comment on new state legislation in this area. One issue has been what standards, if any, to establish for any patrol activity. The SPA requested that the study cover such aspects of patrols as the amount of prior training of the patrol persons and the role of weapons in patrol activities.

Ohio. In Cleveland there is a funded security project in a public housing project for the elderly. The SPA staff is currently working on a proposal that would support a massive residential patrol project in Columbus. The issue of whether residential patrols make people feel safer was raised. Everything else was felt to be peripheral.

Connecticut. Projects in Connecticut include the Hartford Police Department's Neighborhood Team Policing Program (which encourages the implementation of some block-watch and citizen patrol efforts) and the New Britain Police Department's Reduction of Crime Program (which includes a six-citizen patrol unit). The evaluation division of the Planning Committee on Criminal Justice wanted to know the following about residential patrols:

- Under whose jurisdiction do they operate (police? housing authority? etc.);
- What equipment they have (uniforms, radios, especially weapons);
- What, qualitatively, their relationship with the Police Department is;
- How effective they are perceived to be—by themselves, the police, and the community;
o Who initiated them;
  o If the staff is voluntary or paid;
  o What the schedules of the patrols are (number of hours and
    days per week); and
  o Who evaluates their effectiveness and how.

In addition to telephoning SPAs, we sent to the New Jersey, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas SPAs letters identifying relevant LEAA grants in their state and requesting copies of any reports associated with those grants.
### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name/Title</th>
<th>Comments/Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center of Social Policy and Community Development</td>
<td>Sy Rosenhai</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Public Housing Project Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Lawrence Resnick, Editor</td>
<td>Referred to George Washnir's recent study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Crime Prevention Newsletter</td>
<td>Gary Hill</td>
<td>Discussed three Reserve Police Officer projects and offered to provide introductions to any local groups they knew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield, New Jersey</td>
<td>Consultant to JAYCEES</td>
<td>Working with victims of crime; no activity with resident patrols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>Jeff Usher</td>
<td>Discussed general references; unable to get in contact with the appropriate staff people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Nebraska</td>
<td>Cheryl Hoffman</td>
<td>Provided written materials on patrols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie Hayman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilene Bergman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Tue (Washington)</td>
<td>No program in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warren Merr (New York)</td>
<td>Discussed police auxiliary groups and private residential security in middle and upper income neighborhoods in New Orleans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron Kohn</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff member.</td>
<td>No activity in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Pierczec</td>
<td>General discussion of organization's activities in related crime prevention areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant to George Sunderland</td>
<td>In the process of moving, no access to files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judy Williamson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Dunn</td>
<td>Suggested projects: New York City Block Associations, New York City Auxiliary Police, Hassidic Jews in Brooklyn, private security companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Law Enforcement Division</td>
<td>No activity in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanny Proffer</td>
<td>Suggested projects: Dayton (Ohio), New Orleans, Phoenix, Milwaukee, Boston, Inglewood (California), New York (beach patrols).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John McKay, Deputy Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Justice Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name/Title</td>
<td>Comments/Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Legislative Conference</td>
<td>Mr. Lalley</td>
<td>Part of Council of State Governments (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by National Sheriff's Association (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Mental Health</td>
<td>Evelyn Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency</td>
<td>National Operations Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently writing a book on this subject; provided several names and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Tenant Organization</td>
<td>No response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No activity in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Urban Coalition</td>
<td>Gene Pack (Washington)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Mr. Burner (New York)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Urban League</td>
<td>Joe Lewis</td>
<td>Referred to several police projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Foundation</td>
<td>Wayne Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Chuck Ivery</td>
<td>Referred to Gary Hill, CONTACT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States JAYCEES Criminal Justice Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE FIRMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brill Associates</td>
<td>William Brill</td>
<td>Doing consultant work in the area of physical security design in residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>One patrol project in Washington; nationally, very few patrols in upper income residential areas such as Miami, San Francisco, and New York; small percentage of total business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns Security Services</td>
<td>Gene Pack (Washington)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Burner (New York)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkerton Company</td>
<td>Peter Cardenelle (Washington)</td>
<td>No residential patrol projects in Washington; national information being sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art Bilek, Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chicago)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Detective Agencies, Inc.</td>
<td>Mr. James, President</td>
<td>Eleven patrol cars on street; one patrol project in upper income development in Potomac, Maryland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>(local agency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Planning Corporation</td>
<td>Arnold Sagaly</td>
<td>No leads to current patrol studies or activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon and Luchs Realtors</td>
<td>Jerald C. Deem</td>
<td>Suggested we contact Institute of Real Estate Management (Chicago) or Washington Board of Realtors for names of management companies nationwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Smith Security, Inc.</td>
<td>Staff member.</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. (national agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name/Title</td>
<td>Comments/Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>John Diedrich</td>
<td>Is providing lists of projects which used ROIF funds for security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Mort Leeds, Special Assistant</td>
<td>Referred to Rosenthal, Brill, Sunderland, mentioned projects in Pittsburgh Public Housing and New York Public Housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Frankie Peltzman</td>
<td>Referrals; background information from her participation in the writing of Residential Security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Phil Stillman</td>
<td>Suggested some patrol projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Beverly Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Phil Ryan</td>
<td>Is providing list of projects using TFP funds for security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Dorothy Guilford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Jeannie Neidemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Assistance Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Initiative Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDIVIDUALS**

