

MFI

106671

106671

POLICE COMMUNITY STATIONS:
THE HOUSTON FIELD TEST

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

by

Mary Ann Wycoff, Wesley G. Skogan
Antony M. Pate and Lawrence W. Sherman

With the assistance of
Sampson Annan and Gretchen Eckman

Final Draft Report
to the National Institute of Justice

The Honorable James K. Stewart, Director

October 19, 1985

106671

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ
U.S. Department of Justice
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

NCJRS

WUG 4 11087

ACQUISITIONS

Police Foundation
Hubert Williams,
President

POLICE COMMUNITY STATIONS:
THE HOUSTON FIELD TEST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
SUMMARY	1
THE HOUSTON PROGRAM	2
RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS	6
PROGRAM EFFECTS	10
CONCLUSIONS	15
RECOMMENDATIONS	17
POSTSCRIPT	22

SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of a field test conducted by the Houston Police Department and evaluated by the Police Foundation under a grant from the National Institute of Justice. The project, successfully carried out from the fall of 1983 through the summer of 1984, tested the hypothesis that the location of a police community station in a neighborhood could reduce fear of crime and increase citizens' satisfaction with their neighborhood and with the police. Although community stations are not new to American policing, this is, to our knowledge, the first test of the effects of this type of police strategy.

The evaluation found that the creation of the station had several statistically significant beneficial effects, especially on the area as a whole. Residents in the Community Station neighborhood, as compared to those in a matched area where no new programs were introduced, had significantly ($p \leq .05$) lower scores on measures of:

- o Fear of Personal Victimization in Area,
- o Perceived Area Personal Crime Problems,
- o Perceived Area Property Crime Problems,
- o Perceived Area Social Disorder Problems, and
- o Defensive Behaviors to Avoid Personal Victimization.

Persons who worked in non-residential establishments in the program area registered a significant increase in:

- o Fear of Personal Victimization in Area.

As implemented in Houston, the Community Station appears to be one effective means to reduce the public's fear of crime.*

* For a discussion of other fear reduction strategies that were tested as part of the Fear Reduction Project, see Pate et al., 1985.

THE HOUSTON PROGRAM

The National Institute of Justice issued, in late 1982, a request for competitive proposals to test strategies for reducing the fear of crime, and the Police Foundation was selected to evaluate fear reduction strategies on an accelerated timetable. Two cities were selected in which to conduct the tests--Houston, Texas, a new city with low population density, rapid population growth and an expanding economy and Newark, New Jersey, an old, dense city with a declining population and a deteriorating revenue base. In each city, a Fear Reduction Task Force was created to consider possible strategies, select those that were most appropriate for the local conditions and plan and implement those strategies over a one-year period.

The Houston Task Force hypothesized that one source of fear in their city might be a sense of physical, social, and psychological distance between ordinary citizens and police officers. In early 1983, Houston was a city of approximately 1.8 million residents and 3350 police officers distributed over 565 square miles. Almost all patrolling was done in cars. The average citizen would have little opportunity to know police officers except in stressful circumstances of receiving a ticket or talking to police following a victimization. This lack of interaction might cause officers assigned to a beat to have little understanding of the priorities and concerns of the people living there. Recognizing this, citizens might feel that their police neither know nor care about them. The Task Force officers

felt that such alienation could lead to public dissatisfaction with police services, to dissatisfaction with the neighborhood as one in which to live and-- ultimately--to fear of crime and other social problems.

The Task Force believed that the location of a small, storefront police office in a neighborhood might provide one means of overcoming the feeling of distance. Staffed by police department personnel, the station would be open at times when it would be convenient for citizens to lodge a complaint, give or receive information, or just stop by to chat with the local police officer. The office would provide a base of operation for the area officers whose job it would become to get acquainted with the neighborhood residents and business people, identify and help solve neighborhood problems, seek ways of delivering better police service to the area, and develop programs to draw the police and community closer together. The effects of the station and its programs would be reinforced by a monthly police-produced newsletter which would be distributed by the community station staff.

Station and Staff

The Task Force located space in a small, one-story complex of glass-front offices. Very good used furniture was provided by a large Houston firm which had just re-decorated, and the station sign was donated by another. The large (approximately 20 x 30), one-room office was spacious, attractive, well-lighted, well-furnished and comfortable. In addition to desks, chairs and sofas, the office contained a copy machine and soft drink machine which were available to the public.

