AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION OF CRIME AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY IN A MID-SIZED SOUTHERN COMMUNITY

by

James S. Abbott

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School
at Middle Tennessee State University in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree:
Master of Criminal Justice

Middle Tennessee State University
December, 2014

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Thomas Jurkanin, Committee Chair

Dr. Joshua Harms, Committee Member

Dr. Michael Montgomery, TSU Committee Member

I dedicate this thesis to my loving wife Allyson, who has always supported and encouraged me through my academic and professional life. To my family and friends for their understanding and encouragement, your support will never be forgotten.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

Contemporary criminological theory is organized by schools of thought, based upon the particular theoretical premise, and reflecting basic assumptions about human behavior and influences. For example, some theories focus on causative biological factors in explaining criminal conduct, while others focus on psychological factors, or sociological factors. Still other theories examine crime using a mixed approach. Many contemporary theories of crime are based upon sociological perspectives and environmental influences, looking specifically at neighborhoods and communities and their relationship to crime. One such theory of community social disorganization examines collective efficacy within high crime areas. This theory is based upon the premise that neighborhoods and communities exhibiting high incidents of crime, are characterized by a lack of community organization, and suffer from a breakdown of informal social control. The theory contends that low collective efficacy among residents in the community, leads to higher rates of crime. This thesis will examine and test the theory of collective efficacy to determine if communities exhibiting lower levels of collective efficacy also demonstrate higher rates of crime.

Based upon the research, the null hypotheses for each of the three hypotheses were rejected. The study makes the following conclusions: Higher levels of "quality of life" among neighborhood residents, is associated with a higher level of collective efficacy in

the neighborhoods studied; neighborhoods with higher levels of collective efficacy have less reported crime; and, racial heterogeneous neighborhoods exhibit lower levels of collective efficacy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay developed the Social Disorganization Theory of Crime. Their research was designed to answer the question of "why crime and disorder occurs in some neighborhoods and not in others?" Other researchers have furthered the investigation by asking "why neighborhoods become socially disorganized" (Sampson and Groves, 1989)? One such theory focuses on low levels of community collective efficacy exhibited by residents living in socially disorganized neighborhoods. Some research has identified and examined factors that may contribute to lower levels of community collective efficacy. A concentration of disadvantaged and immigrant populations, along with a lack of residential stability, have been identified as key elements that have led to a low level of collective efficacy in communities (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls, 1997). This low level of collective efficacy may explain why some neighborhoods would be characterized as socially disorganized. By examining the indices of low levels of collective efficacy in socially disorganized neighborhoods, we may develop a clearer understanding as to why crime rates are higher in such neighborhoods; and, lower in neighborhoods that are better organized and exhibit higher levels of collective efficacy.

NEED FOR THE STUDY:

It is important to understand why crime and disorder occur in specific places. It is equally important to understand why certain people become victims of crime, and why others become offenders. To a certain extent, law enforcement and other government

agencies can establish formal controls to assist communities in disorder; however, researchers contend that informal social controls are equally, if not more important, in preventing and deterring crime. Research indicates that many high crime neighborhoods are socially disorganized. Studies have shown that the residents in socially disorganized neighborhoods lack collective efficacy, which suggests that a neighborhoods level of collective efficacy may have a causative effect on crime. Research demonstrates an inverse correlation between low levels of neighborhood collective efficacy and higher crime rates. These finding have important policy and operational ramification for law enforcement and city administrators to consider in their efforts to fight crime and disorder.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:

The purpose of this study is to identify neighborhoods, based upon and examination of census tract data, that exhibit high levels of collective efficacy, as well as, those that exhibit lower levels of collective efficacy. The census tracts crime data can then be analyzed to determine if communities demonstrating lower levels of collective efficacy, also demonstrate higher rates of crime; and whether communities that demonstrate higher levels of collective efficacy, exhibit lower levels of crime. The independent variables examined for each of the census tracts, were, race and ethnicity, economic factors, rates of home ownership (as opposed to rentals), age, residential instability, and family disruption. A survey using a Likert scale was used to obtain data to determine each census tract's level of informal social control, social cohesion and trust, and fear of crime. These variables were then used to determine the community's level of collective

efficacy. The dependent variables were the crime rates for each of the census tracts included in the study.

RESEARCH QUESTION:

Does the lack of collective efficacy among residents in socially disorganized communities lead to more crime? By comparing the independent variables to the dependent variable, the evidence should indicate that crime rates are higher in neighborhoods exhibiting low levels of collective efficacy. At the same time, the evidence should indicate lower crime rates in communities and neighborhoods where a healthy level of collective efficacy exists.

HYPOTHESIS:

Based on the research question, three hypotheses were developed to test the theory. Hypothesis 1 poses the following question: "Do neighborhoods exhibiting higher levels of social disorganization (residential instability, poverty and family dysfunction) concurrently exhibit lower levels of social cohesion, and an increased level of fear of crime (both indices of a community's, level of collective efficacy)?" Hypothesis 2 poses the following question: "Do communities exhibiting low levels of collective efficacy have higher rates of crime?" Hypothesis 3 poses the following question: "Do communities that are racial heterogeneous exhibit lower levels of collective efficacy?"

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

This study seeks to further examine theory and research related to community social disorganization, collective efficacy and crime. The study will explore the basic proposition, contending that a lack of cohesion and informal social control, exhibited

among members of the community, who are often transient, and socially and economically disadvantaged, contributes to lower levels of collective efficacy in the community. The following chapters explore research examining neighborhood disorganization and how the breakdown of informal social control promotes community disorganization. Further, the study will examine how community social disorganization leads to a breakdown of collective efficacy within the neighborhood. The research will examine data gathered on informal social control, social cohesion and trust, and fear of crime for each census tract. Data examined will include race and ethnicity, poverty levels, age, family structure, and residential stability in each census tract. Finally crime data for each census tract will be collected for comparative analysis, and conclusions will be drawn, regarding the three proposed hypotheses.

This study will also examine strategies that police and local governments may implement to proactively establish formal and informal social controls in neighborhoods and communities that exhibit low levels of collective efficacy. By isolating and documenting indices of low levels of collective efficacy within a community, local leaders can establish educational and social programs to address the high number of disadvantaged in specific, targeted neighborhoods. By reducing a community's level of social disorder, and fear of crime, and by increasing collective efficacy within the community, law enforcement may more effectively deter, control and reduce crime.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

INTRODUCTION:

Theory on crime, criminal behavior and its causes has a long developmental history, drawing from both distinct and multi-disciplinary perspectives in the biological and social sciences. Many contemporary theories propose that neighborhoods and communities play a contributory role in determining when, where and why crime might occur. Some researchers theorize that an understanding of the way neighborhoods and communities are organized, or alternatively, disorganization, can be useful in explaining why crime occurs in some neighborhoods and communities and not in others. Such theory is further supported by the fact that most crime can be found in neighborhoods exhibiting certain socioeconomic characteristics (McGahey, 1986). For example, high crime, inner-city neighborhoods, are often clustered in easily identifiable geographical areas which are plagued by socio-economic problems (McGahey, 1986). Researchers further theorize that a lack of informal social control results in higher crime rates in neighborhoods where residences face socio-economic distress (Mcgahey, 1986). In sum, a substantial body of research supports the theory that crime occurs at higher rates in "socially disorganized neighborhoods" (Lee and Martinez, 2002).

Research on socially disorganized neighborhoods focuses attention on identifying and understanding the underlying "root causes" of social breakdown within the community. Research findings consistently suggest that troubled communities suffer from a systematic breakdown of formal and informal social controls (Sampson and

Groves, 1989). Researchers have further examined the theory which proposes that a lack

of collective efficacy, on the part of a neighborhood community, leads to a lack of

informal social controls and social cohesion (Sampson et al., 1997). This theory supports

the idea that a socially disorganized neighborhood is more likely to have higher rates of

crime. In order to better understand how low levels of collective efficacy adversely

affects communities, it is necessary to further explore the research on community

disorganization.

SOCIALLY DISORGANIZED NEIGHBORHOODS:

Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay's research on social disorganization theory is

seminal in contributing to an understanding of neighborhood crime (Sun, Triplett, and

Gainey, 2004). Since Shaw and McKay's social disorganization theory was introduced,

numerous studies have been conducted in an attempt to explain how neighborhood crime

rates are directly related to the character of the neighborhood itself (Sun et al., 2004).

Succinctly stated, community disorganization represents, "The inability of a community

structure to realize the common values of its residents and maintain effective social

controls" (Sampson and Groves, 1989, p.777). The lack of effective social control may

be due to a lack of community cohesiveness (Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley,

2002). Based upon the research, a two stage model was developed to better explain

social disorganization in neighborhoods (Sun et al., 2004). First, according to this model,

low socio-economic status, residential instability, family disruption, and racial

heterogeneity are factors that disrupt local social organization (Sun et al., 2004).

Secondly, these factors, in turn, lead to social disorganization that prevents

neighborhoods from maintaining effective social controls over causative behaviors related to crime (Sun et al., 2004).