Leonard Bickman (Chicago)
Charles Girard (Falls Church, Virginia)
Gary Marx (Cambridge, Massachusetts)
Gordon Misner (St. Louis)
Oscar Newman (New York)
Thomas Repetto (New York)
George Washnis (Washington, D.C.)
Ron Weiner (Washington, D.C.)
PATROL PROFILE AND KEY WORD CHECKLISTS

1. PROJECT NAME: ____________________________________________

2. LOCATION: (City and neighborhood, general geographic location, or housing project in which patrol operates)

3. PERSONAL CONTACT: ____________________________________________
   (Name and title, if any)

4. ADDRESS: ____________________________________________

5. TELEPHONE: ________________________________

6. DATE OF INTERVIEW: ___________ 7. TIME: ________________________________
   (Date patrol first began)

NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT:

9. MEDIAN ANNUAL INCOME: ______________________________________
   (Low income; middle income; upper income)

10. RACIAL COMPOSITION: ______________________________________
    (More than 30% black; important ethnic groups)

11. PATROL OPERATES IN HOUSING PROJECT: ______________________
    (Yes, no)

12. MAJOR CRIME PROBLEM: ______________________________________
    (Burglary, street and personal crime, vandalism and minor crimes, drugs, none)

PATROL OPERATIONS:

13. IS THE PATROL CURRENTLY OPERATING OR NOT? ______________________

14. IF NOT, WHEN DID IT LAST OPERATE AND WHY DID IT STOP? ______________________

15. DOMINANT MODE OF PATROL/GUARD ACTIVITY: ______________________
    (Hired resident, paid guard, volunteer)
16. MAIN DUTIES:  
(Stationary, mobile foot patrol, mobile auto patrol, escort)

17. MAIN TYPE OF AREA PATROLLED:  
(Building interior, single block, multiblock area, entryway)

18. THE MOST SERIOUS CRIMINAL INCIDENT DEALT WITH BY THE PATROL TO DATE WAS:  

PATROL ORGANIZATION:

19. SIZE OF MEMBERSHIP:  
(Estimated number of persons involved)

20. AGE OF PATROL PERSONNEL:  
(Adults, youth, elderly)

21. ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION:  
(Organization operating, sponsoring, or affiliated with patrol)

22. APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURES FOR 1975:  

23. MAIN SOURCE OF FUNDS:  
(Police, other municipal office, special grant, contributions, membership dues, fee for service, none)

24. LEAA MONEY (Any amount at any time):  
DATE:  

25. EVALUATIONS OR STUDIES OF THE PROJECT DONE TO DATE (Specify):  

ADDITIONAL PATROL INFORMATION:

26. INITIAL GOALS:  
(Reduce crime, stem civil unrest or crimes arising therefrom, prevent feared or anticipated rise in crime, buffer between residents and police)

27. FREQUENCY OF SURVEILLANCE: HOURS:  
(Day, night, late night, 24 hours)

DAYS:  
(M, Tu, W, Th, F, Sat, Sun)

SEASONS:  
(Winter, Spring, Summer, Fall, All)
28. STAFFING OF SHIFTS:  
(Number of teams and total patrolmen)

29. COORDINATION OF PATROL ACTIVITIES WITH POLICE:  
(Deployed by police, regularly inform police of activities, minimal or irregular contact with police, no police contact)

30. MAIN CHANGES IN NATURE OF PATROL ACTIVITY SINCE START-UP:  

(Specify precise changes in nature of activity [e.g., more crime prevention activity, less social activity, different crime prevention activity] and factors that contributed to and precipitated those changes [e.g., nature of membership, patrol problems, crises, reinforcing events, etc.])