One Task Force officer had primary responsibility for the new station. He consulted with the district captain in the selection of a second officer. A civilian office coordinator, one Community Service Officer and three

Police Aides completed the original staff. Within four months of the opening, station hours were extended* and two more patrol officers were assigned to staff a second shift. The four station officers were freed from the responsibility of responding to calls for service in the area and from routine patrol; other officers maintained regular patrol assignments in the area. The station officers did patrol frequently, however, and did respond to calls when they were patrolling and when residents called the station directly. It was the job of the station officers to design and implement the programs to be run out of the storefront and to be available when citizens came to the station seeking help and information.

Management and Supervision

The station was managed by the Task Force officer assigned to it who was, in turn, supervised through his close working relationship with the district captain. Station officers did not report to regular roll calls and did not frequently meet with a lieutenant or sergeant. These supervisors were supportive of the station when they were needed but were not expected to maintain close supervision of it. This loose system of management and supervision worked well in this particular situation probably because of the personal characteristics of the two principal station officers and because of their relationship with the captain.

Station Programs

The programs developed by the station officers included:

*Hours were 10:00 a.m. to 9:30 p.m., Monday through Friday and 10:00 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays.

Monthly meetings which were held in a neighborhood church. The first attracted just over 100 residents; attendance in the seventh and eighth months averaged 250. Officers discussed crime and other items of interest to the neighborhood and then presented a guest speaker who might be a department commander, judge, politician, banker, or representative of a power utility.

School program. Station officers met regularly with neighborhood school administrators to discuss school problems; as a result, officers began to work vigorously on the truancy problem. Truants were picked up and, unless involved in a crime, were returned to school; older individuals who were with the truant juveniles might be taken to the city jail. Parents having trouble with truant children were advised to discuss the problem with the station officers who might talk with the child and parents and/or refer them to a counseling agency.

Fingerprinting program. Officers fingerprinted children whose parents brought them to the station. They would later (after the evaluation period) extend the program to a neighborhood hamburger shop in an effort to reach a larger segment of the community.

Blood pressure program. Area residents were invited to have their blood pressure taken at the station on one day each month when a nurse or paramedic would be available to take the readings.

Ride-along program. Area churches and civic clubs were invited to select one of their members to ride with an officer patrolling in the neighborhood.

Park Program. A park in the center of the neighborhood had been taken over by rowdy persons who caused other residents to be reluctant to use it. Officers began to patrol it regularly and made several arrests. During the

summer months they instituted monthly athletic "contests" (softball, football, volleyball, and horseshoes) in which residents played against police officers. Residents returned to the park, and a soft drink company which had removed a vending machine after its repeated vandalism installed another one at the park swimming pool.

Newsletters. Between November, 1983 and June, 1984 the station staff distributed a total of approximately 2250 newsletters to the neighborhood.

Table 1 lists the number of hours the station was open by month and the number of persons participating in various programs.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

Design

Five areas, closely matched in terms of size, demographic characteristics, land use, level of crime and other characteristics, were selected to be included in the overall Houston Fear Reduction Program. One of those areas was selected to be the program area in which the police community station would be located. The same selection procedure assigned another neighborhood to be a comparison area, in which no new police programs would be introduced.

Demographic data from the 1980 Census, for these two areas, are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 1

NUMBERS OF STATION HOURS, ACTIVITIES, AND PARTICIPANTS BY MONTH

<u>Month</u>	<u>Hours Open</u>	<u>Citizen Walk-ins</u>	<u>Phone Calls</u>	<u>Reports Taken</u>	<u>Children Finger- Printed</u>	<u>Blood Pressures Taken</u>	<u>Attendance at Monthly Meetings</u>
[Pre-test Survey conducted June-July, 1983]							
November	184	135*	3	2	#	#	#
December	168	49	32	4	#	#	#
January	168	47	39	11	#	#	#
February	185**	124	78	6	18	#	110
March	282	183	112	6	16	#	122
April	---***	270	238	4	87	73	140
May	263	200	253	29	108	9	127
June	224	234	254	20	21	19	134
[Post-test survey conducted June-July, 1984]							
July	224	235	225	16	11	23	157
August	291	210	308	32	9	31	230

* Includes 125 persons attending grand opening.

** Hours expanded on February 20.

*** Not recorded.

Program not yet in operation.