Residential Instability. Cities suffering from socio-economic distress often have identifiable and localized neighborhoods experiencing residential instability and social disorganization. It is theorized that residential transiency and "out-movement" may further transform the neighborhood as crime increases, leading to further neighborhood instability (Hipp, Tita, and Greenbaum, 2009). Such neighborhoods may also have a higher number of disadvantaged residents (Hipp, et al., 2009). Studies have shown that neighborhoods with higher crime rates, also experience decreased home values, which further increases residential instability (Hipp et al., 2009). Residences in these neighborhoods may view the deteriorating condition of the community to be outside of their control (Taylor, 1996). The changing characteristics of the neighborhood may also serve to elevate the level of fear of crime among residents (Taylor, 1996). Residential instability and turnover can affect both formal and informal social controls, and, in turn, diminish the neighborhoods ability to regulate itself (Grattet, 2009).

Research has demonstrated that diminished levels of home ownership can negatively impact neighborhood instability. This is due, in part, to the fact that homeowners often become more invested and participate in activities in their neighborhoods; they are also more likely to know their neighbors, many of whom are longstanding fellow homeowners, as opposed to short-term, transient residents (Hipp et al., 2009). Research demonstrates that when problems and issues arise within stable communities, residents who are more fully invested in the community will work collaborative to address and

resolve presenting problems (Hipp et al., 2009). Community attachment is an essential element of community stability (Taylor, 1996). Community attachment is based upon the proposition that neighborhood residents develop relationships and ties that bring them together, in common-cause, for the betterment of the community (Taylor, 1996).

    Family Disruption. Another factor that disrupts social organization within neighborhoods and communities is family disorganization, or more specifically, "broken homes." Research indicates that living in economically depressed areas leads to higher school dropout rates and increases rates of teenage pregnancy (Lyons and Pettit, 2011). Large numbers of economically disadvantage individuals living within a community or neighborhood can create disruptions within the family unit (Peterson and Krivo, 2005). Research demonstrates that many of these economically depressed communities have a disproportionately high number of African-American residents (Lyons and Pettit, 2011). Community support systems for young people residing in these economically disadvantaged communities are often lacking (Peterson and Krivo, 2005).

    Study results point to a breakdown of family structure in inner-city African-American households (Mendez, 2000). A high percentage of African-American youth, living in disorganized communities, are raised in single mother households, without the presents of the father. Furthermore, research on teen pregnancy among African-American females has shown that female teens, living in homes in which both the married mother and father are present, experience lower onset of sexual activity as opposed to teens living in single parent homes, (Moore and Chase-Lansdale, 2001). Research has also shown that among black male high school dropouts, at least 60% of them will be

incarcerated for up to one year before they reach their 35th birthday (Lyons and Pettit, 2011). Given the research, there is strong evidence that "family breakdown" or family dysfunction is an interactive and contributing component of socially and economically depressed neighborhoods (Peterson and Krivo, 2005).

Family disruption leads to a weakening of social structures within the neighborhood and community. Families and neighborhoods that are socially disorganized are less able to provide and maintain a healthy environment to promote appropriate learning and socialization for developing youth (Teasdal and Silver, 2009). Researcher indicates that "self-control" is derived from social skills that are taught and transmitted to young people, both within the family unit, as well as, within the broader context of neighborhood and community (Teasdal and Silver, 2009). The theory contends that when young people misbehave, members of the family or neighbors will intervene to correct the behavior; however when corrective intervention does not occur, in a consistent manner, young people will fail to develop appropriate levels of self-control (Teasdal and Silver, 2009). As youth enter adolescence, socialization shifts from family to friends and acquaintances (Harding, 2009). In socially disorganized neighborhoods, this secondary level of "community socialization" breaks down, and, in fact, is often antithetical to those values taught in traditional society; delinquency may result (Rankin and Quane, 2002). Delinquent peers and adult criminals living within the community can negatively influence wayward youth, leading to their increased participation in gang and other criminal group activities (Ludwig and Kling, 2007). Youth living in unstable households are more susceptible to corruptive peer and community influence (McGahey, 1986). The

breakdown of the family unit, combined with loss of social control within the community, creates a dangerous precursor affect for the development of delinquency (McGahey, 1986).

    Physical Appearance. A final factor that contributes to the development of socially disorganized communities is the physical appearance of the neighborhood. How do neighborhood residents and outsiders view the physical appearance of the neighborhood? Socially disorganized communities are easily identifiable by such visible indicators as dilapidated and abandoned homes and businesses, abandoned cars, litter and uncollected garbage, graffiti, and active signs of homelessness, gangs, prostitution. Sampson and Raudenbush (2004) found that an individual's visual perspective of these variables highly affected their personal view of neighborhood disorder. Neighborhoods experiencing physical decay project a visual image that clearly connotes a collapse of social order (Ross and Mirowsky, 2001).

    A breakdown of informal social control can result in the systemic destabilization of a neighborhood. As a result, it becomes increasingly difficult for neighborhood residents to establish order and cohesion among themselves; and a challenge to influence community revitalization (Sampson et al., 1997). The breakdown of social control, leading to neighborhood decay, spurs additional community problems. Studies indicate that people living in socially disorganized neighborhoods also face an increased risk of health problems (Ross and Mirowsky, 2001). Research indicates that those living in neighborhoods that show obvious signs of social disorder have a higher concentration of

poverty, teenage pregnancy, and violent crime (Wei, Hipwell, Pardini, Beyers, and Loeber, 2005).

The research of Sampson and Raudenbush (2004) concludes that a lack of informal social control and cohesion in socially disorganized communities, leads to a break down or weakening of collective efficacy within the community. Collective efficacy refers to general capacity of a community to respond to problems within the neighborhood, and encompasses the dynamics of community cohesion, and collective intervention for the betterment of the community (Sampson et al., 1997). Research demonstrates that there is a strong correlation between indicators that are used to measure collective efficacy and violent crime (Sampson et al., 1997). Collective efficacy is a focus of contemporary research designed to contribute to a better understanding of the dynamics and relationship between community disorganization and crime.

COLLECTIVE EFFICACY:

Collective efficacy is an indices of the willingness among neighbors to intervene for the good of the neighborhood, based upon mutual trust and shared values. Collective efficacy breaks down when people living in these neighborhoods become suspicious of one another or fear those living around them (Sampson et al., 2002). When formal and informal social controls are weakened, neighbors will be less likely to intervene for the betterment of the community (Sampson et al., 2002). As a result, residents living in community environments exhibiting high levels of social disorganization and low levels of collective efficacy will be less likely to proactively intervene to control disorder and

crime. Fear and distrust influence low levels of collective efficacy within a community (Hipp et al., 2009).

Neighborhood Cohesiveness. Research indicates that communities that are successful in developing effective crime control strategies also possess the following demographic characteristics; residents are relatively well educated; residents have children, and, residents own their homes (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). Collectively, these factors enhance informal social control and community cohesion, both leading to an increase in the level of collective efficacy exhibited by the community (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). Studies demonstrate that when neighborhoods and communities work together collectively, they are better able to deter and control crime; neighborhood cohesiveness and strong social control, leads to lower rates in crime in the community (Sampson et al., 1997). Skogan (1988) found that when residents and neighbors work together, through social networks and other community organizations, they are better able to address community problems as they arise. This proactive response is effective in controlling crime and other problematic neighborhood issues.

Five Oaks Study. In order to effectively control crime, residents must discover ways and means to address physical and social disorder within their community. A study conducted in Dayton, Ohio examined the effects of community response to an increase in crime and other related problems (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). Dayton's community of Five Oaks had recently seen a decrease in home values, precipitated by an increase in unemployment and residential instability (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). At the time, the city of Dayton was experiencing a period of transition, due to the loss of manufacturing

jobs (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). As a result of deindustrialization, Dayton was experiencing a decrease in population and a corresponding increase in residential instability (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). As research has indicated, a decrease in the economic health of the community is related to an increase in residential instability, a decrease in home values, and an increase in neighborhood segregation by both race and class (Sampson et al., 1997). This combination of factors leads to community disorganization and a breakdown of collective efficacy within the neighborhood; community residents become withdrawn, and less willing to contribute to community care and maintenance (Xu, Fiedler, and Flaming, 2005). In the Five Oaks experiment, neighbors decided to take action and began to act collectively to fight crime and to prevent the further social erosion of their neighborhood (Donnelly and Majka, 1998).

The Dayton study demonstrates the utility of preemptive community action in addressing neighborhood problems, as opposed to organizing and mobilizing once the problems have become entrenched (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). Communities that are well organized have established social-political connections within local government, and this political-social capital allows the community to more effectively reach out for assistance (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). This enhanced government connection provides a platform for exercising established formal controls to gain access to resources that may be provided by the city, or by other government programs (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). The ability of the community to influence and obtain assistance and resources from governmental agencies is another example of the community's ability to exercise informal control (Warner and Rountree, 1997).