31. MAIN CHANGES IN LEVEL OF PATROL ACTIVITY:  

(Specify changes in level of activity [e.g., size of membership, size of patrol, patrol frequency, etc.] and factors contributing thereto [e.g., problems, crises, reinforcing events, etc.])
II. KEY WORD CHECKLIST FOR PATROL COORDINATOR

1. Project title.
2. Location.
3. Start date.
4. Termination date (if any).

A. PATROL START-UP
1. Prior neighborhood organizing.
2. Why patrol was started.
3. Alternatives considered.
4. Alternatives tried/not tried.
5. Number of initial planners.
6. Planners' role(s) in community.
7. How initially planned.
8. Initial recruitment.
10. Main obstacle.
11. Original goals.
12. Changes in goals.
13. Other noncrime-related functions.

B. PATROL OPERATIONS
1. Hours.
2. Days.
4. Type of area.
5. Paid/volunteer.
6. Residents/nonresidents.
7. Patrolmen per beat.
8. Shift length.
10. Main patrol activities.
11. Instructions should a crime be witnessed.
12. Additional patrol activities.
15. Basis for selection.
17. Who provides training.
18. Purpose of training.
20. Equipment.
21. Resources provided by members.
22. Summoning procedure.
23. Coordination of activities with police.
24. Supplemental coverage.
25. When/how provided.
C. PATROL ORGANIZATION

1. Size of membership.
2. Age and characteristics of patrol personnel.
3. Organizational affiliation.
4. Levels of authority.
5. Hiring, selection, discipline.
6. Accountability.
7. Designation of leader.
8. Time spent by leader on patrol effort.
9. Main source of financial support.
11. Types of expenditures.
12. LEAA money; date.

D. IMPLEMENTATION

1. Changes in nature of patrol activity.
   Nature: more crime prevention, different, etc.
   Causes: membership, problems, crises, successes.
2. Changes in level of patrol activity.
   Level: size of membership, patrol size, patrol frequency, dormancy.
   Causes: problems, crises, successes.
3. Continuing problems.
5. Crises.
6. Reinforcing events.
7. Continuing support.
8. Routine police contact.
9. Frequency of police contact.
11. Other crime prevention programs.
12. Written records.
13. Members terminated; reasons.

E. OUTCOMES

2. If problems, or activity terminated—why?
4. Most serious incident handled.
5. Quality of police protection since patrol began.
6. How patrol gets police feedback; nature.
7. How patrol gets resident feedback; nature.
8. Complaints about patrol.
9. Residents' complaints about security.
III. KEY OBSERVATIONS ABOUT SITE PATROLLED

1. Site location features.
2. Housing stock (quality and type).
4. Anticrime hardware.
5. Boundaries and limits to access.
IV. KEY WORDS FOR PATROL MEMBERS AND POLICE

A. PATROL MEMBERS

1. How members learn about patrol.
2. Why people join, why not.
3. Person's experience with crime.
4. Is patrol work dangerous?
5. Rather have hired guards?
6. What joining involves.
7. Patrol activities.
8. Any circumstances that warrant taking law into one's own hands.
10. Is it burdensome?
11. Frequency of absences.
13. What has patrol accomplished?
14. Were expectations about patrol realized?
15. Reputation of patrol: by residents, by police.
16. What members get out of patrol?