TABLE 2

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR POLICE COMMUNITY STATION PROGRAM AND COMPARISON AREA

Area	Total	Population						Housing Units			Occupied Units		
		Ethnicity				Age		Total	% Single Family	% Occupied	Persons Per Unit	Total	% Owner Occupied
		% B	% API	% W	% SO	% Below 18	% 65 and above						
Program Area Northline	5105	13	2	69	16	27	5	2090	52	90	2.7	1891	50
Comparison Area Shady Acres	3690	22	-	52	26	26	15	1626	62	90	2.7	1460	39

Source: 1980 Census

Area Effects

At the area level, effects were examined by analyzing surveys conducted with random cross-sectional samples of residents and with owners or managers of non-residential establishments before and after the introduction of the program, both in the program area and in the comparison area. The pre-program survey resulted in 795 completed interviews with residents in the two areas, with response rates of 77 percent in the program area and 75 percent in the comparison area. The post-program survey produced 863 completed interviews with response rates of 81 percent in the program area and 78 percent in the comparison area.

Individual Effects

At the individual level, effects were examined by comparing the results of surveys conducted with the same persons (a "panel") before and after the program was implemented, both in the program area and in the comparison area. Interviewing the same people twice had the advantage of allowing for controlling statistically the pretest scores on outcome variables. The disadvantage of such an approach is that inevitably only certain types of people can be found and reinterviewed the second time, making it inappropriate to generalize the results to the population of the area as a whole. There were 239 panel respondents in the program area and 183 in the comparison area. These numbers constituted 59 and 47 percent, respectively, of the program and comparison area Wave 1 cross-sectional samples.

Analysis

Data from the area-wide samples for both areas, for both waves of the survey, were pooled and merged and subjected to a pooled cross-sectional

regression analysis in which controls were applied for survey wave, area of residence, the interaction between survey wave and area of residence, and numerous respondent characteristics.

The analysis model for the panel data is similar to that for the area (cross-sectional) data with the addition of a variable which is the pretest score on the outcome measure. The use of the pretest score provides for additional control of unmeasured differences among respondents.

Additionally for panel respondents, regression analysis was used to explore the possible relationship between program awareness and outcome measures. And, also within the panel, regression analysis was used to probe possible differences in program impact among demographic subgroups.

The non-residential data were analyzed using one-tailed t-tests to determine whether there were significant differences in outcome within areas over time.

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Residential Respondents: Area Level (Cross-Sectional) Analyses

Area Level Program. In both the program and comparison areas there were significant increases in the percentage of respondents who were aware of the community station, perhaps because of newspaper stories about this and other community stations which spanned both test areas. However, the percentage point increase in the program area (from 2 percent to 65 percent) was much larger than the increase in the comparison area (from 3 percent to 11 percent). Only in the program area was there a significant increase in the percentage of respondents who had attended a monthly meeting at which a police officer was present.

Area Level Program Effects. The effect of the community station appears to have been substantial, especially as determined by the pooled, cross-sectional, area analysis. The results for both the cross-sectional and the panel analyses are summarized in Table 3.

The first and third columns report the sign and size of the regression coefficients associated with living in the program area* after the other variables in the model have been taken into account. The second and fourth columns report the level of statistical significance of the coefficients.

At the area level (cross-sectional analysis), respondents living in the Community Station neighborhood, relative to those in the comparison area, had significantly ($p \leq .05$) lower scores on measures of:

- o Fear of Personal Victimization in Area,
- o Perceived Area Personal Crime Problems,
- o Perceived Area Property Crime Problems,
- o Perceived Area Social Disorder Problems, and
- o Defensive Behaviors to Avoid Personal Victimization.

The program appears to have had statistically significant, predicted effects on four of the eight attitude measures and on one of two behavioral measures of program impact. For the other four attitudes, the effects were in the predicted direction but were not significant.

*And, for the cross-sectional analysis, being interviewed after program implementation.

TABLE 3

PROGRAM EFFECTS FOR CROSS-SECTIONAL AND PANEL ANALYSES:
REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Cross-Sectional Analysis		Panel Analysis	
	Regression Coefficient (b)	Level of Significance	Regression Coefficient (b)	Level of Significance
<u>Outcome Scale</u>				
Fear of Personal Victimization in Area	-.16	.01*	-.12	.03*
Perceived Area Personal Crime Problems	-.25	.01*	-.11	.04*
Worry About Area Property Crime Problems	-.06	.33	+.06	.36
Perceived Area Property Crime Problems	-.26	.01*	+.04	.56
Perceived Area Social Disorder Problems	-.10	.03*	-.04	.39
Satisfaction with Area	+.06	.29	+.07	.32
Evaluations of Police Service	+.06	.38	+.12	.08
Perceived Police Aggressiveness	-.03	.11	.00	.92
Defensive Behaviors to Avoid Victimization	-.16	.01*	-.01	.88
(N)	1657		420	

*Statistically significant at $p \leq .05$.