The Five Oaks Study effectively demonstrated that the community was able to collectively act against crime by forging neighborhood partnerships and by enhancing participation among the neighbors. It is evident that these strategies were central to the task of controlling and deterring crime within their neighborhood. The study also demonstrates the critical need for neighborhood residents to be prepared for a problem before it arises. If a community has established strong, preexisting community partnerships, it will enhance their ability to act collectively in controlling crime (Donnelly and Majka, 1998). The collective action, taken by the residents of Five Oaks, would not have occurred without community preparedness and/or without the willingness of the residents to act together for the good of the community.

BREAK DOWN OF COLLECTIVE EFFICACY:

Collective efficacy is a defined characteristic of a community, wherein the residents demonstrate a willingness to intervene on behalf of the neighborhood. Neighborhood cohesiveness enhances social control within the community, and provides for more effective control of crime and disorder (Meares, 2002). If a community fails to establish strong social control, a breakdown of collective efficacy results (Meares, 2002). Weakened levels of collective efficacy is associated with neighborhood decline and social disorganization. Shifts in neighborhood demographics, including decreased home values and increase unemployment rates, can lead to increased levels of crime, and to further disruptions within the neighborhood (Skogan, 1986). As a neighborhood declines, residential instability increases, as do corresponding rates of crime and the fear of crime (Hipp et al., 2009).

Research demonstrates that collective efficacy is negatively influenced by the influx of socially and economically disadvantage groups into neighborhood; what Sampson and others refer to as neighborhoods of the "concentrated disadvantaged" (Sampson et al., 1997). Neighborhoods characterized by a high concentration or "clustering" of socio-economically disadvantaged residents are less able to collectively organize in response to community problems. Residents in such a neighborhood are also alienated from traditional society and values (Sampson et al., 1997). For example, high levels of unemployment creates a rippling effect that influences attitudes and values related to equality, opportunity, and the reach for the "American Dream" (Ross, Mirowsky, and Pribesh, 2001). Individual and community disassociation results, negatively affecting the collective efficacy of the neighborhood and leading to a further breakdown of social order (Ross et al., 2001).

Stressors to Collective Efficacy. Taylor (1996) found that residents, who had lived in neighborhoods, prior to changes that brought about social disorganization and a loss of social control, were often invested in the neighborhood. New residents, moving into the community, may not have the same level of attachment or see the neighborhood as an investment (Taylor, 1996). A distrust of new residents moving into the community will also increase the level of fear among those residents who have lived in the neighborhood for a significant amount of time (Taylor, 1996). As the crime rates continue to increase within the neighborhood, the level of fear also increases. Longtime residents feel as though they are losing control of their neighborhood (Taylor, 1996). The fear of crime and the loss of social control causes isolation; longtime residents withdraw from

neighborhood involvement (Skogan, 1986). As a result, they do not affiliate with their neighbors and they increasingly fail to intervene on behalf of their neighborhoods or their community's (Skogan, 1986). Because residents fail to intervene, there is an increase in disorder within the neighborhood. This disorder may be brought on by adult criminals and delinquents residing within the neighborhood or by others outside of the neighborhood, who sense the declining social order of the neighborhood and seek opportunity for predatory criminal conduct (Skogan, 1986).

Loss of Control. The breakdown of informal control may also lead residents to eventually accept and tolerate certain types and levels of delinquency and crime within the community. Additionally, long-standing residents are less likely to intervene to control crime and disorder, if they do not personally know the offender and/ or the victim (McGahey, 1986). Long-term residents, due to the shifting population of the community, become strangers (among strangers) in their own neighborhoods. As personal relationships between neighbors decline, there is an enhanced division between those neighbors who obey the law and those who do not (Browning, Feinberg, and Dietz, 2004). Law abiding residents may be reluctant to act against non-law abiding neighbors, by means of seeking help or advising the police of ongoing criminal activity within the neighborhood (Browning et al., 2004).

Social Networks. Studies have shown that the social environment of a neighborhood can impact the development of its youth and their values in a positive or negative manner (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, Klebanov, and Sealand, 1993). Socialization skills of adolescent youth are forged, in part, by neighborhood norms and influences

(Rankin and Quane, 2002). Youth who are raised in a socially disorganized community, exhibiting low levels of collective efficacy, are less likely to have their misbehaviors monitored, reported, and corrected by informal and formal actions imposed by neighbors and the community at large (Rankin and Quane, 2002).

Juvenile Delinquency and Crime. The lack of neighborhood cohesiveness and intervention and the lack of appropriate adult role models within the community, may lead youth to increasingly be influenced by their peers. Such influence, may lead to involvement in gang and drug activity. Research evidence indicates that young people who are raised in low income neighborhoods, which exhibit a strong gang presents, are more likely to participate in gang activity, and often begin such participation at a very young age (Vigil, 2003). Research demonstrates that youth involved in gang activity become increasingly more violent; young males, coming of age, feel pressure and need to demonstrate their manhood (Vigil, 2003). This is especially true of male adolescents raised in single mother households (Vigil, 2003). Attributable to a breakdown within the family unit, these young people are socialized, in large part, by peers and adults living within the neighborhood, which may lead them to acquire and exhibit antisocial behavior (Vigil, 2003). This occurs because there is a lack of neighborhood efficacy. Law abiding adult residents, living in communities characterized by low levels of collective efficacy, are less likely to get involved and/or intervene in the lives of neighborhood youth who acted out in an inappropriate or antisocial manner (Harding, 2009).

Neighborhood Appearance. As a neighborhood continues to decline there are obvious signs of disorder, such as, abandoned homes and vehicles, litter and unkempt lawns, loitering, public intoxication, graffiti, and other signs of gang and criminal activity (Skogan, 1986). Retail businesses will begin to close, as dictated by the economy and a loss of revenue (Skogan, 1986). The decline of a neighborhood is precipitated by a failure of community residents to be both proactive and reactive in controlling what occurs in the neighborhood. Collective efficacy is a shield against community disorder, while complacency is an invitation to community disorder.

ESTABLISHING COLLECTIVE EFFICACY IN NEIGHBORHOODS:

Establishing collective efficacy among neighborhood residents can be challenging, for a number of reasons. First, residents living in neighborhoods characterized by social disorder may live in fear; and, fear hinders efforts to organize collectively against crime (Sampson et al., 1997). As previously discussed, communities that are socially disorganized are often inundated with gang and group violence (Vigil, 2003). Residents avoid becoming involved out of a fear of retaliation. As a result, residents are reluctant to intervene on behalf of the neighborhood (Vigil, 2003). Secondly, residents often feel racially or socially alienated from the rest of society. As a result, residents tend to hold suspicious and skeptical views toward their neighbors; and, they distrust the police and other government service providers to intervene on their behalf (Drakulich and Cruchfield, 2013).

Police Strategies. Since residents of socially disorganized neighborhoods generally hold a negative view of the police, they are less likely to initiate or accept opportunities to work in partnership with the police to combat community problems and crime. Residents may feel that the police do not care, or that the police have ulterior motives for offering assistance (Drakulich and Cruchfield, 2013). As a result, a major hurdle in designing effective strategies for organizing against crime and disorder, is the building of trust between community residents and the police. Trust is a cornerstone for building an effective community-police partnership, wherein actions of informal social control can be initiated by residents of the neighborhood, and formal social control can be initiated by the police and other government service providers. For effective community control to be effective, the police cannot act alone and the community cannot not act alone; a viable partnership between the two is required.

Research demonstrates that programs established to build social capital and social cohesion among residents in socially disorganized neighborhoods, can reduce crime, disorder, and social problems within the community (Meares, 2002). Crime control strategies that enlist community partners in the fight have been found to be effective in controlling and deterring neighborhood crime. A program established in High Point, North Carolina used such strategies to focus attention on specific crime issues within their cities. In the initial stages of establishing these crime control programs, the police sought advice and assistance from the community residents (Kennedy, 2009). As a prelude to implementing these successful community intervention programs, law enforcement officials had to educate residents and community leaders as to how their

silence was in effect condoning the illegal activity of the offender's, and, in the process, sending a negative message about community indifference and vulnerability to outsiders (Kennedy, 2009). It was imperative that community leaders and residents establish baseline standards, in order to send the message to would-be offenders that crime would not be tolerated (Kennedy, 2009). These standards, established by the exercise of collective efficacy, would be enforced by means of informal and formal social control.

The High Point Police Department met with the community to get "buy in" to the proposed crime control strategy (Kennedy, 2009). In the process, the police were mindful of the fact that public perception of the police and their activities is often affected by race, particularly in disadvantaged minority communities (Drakulich and Cruchfield, 2013). Recognizing this and other potential challenges will assist the police in preparing for, designing and proposing solutions.

The High Point experiment, and other research, demonstrates that police and community can work together effectively to establish informal social controls that will empower the community to intervene on its own behalf (Drakulich and Cruchfield, 2013). The police can initiate action, in partnership with the community, to build strong effective crime-control strategies within socially disorganized neighborhoods. Building community partnerships is the key (McGahey, 1986).