B. POLICE

1. Conduct of patrol.
2. Patrol coordination of activities with police.
3. Patrol contact with police (in the field; generally).
4. Incidents or mishaps.
5. Patrol accomplishments.
6. Patrol problems.
7. Should the patrol be supported? (why? why not?)
8. Displacement of crime.
Appendix E
THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS

Chapter III describes the process whereby 18 urban areas were selected for inclusion in this study. This appendix provides additional detail to clarify the selection process. The procedures that were followed relied mainly on a typology of urban areas developed by Keeler and Rogers (1973), according to which urban areas are clustered on the basis of several characteristics and all the urban areas belonging to a cluster are more similar to each other in regard to a large number of variables than they are to urban areas in other clusters. Unfortunately, these clusters can be described only in statistical terms. For convenience, the cities are listed below with only the cluster number assigned by Keller and Rogers. (For a description of the characteristics of each cluster and a complete list of the urban areas in each cluster, the reader is referred to Keeler and Rogers.)

The site selection process consisted of two stages. First, an initial pool of urban areas was selected according to any of the following characteristics of their central cities:

a. The 15 largest cities (according to 1970 population);
b. Cities in which criminal victimization surveys had been conducted; and
c. LEAA Impact cities.

In addition, three urban areas were selected at random to fulfill the requirement to include:

d. At least one urban area from each Keeler and Rogers cluster.

The list of cities in the pool, together with the criteria by which
they were included, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Urban Area</th>
<th>K-R Cluster</th>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To select 18 urban areas from this pool, a random choice was made of ones to eliminate, subject to two constraints:

- An urban area could not be eliminated if it was the only remaining one in a Keeler and Rogers cluster; and
- At least three urban areas had to remain in each geographical region.

The areas that remained after this elimination process are shown in Chapter III.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrol Location and Name</th>
<th>Dates of Existence</th>
<th>Source and Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greater New York City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooklyn</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>Maccabees formed by rabbi after 82-year-old woman was raped and murdered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooklyn</strong></td>
<td>Summer 1969-? (recently)</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>Group of youths and adults patrolled streets and reported wrongdoings to police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harlem</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>At least some members of three neighborhood patrols have been armed while hunting for narcotics addicts and pushers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harlem</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>Institute provides escort patrols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harlem Crime Prevention Institute</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>Newsweek</strong></td>
<td>Mothers in orange raincoats constitute Safety Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manhattan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manhattan’s East Side Child Safety Patrol</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>Residents, concerned for safety of mothers and children, organized to rid neighborhood park of homosexuals; 30 to 40 men went to park nightly, equipped with radios and flashlights to disperse homosexuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manhattan, Lower East Side</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>Organized group of Puerto Ricans and blacks have assaulted narcotics pushers and addicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manhattan, Lower East Side</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>17-year-old heads group that patrols to rid area of narcotics pushers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>Housing project has volunteer patrol composed mainly of elderly Jews and some Puerto Ricans and blacks; leader of patrol is paid by the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East 7th Street</strong></td>
<td>June 1969-? [one month ago]</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 7/2/69</td>
<td>20 armed males, volunteers guard apartment buildings; strangers are stopped and escorted to place of visit--group formed after resident attacked in building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manhattan, Lower East Side</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>Patrol has more than 100 armed members who track narcotics addicts and dealers; claim that member was murdered last year as retaliation from dealers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East 7th Street</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>Group of tenement residents use walkie-talkies for patrol purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Citizens Patrol</strong></td>
<td>March 1968-? [a year and a half]</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>With 155 members, patrol plans to &quot;discourage&quot; those who would push drugs in Harlem public schools by circulating names and photographs of suspected or known pushers; people will be stationed in schools to report suspicions to police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> 9/23/69</td>
<td>City pays leaders of 92 patrols in housing projects: about 4,500 volunteer residents guard lobbies of these projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td>September 1971-?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> Magazine 5/7/72</td>
<td>After resident was murdered, private guards were hired; they patrol 16 hours per day and also perform escort service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td><strong>NY Times</strong> Magazine 5/7/72</td>
<td>Patrol started with resident volunteers working four hours a day; after they saw success of Jane Street security guards, private guards were hired to replace residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A question mark indicates that the dates of existence were not given in the source. Wording in brackets is that used in the source. For example, if it was stated in an article dated May 1973 that a group "recently began patrol activities," the starting date is given in this table as Spring 1973 and "recently" is given beneath in brackets.