Residential Respondents: Individual (Panel) Analyses

Panel Program Awareness. In the panel data, respondents in both areas indicated significant increases in awareness of the community station. However, there was a 73 percentage point increase in the program area and only a 12 percentage point increase in the comparison area.

Panel Program Effects. In the panel analysis, persons living in the program area had significantly ($p \leq .05$) lower scores on:

- o Fear of Personal Victimization in Area, and
- o Perceived Area Personal Crime Problems.

The cross-sectional analysis provides the best estimates of the effects of the program on the area as a whole while the panel analysis gives the best test of program effects on individuals. There are fewer effects found in the panel than in the cross-sectional analysis. We cannot determine whether these differences are due to the fact that the two data sets were subjected to different types of analyses, are due to the differential receptivity to the program on the part of respondents in the two types of samples, or are due to the effects of panel respondents having been interviewed twice in one year rather than only once (the case for the cross-sectional respondents). Additionally, as will be discussed in the following section, some population subgroups did not share in the apparent benefits from the community station. This fact, combined with desirable, although not significant, differences over time in the comparison area may have served to mute the program effects that could be detected in the panel

analysis. It may also serve to explain panel outcomes on two variables (Worry About Area Property Crime Problems and Perceived Area Property Crime Problems) which were in the direction opposite the prediction.

Effects for Residential Subgroups. Analyses of possible differential program effects on subgroups of panel respondents found that blacks and renters shared very few of the program benefits with other population subgroups. Among nine measured outcomes, blacks indicated significant positive program effects on only one (a decrease in Perceived Area Personal Crime Problems). Both blacks and renters recalled much lower levels of program exposure than did other subgroups. Blacks and renters in the comparison area tended to indicate more desirable changes over time than did those in the program area.

Program Awareness and Outcomes. Within the program area, an analysis of the relationship between program outcomes and recalled exposure to various program components found these statistically significant results:

- o A significant positive (desirable) relationship between reported awareness of the community station and evaluation of police service.
- o A significant positive (undesirable) relationship between reports of calling and visiting the community station and perceptions of area social disorder problems. This relationship may result from the fact that persons who reported calling and visiting the station also reported having experienced more victimization than did persons who did not report calling and visiting the station.
- o Significant desirable relationships between the report of having seen an officer in the area in the previous 24 hours and the fear of personal victimization (r is -), perceptions of area personal crime problems (r is -), perceptions of area social disorder problems (r is -), satisfaction with the area (r is +), and evaluations of police service (r is +).

Findings for Non-Residential Respondents

At Wave 2, as compared to Wave 1, respondents from non-residential establishments in the program area had a statistically significantly lower level of:

- o Fear of Personal Victimization in Area.

There were no significant differences over time on any other outcome measures in either area.

Alternative Explanations of Findings

The fact that Wave 1 outcome scores were higher (or lower) in the program area than the comparison area raises the possibility that the measured effects were, at least in part, the result of regression toward the mean. This possibility is one basis for an argument to replicate this strategy in a number of areas, with an emphasis on reaching blacks and renters with station programs.

CONCLUSIONS

The Houston police community station evaluated in this report appears to have been successful in reducing citizens' levels of fear. These findings are supported most strongly by the cross-sectional area-level analysis of residential surveys. The panel analysis duplicated only two of five area-level findings. There are several possible explanations for this difference including, simply, the fact that the cross-sectional and panel data sets were subjected to different forms of analysis. But it is worth considering that two other conditions may have contributed to the paucity of findings in the panel data:

1. the fact that respondents in the comparison area registered changes (although not significant) over time which were similar in direction, if not magnitude to those in the program area, and

2. the fact that blacks and renters in the comparison area indicated more beneficial outcomes than did similar groups in the program area.

This combination of conditions may have decreased the likelihood of finding significant effects in the panel analysis which was more stringent than the cross-sectional analysis. Further analysis at a later date will be necessary to explore the extent and relative impact of these conditions in the cross-sectional and panel data sets.

The lack of positive program effects for blacks and renters seems to be a function of their lower levels of awareness of the program. The community station program had relied, in part, on established civic organizations to attract residents to station programs. To the extent that blacks and renters are less likely to be members of these organizations, the program needs to utilize other means of reaching these people.