Research has demonstrated that traditional police strategy (routine patrol), fails to significantly reduce crime and disorder in communities experiencing socio-economic problems (McGahey, 1986). Furthermore, while research findings on the effectiveness of community policing strategies are mixed, they generally fail to show significant

indicators of associated crime reduction patterns. However, one strong indicator of the effectiveness of community policing programs is that they reduce the fear of crime among neighborhood residents (Weisburd and Eck, 2004). This finding gives support to the strategy of enlisting community involvement in crime fighting endeavors; to building partnerships between the community and the police; and to enhancing the collective efficacy of the neighborhood.

Zoning. Katyal (2002) has addressed the process by which municipalities can formally plan and zone to prevent community deterioration, and in the process, reduce crime and disorder. Local governments routinely use zoning ordinances and planning commissions to plan for and control growth (Katyal, 2002). When planning for new growth, city and county governments often consider the environmental impact of the new development on the neighborhood (Katyal, 2002). For example, they consider how the new development might impact traffic patterns, local residents and businesses and whether the new development meets established zoning and planning requirements. However, Katyal contends, that local governments often fail to take into account the impact that growth will have on crime and disorder (Katyal, 2002). "Crime impact statements" are one tool that a city can use when planning for new development (Katyal, 2002). Crime impact statements take into account the potential impact the new development may have on crime and police services (Katyal, 2002). Crime impact studies can also project how shifting new business growth to specific areas of the city, while limiting business growth in older sections of the city, can lead to the deterioration of older neighborhoods. As businesses leave the neighborhood, building are left

unoccupied, the economic health of the neighborhood deteriorates, and community

disorganization may result (Katyal, 2002). As businesses move out, residents will often

relocate; either to be closer to businesses and services, or because of a decline in the

neighborhood bought on by mass exodus (Katyal, 2002). Many local governments have

demonstrated that growth can be accommodated, while concurrently maintaining the

older established neighborhoods. Community planning is the key.

Neighborhoods with a balance of both business and residential placement are more

active on a day-to-day basis, and this movement of people serves as a deterrent to crime

and disorder. Conversely, if cities create business centers separate from the

neighborhoods, neighborhood activity is diminished and the potential for crime increases

(Katyal, 2002). Neighborhoods with a business and residential mix also serve to bring

people together from different races, cultures, and social backgrounds, as opposed to the

isolation by race and class, which is common in disorganized neighborhoods. Another

way that zoning can be used as a deterrent to crime and disorder is the strategic

placement of religious institutions throughout the city (Katyal, 2002). Religious

institutions can bring neighbors together for the common good and provide for the

enhancement of social structure within the neighborhood (Katyal, 2002).

City Services. The use of coordinated city services can be utilized to prevent the

physical decay of older neighborhoods, before these neighborhoods begin to show

obvious signs of disorder (Katyal, 2002). For example, the enforcement of code

violations related to abandoned vehicles, abandoned and dilapidated buildings, and

related property maintenance can keep properties in good repair. The street department

can repair lighting problems, the health department can control rat and other infestations, and some cities even administer a graffiti abatement program. Obvious signs of physical disorder in the neighborhood, if left unchecked and uncorrected, sends the message that no one cares; community disorganization, crime and fear of crime are the byproducts. The control of crime and disorder is not just the responsibility of the police and residents within the community. Coordinated city services and effective planning can serve to enhance the overall socioeconomic health of neighborhoods, while controlling for crime and disorder. City administrators must make it clear that maintaining the health, safety and welfare of the community and its citizens is the mission and responsibility of all departments. Crime control is no exception.

SUMMARY:

This chapter examined Social Disorganization Theory and discussed how a breakdown of social control leads to dysfunction within neighborhoods and communities, which, in turn, causes crime. The literature review also examined the concept of collective efficacy, and the role that it plays in enhancing or diminishing a communities ability to control crime. Research was presented to explain how a breakdown of informal social control, within a community, leads to lower levels of collective efficacy among neighbors, and, in turn, inhibits their ability to defend themselves and their community against crime and disorder (Sampson et al., 1997). Once neighborhood structure and organization is lost, the residents begin to live in fear, often withdrawing into the safety of their own homes. Once withdrawn, residents fail to

act, and fail to work on behalf of the community (Skogan, 1986). In short, the community aspect of the neighborhood ceases to exist.

Research demonstrates that a neighborhood or community in the throes of social disorganization will experience increased problems related to delinquency, crime and disorder. A downward spiraling effect takes hold, marked by such indicators as, a drop in home values, the exodus of families and businesses, and the noticeable physical decay of properties. In addition, residents who have the financial resource to move out of the neighborhood do so, leaving behind a neighborhood often segregated by class and race (Sun et al., 2004).

Community disorganization is often associated with a breakdown of the family unit and an increase in single parent households; a rise in high school dropout rates; increased levels of juvenile delinquency; and, an increase in the incidents of teenage pregnancy. Young people, living in disorganized neighborhoods, often fail to receive appropriate levels of supervision and guidance from family members and from the extended community. This lack of supervision, over an extended period of time, results in a diminished ability of the young person to exercise self-control (Teasdal and Silver, 2009).

As community disorganization intensifies, crime rates increase, and residents become increasingly fearful of crime (Sampson and Raudenbush, 2004). As a result, the community projects a less than desirable appearance to those outside the neighborhood, being viewed as chaotic and unsafe (Sampson and Raudenbush, 2004).

Municipalities have the ability and resources to initiate proactive measures to slowdown or reverse community disorganization. Examples include the utilization of effective city planning and zoning strategies; the effective implementation of intelligence-based crime control strategies, including community policing; and, the enlistment of all city departments to become active in the fight against crime and disorder. While the municipality can leverage resources to aid neighborhoods in their fight against disorder and crime, it is imperative that the residents join in partnership to save themselves and their community.

CHAPTER III

Methods

PARTICIPANTS:

In order to better understand possible relationships and effects between collective efficacy and crime, relevant census tract data will be identified and submitted to analyses. An initial review of census tract data will include all neighborhoods located in the city of Murfreesboro, Tennessee. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, had a total population of 108,755 (United States Census Bureau, 2010). Murfreesboro is the county seat of Rutherford County, Tennessee. Rutherford County has a total population of 262,604, according to the 2010, U.S.Census reports (United States Census Bureau, 2010).

Murfreesboro, Tennessee, is located about 30 miles southeast of Nashville, Tennessee. U.S. (Interstate) I-24 runs through the Murfreesboro city limits, and provides for accessible interstate access to U.S. routs, via U.S. I-40, I-440, I-65, I-85 and I-59; all within a one-hundred mile radius of the city. This accessibility provides a corridor to major cities located within the southeastern United States and has brought both service and manufacturing jobs to the area. Murfreesboro, Tennessee is also home to Middle Tennessee State University, which is the largest undergraduate college in Tennessee, with a student population of over 23,000. Because of the significant student population and the location of the university, Murfreesboro has large clusters of student apartment complexes and rental properties near the downtown area. As a result of strong job growth in the Murfreesboro area, and an increase in student enrollment at Middle

Tennessee State University, the City of Murfreesboro has experienced unprecedented growth in available housing units.

VARIABLES:

The independent variables identified and used in this study were gleaned from past research, wherein key factors were identified as having an effect on collective efficacy (Sampson et al., 1997). The independent variables examined in this study included race and ethnicity, poverty levels, family structure, and residential stability. Data on each independent variable were collected and analyzed for each identified census tract. A scale of measurement was created to identify, analyze and assess socioeconomic characteristics of neighborhoods related to "quality of life.". A scale was also created to measure "collective efficacy", which included the independent variables of informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime (Sampson et al., 1997). Data were then examined to determine the indices or level of collective efficacy within each identified census tract.

A scale of measurement was also created to identify, analyze and assess the dependent variable, or the level of police response activity in each census tract, as measured by "calls for police service." Data were collected for the year 2012, and included Part 1 Crimes of the FBI's Uniform Crime Report-- homicide, assault, robbery, burglary, theft, and arson. Additionally, other "calls for police service", which relate to "crime" and "quality of life," were recorded. These incidents included firearms violations, reported shots fired, reported drug activity and vandalism. Based upon the hypotheses, census tracts exhibiting lower levels of collective efficacy should also exhibit higher

rates of crime; while conversely, census tracts exhibiting higher levels of collective efficacy should also exhibit lower rates of crime.

RESEARCH DESIGN:

The study utilized a quasi-experimental design to test the relationship between collective efficacy and crime. For purposed of identifying neighborhoods of interest, the city was broken down by census tracts. " Quality of life" and "collective efficacy" levels within each census tract were determined through analyses of demographic data, and resident surveys. The experimental group was defined as those census tracts exhibiting higher levels of collective efficacy and the control group was defined as those census tracts exhibiting lower levels of collective efficacy. "Quality of life" and "collective efficacy" assessment data were then compared to 2012 crime data, as recorded by the Murfreesboro Police Department. It is hypothesized that comparison of the "calls for police service" to the stipulated independent variables in each census tract, should yield data necessary to determine if there is a higher rate of crime in the neighborhoods exhibiting low levels of collective efficacy; and, conversely, if there is a lower rate of crime in neighborhoods exhibiting higher levels of collective efficacy.