2 The full citations are given at the end of this table (p. 146).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrol Location and Name</th>
<th>Dates of Existence</th>
<th>Source and Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>December 1972-?</td>
<td>NY Times 12/22/72</td>
<td>Anti-crime campaign initiated involving thousands who will receive police training; will use walkie-talkie and watch streets and building interiors and report suspicious incidents to police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10/15/73</td>
<td>400 police-trained volunteers patrol on foot to keep a lookout for trouble and to check working order of public telephones, police callboxes, etc.; patrol operates in early morning and mid-afternoon to provide safety for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's League Child Safety Campaign</td>
<td>April 1972-?</td>
<td>New York 10/15/73</td>
<td>Resident patrol organized by area association due to increased muggings; volunteers replaced by hired guard after funds were raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 105th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York 10/15/73</td>
<td>6,000 volunteers cruise streets in cars--use citizen band radio to report crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York West 110th Street</td>
<td>1971-? [2 years ago]</td>
<td>New York 10/15/73</td>
<td>Tenants' association hired armed guard after repeated incidents of muggings; difficulty with guard caused resident to take over patrol duty at night; residents pay for service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Civilian Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York 10/15/73</td>
<td>250 volunteers to patrol streets in pairs near schools to provide extra protection for children; sponsored by Parents League of New York and LEAA--will wear special clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York near Central Park</td>
<td>Summer 1973-?</td>
<td>NY Times 8/16/74</td>
<td>Parents League Child Safety Campaign has two people wearing bright caps to patrol near schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Central Park area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>1000 block associations are entitled to municipal funds for security communication equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>Patrol has about 9,500 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago 9/75</td>
<td>22 blocks constitute secret vigilante group—patrol streets during late night and early morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 6/30/75</td>
<td>40 volunteers operate mobile radio patrol—retirees patrol during day and others on Friday and Saturday nights; police imposed limitations so group only reports and does not apprehend or chase or detain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham Park Manor Patrol</td>
<td>1971-present</td>
<td>Chicago 9/75</td>
<td>11 black males drive through housing project and surrounding area looking for stolen cars and suspicious-looking people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrini Green Citizens Radio Patrol</td>
<td>Summer 1975-present</td>
<td>Chicago 9/75</td>
<td>Group originally organized as social club originated weekend radio patrol to cover streets and playgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Citizens Radio League</td>
<td>1969-present</td>
<td>Chicago 9/75</td>
<td>Foot patrol covers El platforms and bus stops, and provide escort service to women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth City Community Corporation</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chicago 9/75</td>
<td>40 members operate mobile radio patrol on Friday and Saturday; police check potential members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Radio Patrol</td>
<td>Winter 1972-present</td>
<td>Chicago 9/75</td>
<td>Radio patrol has 25 members providing surveillance seven nights per week; forced after reading about Chatham Park Manor Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pullman Blazers</td>
<td>1973-present</td>
<td>Chicago 9/75</td>
<td>40 citizen radio patrols are operating—have two people per automobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>U.S. News and World Report 9/29/75</td>
<td>Woman organized homeowners to pay for two private patrol cars; patrol terminated when she quit coordinating activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Location and Name</td>
<td>Dates of Existence</td>
<td>Source and Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Newsweek 12/18/72</td>
<td>&quot;Street-wise&quot; courtesy patrols exist in black community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiber Island</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Newsweek 12/18/72</td>
<td>Guards patrol luxury high-rise 24 hours per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Virginia</td>
<td>Summer 1971-</td>
<td>Washington 4/72</td>
<td>Established after police requested citizens to &quot;keep eyes open&quot; for crime, group patrolled at night looking for suspicious activity; disbanded because of members seasonal interests (hunting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Ray Patrol</td>
<td>Winter 1971 [less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>than 1 year ago-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Virginia</td>
<td>Spring 1972-?</td>
<td>Washington 4/72</td>
<td>As part of broad program of Crime Prevention Association of Alexandria, Inc., volunteers will be recruited and trained by police, patrol in marked cars, and operate under City Hall guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye on Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood, Maryland</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Washington 4/72</td>
<td>Homeowners subscribe to private police protection through Kenwood Citizens Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood Citizens Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure World, Maryland</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Washington 4/72</td>
<td>Development for people over 50 years old has guardhouse at entrance to control ingress and also has grounds patrolled by guards in cars; services are paid for by residents through co-op and condominium fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossoom Leisure World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, Virginia</td>
<td>?-Spring 1971 [ended 1 year ago]</td>
<td>Washington 4/72</td>