The fact that there was only one significant effect for respondents from non-residential establishments is not surprising, since these respondents are more likely to have had exposure to the police prior to the implementation of the station. (Also, the small number of such establishments decreases the likelihood of detecting statistically significant change.) There was no reason to believe that commercial areas of the neighborhood were suffering adverse financial consequences from fear of crime. The apparent lack of improvement in business conditions may simply mean that area businesses were not suffering prior to program implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our interpretation of the data, we would recommend that other departments which perceive a need to help citizens feel more secure in their neighborhoods consider establishing community police stations similar to the one which has been described and evaluated here. Based on our personal observations of the program, we offer these additional recommendations concerning the operation of a community station program.

1. Personnel Qualifications. The Community Station personnel's intelligence, integrity, creativity, gregariousness, enthusiasm and willingness to work were perhaps the most critical elements of the operation. It is probably the case that many different types of personality combinations could do the job well (if somewhat differently), but a key characteristic for any community station officer would be the ability to talk with people. Much of the success of this station seems attributable to the persuasiveness and infectious enthusiasm of the principal station officer whose verbal skills were essential to the communication of these qualities. While at least one of the station officers had all the characteristics mentioned here, other staff members either shared or complemented these traits. The primary officer was a good judge of people and purposely chose other staff members who would be better at some types of program efforts than he perceived himself to be.

Given the nature of their work, the station staff members must be highly self-motivating and capable of working effectively without close supervision. Some commanders might be tempted to "bury" a lazy street officer in a storefront operation, but such an assignment would bury the station at the same time.

2. Personnel involvement. This station was created by the two officers who currently run it. They found the space, moved the furniture, hung the pictures, advertised themselves to the community, designed the programs, and implemented them. As a result of their efforts and the community's warm response to the opening of the station, they feel proudly proprietary of it. This fact may provide crucial motivation behind the energy they commit to the station. We have no experience with turnover of key personnel in such an operation, but we suspect it would be important to devise ways of giving new station personnel a sense of ownership of already established programs.

3. Management. This was a happy circumstance in which a very good patrol officer was backed by a very good captain. The captain had the confidence to give the officer a great amount of discretion in developing the station operation and the commitment to provide whatever support was necessary. While such a successful pairing of program and people need not be unique, neither will it be the rule in large organizations. One uncaring captain could doom several community station operations to failure, either by not making a careful choice of station personnel or by not providing sufficient support for the station operation.

Substantial management support is needed, especially in the start-up stage when space and furnishings must be found, contracts negotiated, work schedules devised, and programs developed. Given the demands a new station would put on management resources, it is probably a good idea to give each manager the responsibility for initially starting only one such operation. That one could be given all the attention and resources necessary to make it a model for later stations in the area. When the department command staff decided the first station was adequate to serve as a good model for others

in the district, steps could then be taken to develop the additional stations.

4. Supervision. While this station worked well with a minimum of supervision, such a loose structure might not work well in every situation. In this case, it succeeded because of the strong relationship between the captain and the officer in charge of the station. However, if the station officer needed more supervision, or if the captain had several stations to manage, more consideration would have to be given to the development of a formal supervisory structure for the stations. (The Detroit Police Department appears to have worked out a satisfactory arrangement for the management and supervision of approximately 50 storefront stations.)

5. Programs. There is no way of knowing which of the many Houston programs were most effective in producing the positive outcomes we have attributed to the station. Indeed, it may well be the mix of programs which was effective. In any case, it seems unlikely that there is a "package" of programs which could be transferred to another station. All of the programs implemented in Houston may be worth consideration for use elsewhere, but the success of community station programs very likely depends on their match with the needs of the community. The Houston officers designed their programs after they were familiar with the community.

6. Familiarity with the community. It appears that getting to know both the characteristics of the area and many of the people who live in it has been important to the success of the Houston station. While it was important to the successful establishment of the station, it is probably also important to the effectiveness of the individual officers. To get the program started, the officers who opened the station had to make a lot of community contacts. Officers who will be assigned to the station later will

not have the same motivation to learn the community and will have to be encouraged to do so, perhaps through assignment to programs which will necessitate meeting people personally. A program of door-to-door contacts (see Wycoff and Skogan, 1985a) might be one way of familiarizing the new officer with the neighborhood.

7. Station atmosphere. It is important that the station give the impression that it is a place intended to accommodate citizens rather than police officers. The Houston station accomplished this with its open front, comfortable furnishings, and ready welcome for visitors. The only time a citizen was observed to hesitate about entering was when three officers were talking together. Citizens must not be given the feeling, common to traditional police stations, that they are intruding upon "police business." Any effort to combine a police substation with a storefront operation should reserve a front room of the office and a front parking lot solely for use by citizen visitors.