DATA COLLECTION:

In order to provide for an accurate reflection of the demographics in each census tract, data were collected from secondary data sources; most notably, from the United States Census Bureau and the Murfreesboro Police Department. Socioeconomic data were collected for each identified census tract and included, the following demographics: population based upon race and ethnicity, poverty rates, percentage of residents receiving

assistance, percentage of uninsured, median income, residential mobility, renter/owner occupied residences, residences for rent, and the number of households wherein both the mother and father are present. Calls for police service data were collected based upon reported Part 1 Crimes of the FBI's Uniform Crime Report, as well as, crimes that were previously identified as affecting "quality of life."

A survey instrument, utilizing questions formatted in Likert Scales, was used to collect data to determine levels of collective efficacy for each census tract located in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. Likert scaling allowed the researcher to obtain data on three separate independent variables thought to be associated with collective efficacy. The scales measured levels of informal social control, levels of social cohesion, and levels of fear of crime within each census tract. A door to door survey, utilizing an interview approach, was used to collect and record the data. Respondents were asked questions about informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime within their neighborhood. This Likert scale utilized in this study was similar to the Likert scale used by Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls research on collective efficacy (Sampson et al., 1997).

SAMPLING:

Individual census tracts located in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, represented the unit of analysis for the study. The utilization of census tracts to identify and define neighborhoods is used often in social science (Sampson et al., 2002). Although many social scientists consider the collection of census tract data to be the best method to conduct micro-level analysis within a city, they also caution that data collected by this

means may not accurately reflect neighborhood boundaries and may skew some socioeconomic demographic data (Sampson et al., 2002).

The sampling frame of the study was 17 census tracts in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. Three additional census tracts that also represent Murfreesboro were not counted. Census tract 409.01, 423, and 410 were the census tracts excluded from the research. Census tract 409.01 is made up of mostly industrial and business districts. Census tract 410 and 423 included several neighborhoods in which the majority of the population lived outside the city limits.

The survey sample, taken from a sampling frame representing the population of each identified census tract, included individual respondents completing the survey. Based upon data collected for each census tract, an analysis was conducted to identify and distinguish between those census tracts exhibiting higher levels of collective efficacy, as contrasted and compared to those census tracts exhibiting lower levels of collective efficacy.

In order to either accept or reject the hypotheses, calls for police service to the Murfreesboro Police Department were compared (with and among) each of the 17 census tracts. A simple random sampling method was then used to conduct a door-to-door survey of individuals residing within each census tract area, and to collect and record data on race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic demographics of each respondent.

CHAPTER IV

Results

SAMPLE:

During the research phase of the study, 10 surveys were completed for each of the 17 census tracts, for a total number of 170 surveys completed (*N*=170). The surveys were broken down by census tract and entered into SPSS software for analysis in three categories. These three categories were informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime. Socioeconomic variables, identified as being used in past research, were combined into one assessment measure in this study. The current study created the variable of "quality of life"; and the variable was quantified and recorded in the SPSS database. The "quality of life" variable was composed of demographic information retrieved from each census tract, and included median income, poverty rates, number of residents receiving government assistance and the number of residents who were uninsured. Other information used to create the "quality of life" variable in each census tract included population mobility for the past year, the number of owner and renter occupied housing units, the number of homes for rent, and the number of residences wherein both parents reside in the home.

"Police calls for service" data were retrieved from the Murfreesboro Police Departments, Computer Aided Dispatch system also known as "CAD". This system allowed the researcher to download all calls for service recorded in 2012, by census track and crime type. 'Police calls for service' were defined as police response, whether such calls were generated by the public or by police officers in the field. The crimes that were

counted included Part I crimes from the FBI's Uniform Crime Report--homicide, assaults, robbery, burglary, theft, and arson. Additionally, other calls for police service, which were determined to affect "quality of life", were collected and included in the data. Those calls included firearm violations, reported shots fired, vandalism, drug activity, and drug arrests. The call for police service data retrieved from the police department, and broken down by census tract, was then entered into the SPSS software program for analysis.

ANALYSIS:

The mean and standard deviation, was obtained for all 17 census tracts using the independent and dependent variables, as shown in Table 1 below. The quality of life variable, racial population variables, and calls for police service variables were all tested against the individual variables identified as informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime; all of which define collective efficacy. Race was broken down by the percentage of white, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian populations represented in each of the 17 census tracts, as shown in Table 2 below. Only census tract 419 recorded an African-American population which was equal to that of the white population. Census tract 413.01 recorded the largest white population: 91% white, 4% African-American, 3% Asian and 1% Hispanic.

Table 1

Sample, Minimum, Maximum, Mean and Standard Deviation of Variables

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Calls For Service	17	45.00	728.00	287.5	213.8
Informal Social Controls	17	5.40	14.20	10.1	2.4
Social Cohesion	17	5.40	14.10	10.2	2.2
Fear of Crime	17	1.10	10.90	4.7	3.4
Quality of Life	17	11.00	31.00	21.2	5.7

Table 2

Census Tract Racial Demographics

Census Tracts	White	African American	Hispanic	Asian
409.02	83%	9%	4%	4%
409.03	79%	12%	5%	4%
409.04	79%	10%	4%	7%
409.05	81%	13%	3%	3%
411.01	84%	10%	3%	3%
412.01	86%	7%	3%	4%
413.01	91%	4%	1%	3%
413.02	86%	8%	4%	2%
414.01	79%	14%	4%	3%
414.02	70%	21%	8%	1%
414.03	77%	15%	5%	3%
416	75%	18%	8%	1%
417	60%	12%	6%	2%
418	64%	26%	7%	3%
419	44%	43%	12%	1%
420	69%	14%	13%	4%
421	63%	22%	11%	5%

Socioeconomic demographical data were recorded using census tract data gathered

from the U.S. Census Bureau in order to create the "quality of life" variable that was

tested against informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime (all of which define collective efficacy). The data used were median income per household, the percentage of residents living below the poverty level, the number of residents receiving government assistance, (SNAP), and the percentage of resident's who were uninsured. Based upon the data gathered, residents of census tract 413.01 enjoyed a higher standard of living than residents in all other census tracts.

As shown in Table 3, residents in census tract 416 appeared to have the lowest standard of living, as determined by the following indices: lowest median income, highest percentage of uninsured, highest number of residents receiving government assistance, and highest percentage of residents living below the poverty level.

Table 3

Census Tract Economic Demographics

Census Tracts	Median Income	% of Residents Below Poverty	# of Residents Receiving Assistance	% of Residents Uninsured
409.02	$66,445	4.60%	256	5.60%
409.03	$59,724	2.70%	156	7.70%
409.04	$60,768	4.50%	146	14.30%
409.05	$55,507	10.90%	360	7.80%
411.01	$79,021	4.10%	202	3.80%
412.01	$88,833	9.70%	101	13.50%
413.01	$102,802	1.60%	17	5.80%
413.02	$62,823	6.50%	173	4.80%
414.01	$46,554	10.30%	299	16.80%
414.02	$31,875	22.10%	285	17.40%
414.03	$36,994	9.70%	314	13.20%
416	$24,668	26.40%	717	28.00%
417	$42,763	18.40%	344	11.10%
418	$31,541	31.20%	481	12.20%
419	$26,095	30.50%	480	24.80%
420	$44,019	12.40%	197	22.20%
421	$35,316	22.80%	538	22.50%

Residential mobility demographics were also used to create the "quality of life" variable which was measured against collective efficacy variables. The residential mobility demographics used were population mobility for 2012, owner occupied households, renter occupied households, and the number of residence's for rent. Based upon previous research and theory, residential mobility affects a community's level of collective efficacy.

As shown in Table 4, census tracts 413.01 and 412.01 recorded the fewest number of renter-occupied housing units and exhibited the lowest level of residential mobility. Census tracts 414.02 and 416 recorded the most renter-occupied housing units and exhibited the highest level of residential mobility.

Table 4

Census Tract Data on Population Mobility

Census Tract	Population Mobility Past Year	Number of Owner Occupied Houses	Number of Renter Occupied Houses	For Rent
409.02	2,057	2,172	1,020	72
409.03	2,599	2,283	1,902	97
409.04	688	1,500	208	8
409.05	1,585	2,074	976	63
411.01	1,064	2,278	262	16
412.01	324	1,607	173	15
413.01	369	1,749	142	3
413.02	903	1,632	723	88
414.01	1,096	950	717	52
414.02	2,103	573	2,250	276
414.03	2,616	1,146	1,969	242
416	2,024	541	2,213	265
417	1,536	976	1,213	150
418	1,650	388	1,041	127
419	1,390	361	1,303	230
420	1,321	1,218	723	140
421	2,322	1,302	2,056	216

The final census demographic used to create the "quality of life" variable was the number of households in which the mother and father were both present. Based upon the data, as shown in Table 5, census tract 413.01 had the highest number of residential households wherein both the mother and father resided. Conversely, census tract 419 had the fewest number of residential households wherein both the mother and father resided.

Calls for police service were used as the dependent variable to test against the collective efficacy, racial heterogeneity, and quality of life variables. Based upon the data gathered, as shown in Table 5, census tract 413.01 had the least number of calls for police service, while census tract 416 had the most reported calls for police service.