<td>Homeowners in townhouse community assessed to pay for private patrolmen who were to thwart auto break-ins and residential theft; activity ended when residents decided it was unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Falls, Maryland</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Washington 4/72</td>
<td>Through Homeowners Association, families pay for 24-hour protection provided by armed private guards in automobiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Falls Homeowners Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Black October</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>U.S. News and World Report 2/4/74</td>
<td>Organized group of blacks claimed credit for murdering two narcotics dealers; they are attempting to obliterate heroin traffic in black community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Jewish Defense League</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Psychology Today 1/73</td>
<td>Self-protection group whose potential members are subjected psychiatric examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, Illinois</td>
<td>Summer 1967-?</td>
<td>NY Times 5/1/69</td>
<td>Originally formed as defensive body after surge of arson and gunfire, organization with more than 500 members is focal point of fear and resentment among black residents; it is a white vigilante group patrolling in radio-equipped autos--most members are armed and wear white helmets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, Illinois</td>
<td>Summer 1967- [2 years ago]</td>
<td>NY Times 6/17/69</td>
<td>White vigilante association credited with responsibility for racial fear and violence; group organized after rash of arson and gunfire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, Illinois</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NY Times 9/18/69</td>
<td>Black community leaders suggested that shooting of black youth was done by white vigilantes; associated incident with previous gunfire outbreak that wounded young black woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Citizens for Community Action</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NY Times 10/27/70</td>
<td>White Hats, a vigilante group, formed this organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Washington 4/72</td>
<td>20 neighborhoods have volunteer resident patrols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>U.S. News and Report 2/4/74</td>
<td>200 to 300 volunteers patrol during evening hours and act as &quot;eyes and ears&quot; of police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Location and Name</td>
<td>Dates of Existence</td>
<td>Source and Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>U.S. News and World Report 9/29/75</td>
<td>Police feel volunteers sometimes &quot;get in the way&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartfod, Connecticut</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>Females are being taught how to patrol public housing projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Hills, California Rosemoor Leisure World</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Time 5/1/72</td>
<td>Enclosed retirement community has 170 residents patrolling in radio-equipped cars and staffing entrance gates; 4 armed professionals serve as leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Miguel, California The Shores</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Time 5/1/72</td>
<td>Walled-in community of 200 homes utilizes armed guards at gatehouses for ingress control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurelton, New York</td>
<td>1969-? [6 years old]</td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>Mobile patrol with blue lights on top of cars to call attention to presence operates visually to deter crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Watts Community Alert Patrol</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Psychology Today 1/73</td>
<td>Private defense group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Deacons</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Psychology Today 1/73</td>
<td>Citizens joined to perform self-defense activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Psychology Today 1/73</td>
<td>Predominantly Italian group prepared with &quot;arsenal&quot; should law and order collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark North Ward Citizen's Committee</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>425 members, including 25 policemen, patrol every night in 10 radio-equipped automobiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg, Virginia People Against Crime (PAC)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>U.S. News and World Report 9/29/75</td>
<td>Volunteers patrol in autos with portable radio equipment and report suspicious activity to police; assist police if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac, Michigan Citizen Watch</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Newsweek 12/18/72</td>
<td>16-block area patrolled nightly by members in cars equipped with citizen band radios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac, Michigan Citizen Watch</td>
<td>1971-? [4 years ago]</td>
<td>U.S. News and World Report 9/29/75</td>
<td>18 to 20 of 100 members patrol at night with citizen band radios in their cars; petty harassment by police has been correlated with declining morale of members and subsequent drop in membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac, Michigan City-Wide Citizens Watch</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>U.S. News and World Report 2/4/74</td>
<td>Mobile radio patrol operates every night and reports suspicious activity to police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, New York Teams on Patrol</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Parade 6/22/75</td>
<td>Supported by Eastman Kodak Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NY Times Magazine 10/8/73</td>
<td>Group of homosexuals patrols streets nightly to deter youth and gang attacks on members of homosexual community; members are trained in judo and karate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake Island, California</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Time 5/1/72</td>
<td>125-home island community is reached only by bridge where ingress is controlled by security guard—homeowners are assessed for service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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