8. Publicity. The community station cannot be effective unless residents know about it, and every means should be made to publicize the existence of the station and its programs. The repeated use of large numbers of fliers distributed by the community station staff probably was effective as a means of publicizing the station's opening and later programs. Good coverage in the local, community paper also was useful.

9. Community involvement. The station staff made good use of existing community institutions as a means of drawing the community into the station program. A local church was used for the monthly meetings which drew crowds too large for the station to accommodate. Neighborhood civic groups were used as "organizing agents" for the monthly meetings. This approach appears to have worked well for persons who tend to be members of these groups, but

other approaches will have to be developed for groups of residents who are not already affiliated with existing neighborhood organizations.

10. Salesmanship. The officers had to sell the program to individuals and groups whose support they needed. They did this, in part, through publicity and their own enthusiasm. But they also appear to have done it by offering others the chance to be involved in an adventure. The patrol officer who managed the station rarely asked businesses or organizations for help; rather, he deliberately gave them the "opportunity to do something for the neighborhood." The skills of a good salesperson were in evidence.

Finally, we would recommend that any department considering the development of a community station program take a first-hand look at one already in successful operation. Exemplary storefront stations can be observed in Houston, Texas; Newark, New Jersey; Santa Ana, California; Detroit, Michigan and perhaps in other cities we have yet to visit. Video tapes or slide presentations available from the Detroit, Houston and Santa Ana departments can provide some sense of the nature of the operations. All of these programs will be described in Skolnick and Bayley, forthcoming. Additionally, the Detroit program is described in Holland, 1985. There is, however, no effective substitute for sitting in a community station and talking directly with the officers who make it work.

NOTE: Complete details of the program and its evaluation are available in Wycoff and Skogan, 1985b.

POSTSCRIPT

After hearing about the programs which the Northline Community Station staff had developed for neighborhood residents, an official visitor asked Officer Robin Kirk what effect the station had had on him.

"It has given me the opportunity to be nice to people," he said. His partner nodded quick agreement.

Several months later, in the course of being nice to people, these officers hosted an ice cream social for about sixty neighborhood children-- blacks, whites and Hispanics. During the party, an eleven year old black male drew one of the officers to the side and told him about a local fencing operation. As a result of the information, the Houston police recovered \$10,000 worth of stolen property .

REFERENCES

- Holland, Lawrence H. 1985. "Police and the Community: The Detroit Ministation Experience." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, February.
- Pate, Antony M., Mary Ann Wycoff, Wesley G. Skogan and Lawrence W. Sherman. 1985. Reducing the Fear of Crime: An Overview of the Houston and Newark Experiences. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.
- Skolnick, Jerome H. and David Bayley. Forthcoming. Police Innovation.
- Wycoff, Mary Ann and Wesley G. Skogan. 1985a. Citizen Contact Patrol: The Houston Field Test. Technical Report. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.
- Wycoff, Mary Ann and Wesley G. Skogan. 1985b. Police Community Stations: The Houston Field Test. Technical Report. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Houston Police Department

Lee P. Brown, Chief of Police
Robert Wasserman, Police Administrator
Cynthia Sulton, Director, Planning and Research Division
T. G. Koby, Captain, North Shepherd Station

Houston Community Station Staff

Sergeant Steve Fowler,
Supervisor Fear Reduction Task Force
Police Officer Robin Kirk,
Fear Reduction Task Force member, and Project Director
Donny Martin, Station Coordinator
Margie Curtis, Police Officer
Norman Henson, Police Officer
Mike Mikeska, Police Officer
Tina Walker, Police Aide

Police Foundation Staff

Patrick V. Murphy, Past President
Lawrence W. Sherman, Past Vice President for Research

Police Foundation Fear Reduction Program Evaluation Staff

Antony M. Pate, Project Co-Director
Mary Ann Wycoff, Project Co-Director
Sampson O. Annan, Survey Research Director
Gretchen Eckman, Houston Process Evaluator
Wesley G. Skogan, Principal Consultant

(Box comments by James K. Stewart
Hubert Williams
Lee P. Brown
to be added)

Grant No. 83-IJ-CX-0003 from the
National Institute of Justice, U.S.
Department of Justice. Points of view
or opinions stated in this report do
not necessarily represent the official
position of the U.S. Department of
Justice, the Houston Police Department
or the Police Foundation.