Table 5

Census Tract Data on Households with Mother Father present and Calls for Police Services

Census Tract	Mother/Father Together	Calls for Service
409.02	1,807	182
409.03	2,166	202
409.04	1,072	136
409.05	1,702	147
411.01	1,710	63
412.01	1,333	53
413.01	1,560	45
413.02	1,224	145
414.01	715	135
414.02	629	488
414.03	959	463
416	767	728
417	796	384
418	357	555
419	205	501
420	666	147
421	863	514

Testing and analyses were completed to determine correlations and statistical significance between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Quality of life, racial composition, and calls for police service variables were also tested against one another, to determine interactive effects. As illustrated in Table 6, all three variables (designed to measure collective efficacy) informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime were shown to be statistically significant factors related to crime rates assessed in the 17 census tracts included in this study.

Table 6
Collective Efficacy, Quality of Life, Calls for Service, and Race Correlations

	Informal Social Controls	Social Cohesion	Fear of Crime	Quality of Life	Calls for Service
Informal Social Controls					
Social Cohesion	.923**				
Fear of Crime	-.909**	-.884**			
Quality of Life	.825**	.788**	-.883**		
Calls for Service	-.816**	-.772**	.898**	-.917**	
White	.747**	.789**	-.748**	.724**	-.663**
Black	-.812**	-.819**	.829**	-.785**	.690**
Hispanic	-.626**	-.674**	.742**	-.757**	.596*
Asian	.203	.235	-.292	.438	-.453

*p<.05, **p<.01

Based upon the analyses, informal social control was found to have a strong positive correlation to social cohesion, r = .923, n = 17, p = .000. Informal social control was also found to have a strong negative correlation to fear of crime, r = -.909, n = 17, p = .000. The same was true in an examining the variable of social cohesion, which was found to have a strong negative correlation with fear of crime, r = -.884, n = 17, p = .000. The

results demonstrate that, as informal social control and social cohesion decrease within the neighborhood, fear of crime increases. Informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime were found to be statistically significant in interactive-effect, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7
Testing of Informal Social Controls, Social Cohesion and Fear of Crime

	Informal Social Controls	Social Cohesion
Informal Social Controls		
Social Cohesion	.923**	
Fear of Crime	-.909**	-.884**

*p<.05, **p<.01

Further analyses of the data demonstrates a strong positive correlation between "quality of life" and informal social control, r = .825, n = 17, p = .000; as well as a strong positive correlation between "quality of life" and social cohesion, r = .788, n = 17, p = .000. The analysis showed that as "quality of life" increased, so did informal social control and social cohesion. A strong negative correlation was found between "quality of life" and "fear of crime," r = -.883, n = 17, p = .000. As the "quality of life" of those living in the community decreased, "fear of crime" increased, as shown in Table 8.

Analyses of data involving "calls for police service" showed that there was a strong negative correlation between "calls for police service" and informal social control, r = -.816, n = 17, p = .000; and a strong negative correlation between "calls for police service" and social cohesion r = -.772, n = 17, p = .000. These data indicate that as informal

social control and social cohesion decreased within the neighborhood, calls for police service increased.

As illustrated in Table 8, analyses of "calls for police service" and "fear of crime" showed a strong positive correlation, $r = .898$, $n = 17$, $p = .000$. As fear of crime increased among neighborhood residents, calls for police service also increased. Further analyses showed that there was a strong negative correlation between "quality of life" and "calls for police service", $r = -.917$, $n = 17$, $p = .000$. Informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime were all found to be statistically significant factors affecting "quality of life" and "calls for police service.". Furthermore, "quality of life" was found to be a statistically significant factor affecting "calls for police services."

Table 8
Testing of Quality of Life and Calls for Service variables against Informal Social Controls, Social Cohesion and Fear of Crime

	Informal Social Controls	Social Cohesion	Fear of Crime	Quality of Life
Quality of Life	.825**	.788**	-.883**	
Calls for Service	-.816**	-.772**	.898**	-.917**

*p<.05, **p<.01

Variables identifying racial demographics for each of the 17 census tract were also analyzed against informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime. Such analyses were designed to identify possible correlations between racial heterogeneity and the three variables that identify collective efficacy. Analyses between white populations living within the census tracks and "informal social control" showed a strong positive

correlation, r = .747, n = 17, p = .001. As the number of white residents in neighborhood increased, so did the level of informal social control. The analyses also showed a strong negative correlation between African-American populations and informal social control, r = -.812, n = 17, p = .000. This analysis showed that as the number of African-American residents increased within a neighborhood, informal social control decreased. The data also showed that there was moderate negative correlation between Hispanic populations and informal social control, r = -.626, n = 17, p = .007. As Hispanic populations increased within the neighborhood there was a moderate decrease in informal social control. Data also showed that there was weak or no correlation between Asian populations and informal social control, r = .203, n = 17, p = .435. Based upon the analyses, it can be concluded that white, African-American, and Hispanic populations are statistically significant in affecting informal social control within a neighborhood. Asian populations did not significantly influence levels of informal social control in the neighborhoods. This data is illustrated in Table 9.

Analyses of white populations by census tract and social cohesion showed a strong positive correlation, r = .789, n = 17, p = .000. As the number of white residents increased within a neighborhood, so did the level of neighborhood social cohesion. The analyses also showed a strong negative correlation between African-American populations and social cohesion, r = -.819, n = 17, p = .000. This analysis showed that as the number of African-American residents increased within the neighborhood, social cohesion decreased. The data also showed that there was a moderate negative correlation between Hispanic populations and social cohesion, r = -.674, n = 17, p = .003. As

Hispanic populations increased within the neighborhood there was a moderate decrease in the level of neighborhood social cohesion. Data further showed that there was weak or no correlation between Asian populations and social cohesion, r = .235, n = 17, p = .364. Based upon the analyses, white, African-American, and Hispanic populations are statistically significant in affecting social cohesion. Asian populations did not significantly influence levels of social cohesion within the neighborhood. This data is illustrated in Table 9.

The analyses of white populations by census tract and "fear of crime" showed a strong negative correlation, r = -.748, n = 17, p = .001. The analysis indicates that as the population of white residents decreased the fear of crime increased. The analysis also showed a strong positive correlation between "fear of crime" and both African-American populations, r = .829, n = 17, p = .000, and Hispanic populations, r = .742, n = 17, p = .001. The analysis indicates that as the number of African-American and Hispanic residents increased within the neighborhood, fear of crime also increased. Finally, the analysis indicates that there was weak or no correlation between Asian populations and fear of crime, r = -.292, n = 17, p = .256. Based upon the analyses, white, African-American and Hispanic populations are statistically significant in affecting fear of crime levels within the neighborhoods. Asian population did not significantly influence fear of crime levels within the neighborhoods. This date is illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9

Testing Informal Social Controls, Social Cohesion, Fear of Crime
against Race

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Informal Social Controls	.747**	-.812**	-.626**	.203
Social Cohesion	.789**	-.819**	-.674**	.235
Fear of Crime	-.748**	.829**	.742**	-.292

*p<.05,**p<.01

The analyses of white populations by census tract and quality of life indices, showed

a strong positive correlation, r = .724, n = 17, p = .001. As the population of white

residents increased in the neighborhoods, so did the quality of life. The analysis also

showed a strong negative correlation between neighborhood quality of life indices and

both African-American populations, r = -.785, n = 17, p = .000, and Hispanic

populations, r = -.759, n = 17, p = .000. The analysis indicates that as the number of

African-American and Hispanic residents increased within a neighborhood, quality of life

decreased. The analysis also showed that there was moderate positive correlation

between Asian populations and quality of life, r = .438, n = 17, p = .079. As the Asian

population within the neighborhood increased, so did the quality of life. Based upon the

analyses, white, African-American, and Hispanic populations were statistically

significant in affecting the quality of life within the neighborhoods, while Asian

populations showed a moderate, but not statistically significant effect on the quality of

life within the neighborhoods. These data are illustrated in Table 10..

The analyses of white populations by census tract and calls for police services,

showed a moderate negative correlation, r = -.663, n = 17, p = .004. The analysis

indicated that as the population of white residents increased within the neighborhoods, calls for police services decreased. The analyses also showed a moderate positive correlation between calls for police service within the neighborhoods and both African-American populations, r = .690, n = 17, p = .002, and Hispanic populations, r = .546, n = 17, p = .012. The analysis indicated that as the number of African-American and Hispanic residents increased within the neighborhoods, calls for police services also increased. The analysis further showed a moderate negative correlation between Asian populations and calls for police service, r = -.453, n = 17, p = .068. As the Asian population within the neighborhood increased, calls for police services decreased. Based upon the analyses, white, African-American, and Hispanic populations were statistically significant in determining calls for police service within the neighborhoods. Asian populations showed a moderate, but not statistically significant affect in determining calls for police service within the neighborhoods. These data are illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10
Testing Quality of Life, Calls for Service and Race

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Quality of Life	.724**	-.785**	-.757**	.438
Calls for Service	-.663**	.690**	.596*	-.453

*p<.05, **p<.01

RESULTS:

After analyzing the data, the researcher was able to answer the three hypotheses identified in chapter one.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 posed the following question; "Do neighborhoods exhibiting higher levels of social disorganization (residential instability, poverty and family dysfunction) concurrently exhibit lower levels of social cohesion, and an increased level of fear of crime (both indices of a community's, level of collective efficacy)?" The analysis of the data demonstrated that the "quality of life" of neighborhood residents is statistically significant in influencing the level of collective efficacy within the neighborhoods studied. Data and analyses confirm that higher levels of "quality of life" among neighborhood residents, is associated with a higher level of collective efficacy in the neighborhoods studied.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 posed the following question: "Do communities exhibiting low levels of collective efficacy have higher rates of crime?" The analysis of the data demonstrated that the level of collective efficacy of the neighborhoods, as defined by informal social control, social cohesion, and fear of crime, is statistically significant in influencing the number of calls for police service in the neighborhoods studied. Based upon the analysis, neighborhoods with higher levels of collective efficacy have less reported crime.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 posed the following question: "Do communities that are racial heterogeneous exhibit lower levels of collective efficacy?" The analysis of the data showed that racial heterogeneity was statistically significant in affecting collective efficacy within neighborhoods, as defined by informal social control, social cohesion, and

fear of crime. Based upon the analysis, racial heterogeneous neighborhoods exhibit lower levels of collective efficacy.

Null Hypothesis

Based on the research the null hypothesis for each of the three hypotheses was rejected.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

SUMMARY:

This study has demonstrated that collective efficacy is a statistically significant factor affecting calls for police services. The research also demonstrated that there is a statistically significant correlation between collective efficacy and both racial heterogeneity and quality of life. Based upon testing and analysis, it was determined that socio-economic disorder and racial heterogeneity within neighborhoods, leads to a breakdown of collective efficacy. This type of neighborhood disruption causes a breakdown of social order within the community, which, in turn, leads to increased rates of crime (Skogan, 1986). This finding is important in fostering a clearer understanding of the dynamics of collectively efficacy "at work" within neighborhoods and communities. By understanding the factors that lead to a breakdown of collective efficacy, we can better understand and explain why crime rates are higher in some neighborhoods and lower in others.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Community Oriented Policing Strategy (COPS) has been widely embraced and implemented by city governments and police agencies nationwide. The COPS strategy most often targets high-crime neighborhoods, which are experiencing social and economic decline. Extensive evaluative research suggests that COPS Programs fail to reduce or control crime, particularly when they are used as a standalone strategy (Weisburd and Eck, 2004). Research indicates that COPS programs are more successful

when they concurrently employ a Problem-Oriented Policing Strategy (POPS) as part of a broader crime control strategy applied in socio-economic depressed neighborhoods. (Weisburd and Eck, 2004).

By employing a problem-oriented policing approach in high-crime neighborhoods, city leaders, law enforcement officials, and the community at large, are better able to identify specific neighborhood problems; and, therefore, are better positioned to develop strategy and to apply necessary resources to address the problems (Weisburd and Eck, 2004).

Current research on policing demonstrates that adding more cops is not always the answer to achieving lower crime rates within a community (Weisburd and Eck, 2004). Research has shown that community oriented policing programs, which were, in part, developed to place more officers in socio-economically depressed neighborhoods, failed to remove offenders from the streets (Weisburd and Eck, 2004). Therefore, police must work smarter. And, importantly, the police cannot do it alone. In order to restore neighborhood health and concurrently, increase quality of life, city's leaders and police officials must look to larger, more inclusive strategies, that bring government, community leaders, citizens, police, and private businesses together in partnership. Collaboration and experimentation, followed by evaluation and readjustment, are all key factors to consider in rebuilding neighborhoods and increasing the quality of life of residents.

Law Enforcement agencies collect a large amount of data and intelligence information on the communities and neighborhoods they serve. If properly organized, analyzed, and disseminated, this information can provide law enforcement and city

leaders with a blueprint for developing a more focused strategy to address socio-economic disorder and crime (Braga, Kennedy, Waring, & Piehl, 2001). Such information can be used to identify and target specific individuals, types of crime, and specific residences, and businesses, for future criminal and civil enforcement action (Sherman, 1992). A well-balanced, well-planned strategic approach can help to avert implementation of controversial policies and practices that often include overzealous patrol activity, zero tolerance enforcement, and increased targeted-arrests in socio-economically depressed minority neighborhoods (Weisburd and Eck, 2004). Questionable police policies and practices have often created citizen mistrust of the police, especially in minority communities (Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). Implementing a broad- based problem oriented policing strategy can assist local governments in their efforts to identify and address "root-cause" socio-economic problems that lead to crime and disorder. Such a strategy is proactive, dynamic, and engaging by design.

As discussed in the literature review, local governments can significantly influence neighborhood development, redevelopment and structure through effective planning. New community developments should be planned using "crime impact studies." Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques are now routinely utilized by cities in new community development and building projects. Many local communities also invest in careful planning initiatives designed for community redevelopment and revitalization. Effective city planning and proper deployment of city services can help prevent and/or reverse social and physical decay in socio-economic depressed neighborhoods (Katyal, 2002). City planning and zoning commission should

carefully consider the placement of housing developments, businesses, parks and other recreational and entertainment venues. Additionally, city governments should utilize strict civil code enforcement mechanisms to ensure that properties are maintained in good order.

An active business recruitment and business development plan, executed by the city in cooperation with the Chamber of Commerce, can help to attract and encourage private businesses to invest in the community; and, associated funding incentive programs can direct business growth to economically depressed neighborhoods. Transportation is yet another factor that must be considered, as it influences access to services and employment within a community.

There are a plethora of factors that can influence community dynamics and social structures. Effective community planning can strengthened community social structure and enhance the ability of residence to collectively self-police and self-regulate. Establishing a healthy level of collective efficacy within the community is the goal, as demonstrated by this study.

RESEARCH LIMITATIONS:

As discussed in Chapter 3, relying upon census tract data and information has inherent limitations, as it does not always accurately define a specific neighborhood (Sampson et al., 2002). One reason is that census tracts may be composed of two or three diverse neighborhoods, which can skew demographic data and fail to accurately reflect neighborhood populations. Census tract 414.02 (in this study) demonstrates the problem. The east side of the census tract is composed of a large area of residential rental property

units; many are single parent households, with residents living on government assistance, and living below the average median income for Murfreesboro. The west side of the census tract is a more established owner occupied residential area, represented by working families and retirees who enjoy a higher standard of living. In analyzing the 488 calls for police services (in 2012) for Census Tract 414.02, 94% of the calls were found to originate from street addresses and residences on the east side of the census tract; while only 6% originated from the west side of the census tract. Using Census Tracks as a unit of measurement skews the data.

FUTURE RESEARCH:

Future research should take a closer look at the dynamics of racial heterogeneity. Such research should examine why and how racial heterogeneity effects collective efficacy, and how this dynamic contributes to higher levels of crime within neighborhoods. In examining the factor of racial heterogeneity, one must look beyond race. Socio-economic challenges facing these racial heterogeneous neighborhoods create "strain," which leads to a loss of social control in affected neighborhoods. Loss of neighborhood social control can be exacerbated when those living in the neighborhood feel as though they have been isolated by both race and class (Sampson et al., 1997). Though these neighborhoods are racially heterogeneous, they are socially and economically homogeneous. Many of the residents living in these neighborhoods commonly share economic hardship and, high unemployment, and live in areas experiencing social disorder. Past research has shown that neighborhoods that have a large population of African-Americans are often surrounded by areas that suffer from

socio-economic disorder (Sharkey, 2014). This is even true for African-American middle class neighborhoods (Sharkey, 2014). Because of socio-economic disorder, it is difficult to determine if racial heterogeneity leads to a breakdown of collective efficacy, or if it is due, in part, to the social-economic homogeneous nature of the residents that populate racially diversified neighborhoods. Future research should more closely examine the interactive relationship between racial heterogeneous neighborhoods and crime. Such a study might be designed to compare socially disorganized neighborhoods that are racial heterogonous to a similar number of socially disorganized neighborhoods that are predominately white. The dependent variable might be "calls for police service" or actual crime rates within the experimental and control group neighborhoods.

CONCLUSION:

The research shows that higher levels of crime occurs in neighborhoods where collective efficacy is strained or weakened, while the opposite is true in neighborhoods where collective efficacy is stronger. Neighborhoods exhibiting social and economic disorder, characterized by such indices as lower median income, a higher number of residents receiving government assistance, higher levels of residential mobility, family disruption, and racial heterogeneity, leads to a breakdown of neighborhood social control, and social cohesion, while increasing fear of crime. The opposite is true for white homogenous neighborhoods exhibiting social and economic stability.

REFERENCES

Braga, A., Kennedy, D., Waring, E., & Piehl, A. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's operation ceasefire. *Journal of Research In Crime and Delinquency 38*(3), 195-225.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G., Klebanov, P., & Sealand, N. (1993). Do neighborhoods influence child and adolescent development. *American Journal of Sociology, 99* (2), 353-395.

Browning, C., Feinberg, S., & Dietz, R. (2004). The paradox of social organization: Networks, collective efficacy, and violent crime in urban neighborhoods. *Social Forces, 83*(2), 503-534.

Donnelly, P. (1989). Individual and neighborhood influences on fear of crime. *Sociological Focus, 22*(1), 69-85.

Donnelly, P., & Majka, T. (1998). Residents' efforts at neighborhood stabilization: Facing the challenges of inner-city neighborhoods. *Sociological Forum, 13*(2), 189-213.

Drakulich, K., & Crutchfield, R. (2013). The role of perceptions of the police in informal social control: Implications for the racial stratification of crime and control. *Social Problems, 60*(3), 383-407.

Grattet, R. (2009). The urban ecology of bias crime: A study of disorganized and defended neighborhoods. *Social Problems, 56* (1), 132-150.

Harding, J. (2009). Violence, older peers, and the socialization of adolescent boys in disadvantaged neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review, 74* (3), 445-464.

Hipp, J., Tita, G., & Greenbaum, R. (2009). Drive-bys and trade-ups: Examining the directionality of the crime and residential instability relationship. *Social Forces*, *87*(4), 1777-1812.

Katyal, N. (2002). Architecture as crime control. *The Yale Law Journal, 111*(5), 1039-1139.

Kennedy, D. M. (2009). *Deterrence and crime prevention: reconsidering the prospect of sanction*. London: Routledge.

Lee, M., & Martinez, R. (2002). Social disorganization revisited: Mapping the recent immigration and black homicide relationship in northern Miami. *Sociological Focus, 35*(4), 363-380.

Lee, G., Akers, R., & Borg, M. (2004). Social learning and structural factors in adolescent substance use. *Western Criminology Review, 5* (1) 17-34.

Ludwig, J., & Kling, J. (2007). Is crime contagious? *Journal of Law and Economics, 50* (3), 491-518.

Lyons, J., & Pettit, B. (2011). Compounded disadvantage: Race, incarceration, and wage growth. *Social Problems, 58*(2), 257-280.

McGahey, R. (1986). Economic conditions, neighborhood organization, and urban crime. *Crime and Justice, 8*, 231-270.

Meares, T. (2002). Praying for community policing. *California Law Review, 90*(5), 1593-1634.

Mendez, G. (2000). Incarcerated African-American men and their children: A case study. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 569*, 86-101.

Middle Tennessee State University. (2013). *Top 10 things about MTSU*. Retrieved from http://www.mtsu.edu/about/index.php.

Moore, M., & Chase-Lansdale, P. (2001). Sexual intercourse and pregnancy among African-American girls in high poverty neighborhoods: The role of family and perceived community environment. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(4), 1146-1157.

Peterson, R., & Krivo, L. (2005). Macrostructural analyses of race, ethnicity, and violent crime: Recent lessons and new directions for research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 31*, 331-356.

Rankin, B., & Quane, J. (2002). Social contexts and urban adolescent outcomes: The interrelated effects of neighborhoods, families, and peers on African-American youth. *Social Problems, 49*(1), 79-100.

Ross, C., & Mirowsky, J. (2001). Neighborhood disadvantage, disorder, and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 42*(3), 258-276.

Ross, C., Mirowsky, J., & Pribesh, S. (2001). Powerlessness and the amplification of threat: Neighborhood disadvantage, disorder, and mistrust. *American Sociological Review, 66*(4), 568-591.

Sampson, R., & Groves, B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*(4), 774-802.

Sampson, R., & Raudenbush, S. (2004). Seeing disorder: Neighborhood stigma and the social construction of broken windows. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67*(4), 319-342.

Sampson, R., Morenoff, J., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing neighborhood effects: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*, 443-478.

Sampson, R., Raudenbush S., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, *277*(5328), 918-924.

Sharkey, P. (2014). Spatial Segmentation and the Black Middle Class. *American Journal of Sociology, 119*(4), 903-954.

Sherman, L. (1992). Attacking crime: Police and crime control. *Crime and Justice 15*, 159-230.

Skogan, W. (1986). Fear of crime and neighborhood change. *Crime and Justice, 8*, 203-229.

Skogan, W. (1988). Community organizations and crime. *Crime and Justice, 10,* 39-78.

Sun, Y., Triplett, R., & Gainey, R. (2004). Neighborhood characteristics and crime: A test of Sampson and Groves model of social disorganization. *Western Criminology Review 5*(1), 1-16.

Taylor, R. (1996). Neighborhood responses to disorder and local attachments: The systemic model of attachment, social disorganization, and neighborhood use value. *Sociological Forum, 11*(1), 41-74.

Teasdale, B., & Silver, E. (2009). Neighborhoods and self-control: Toward an expanded view of socialization. *Social Problems, 56*(1), 205-222.

United States Census Bureau. (2013). *Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 2010 Census.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/2010census/.

Vigil, D. (2003). Urban violence and street gangs. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 32*, 225-242.

Wei, E., Hipwell, A., Pardini, D., Beyers, J., & Loeber, R. (1979). Block observations of neighborhood physical disorder are associated with neighborhood crime, firearm injuries and deaths, and teen births. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 59*(10), 904-908.

Weisburd, D., & Eck, J. (2004). What can police do to reduce crime, disorder and fear?
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, *593*, 42-65.

Weitzer, R. & Tuch, S. (2004). Race and perceptions of police misconduct. *Social
Problems, 51*(3), 305-325.

Xu, Y., Fiedler, M., & Flaming, K. (2005). Discovering the impact of community
policing: The broken windows thesis, collective efficacy, and citizens' judgment.
Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 42, 147-186.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROL:
Would any of your neighbors intervene if?

1) They saw children in the neighborhood skipping school and hanging out on the street? 1.very likely, 2. likely, 3.unlikely, 4.very unlikely

2) Children were vandalizing buildings or signs in the neighborhood?

   1.very likely, 2. likely, 3.unlikely, 4.very unlikely

3) A fight broke out in front of their house?

   1.very likely, 2. likely, 3.unlikely, 4.very unlikely

4) Calling the police to report drug and gang activity?

   1.very likely, 2. likely, 3.unlikely, 4.very unlikely

5) Rallying to stop the closure of a neighborhood fire station?

   1.very likely, 2. likely, 3.unlikely, 4.very unlikely

SOCIAL COHESION AND TRUST:

1) People who live in the neighborhood are generally friendly?

   1.strongly disagree, 2.disagree, 3.agree, 4.strongly agree

2) People around here take care of each other?

   1.strongly disagree, 2.disagree, 3.agree, 4.strongly agree

3) People in the neighborhood can be trusted?

   1.strongly disagree, 2.disagree, 3.agree, 4.strongly agree

4) This is a close-knit neighborhood?

   1.strongly disagree, 2.disagree, 3.agree, 4.strongly agree

5) The neighborhood is a good place to raise children?

   1.strongly disagree, 2.disagree, 3.agree, 4.strongly agree

FEAR OF CRIME:

Are you concerned about?

1) Open air drug activity and markets in your neighborhood?

   1.very concerned, 2.concerned, 3.unconcerned, 4.very unconcerned

2) Gang activity in your neighborhood?

   1.very concerned, 2.concerned, 3.unconcerned, 4.very unconcerned

3) Theft or vandalism occurring in your neighborhood?

   1.very concerned, 2.concerned, 3.unconcerned, 4.very unconcerned

4) Robberies or assaults in your neighborhood?

   1.very concerned, 2.concerned, 3.unconcerned, 4.very unconcerned

5) Gun violence in your neighborhood?

   1.very concerned, 2.concerned, 3.unconcerned, 4.very unconcerned

APPENDIX B

IRB Letter

5/6/2014

Investigator(s): James Abbott, Dr. Thomas Jurkanin
Department: Criminal Justice Administration
Investigator(s) Email Address: jsa2c@mtmail.mtsu.edu, Thomas.Jurkanin@mtsu.edu

Protocol Title: An Empirical Examination of Crime and Collective Efficacy in a Mid-Sized Southern Community

Protocol Number: #14-324

Dear Investigator(s),

Your study has been designated to be exempt. The exemption is pursuant to 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) Educational Tests, Surveys, Interviews, or Observations.

We will contact you annually on the status of your project. If it is completed, we will close it out of our system. You do not need to complete a progress report and you will not need to complete a final report. It is important to note that your study is approved for the life of the project and does not have an expiration date.

The following changes must be reported to the Office of Compliance before they are initiated:
- Adding new subject population
- Adding a new investigator
- Adding new procedures (e.g., new survey; new questions to your survey)
- A change in funding source
- Any change that makes the study no longer eligible for exemption.

The following changes do not need to be reported to the Office of Compliance:
- Editorial or administrative revisions to the consent or other study documents
- Increasing or decreasing the number of subjects from your proposed population

If you encounter any serious unanticipated problems to participants, or if you have any questions as you conduct your research, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Kellie Hilker, Compliance Officer