If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

NATIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM

Series A
Number 9

Citizen Patrol Projects

36435

y Enforcement and Criminal Justice
ınce Administration
nt of Justice

Phase 1 Report

Criminal justice policymakers at all levels of government are hampered by a lack of sound information on the effectiveness of various programs and approaches. To help remedy the problem, the National Institute sponsors a National Evaluation Program to provide practical information on the costs, benefits and limitations of selected criminal justice programs now in use throughout the country.

Each NEP assessment concentrates on a specific "topic area" consisting of groups of on-going projects with similar objectives and strategies. The initial step in the process is a "Phase I" study that identifies the key issues, assesses what is currently known about them, and develops methods for more intensive evaluation at both the national and local level. Phase I studies are not meant to be definitive evaluations; rather, they analyze what we presently know and what is still uncertain or unknown. They offer a sound basis for planning further evaluation and research.

Although Phase I studies are generally short-term (approximately six to eight months), they examine many projects and collect and analyze a great deal of information. To make this information available to state and local decision-makers and others, the National Institute publishes a summary of the findings of each Phase I study. Microfiche or loan copies of the full report are made available through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Evaluation Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 24036, S.W. Post Office, Washington, D.C. 20024.

These Phase I reports are now available:

- Operation Identification Projects
- Citizen Crime Reporting Projects
- Specialized Police Patrol Operations
- Neighborhood Team Policing
- Pre-Trial Screening
- Pre-Trial Release
- Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)
- Early Warning Robbery Reduction Projects
- Delinquency Prevention
- Alternatives to Incarceration of Juveniles
- Juvenile Diversion
- Citizen Patrol
- Traditional Patrol
- Security Survey Projects
- Halfway Houses

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1.10

Stock No. 027-000-00464-4

NATIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM
PHASE I SUMMARY REPORT

Citizen Patrol Projects

By

Robert K. Yin
Mary E. Vogel
Jan M. Chaiken
Deborah R. Both

This project was supported by Grant Number 75NI-99-0105, awarded to the Rand Corporation, Washington, D. C. office, by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. 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 U. S. Department of Justice.

January 1977

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U.S. Department of Justice

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Gerald M. Caplan, *Director*

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

Richard W. Velde, *Administrator*

Paul K. Wormeli, *Deputy Administrator*

ABSTRACT

This study identified over 200 resident patrols in 16 urban areas. Such patrols involve situations in which residents themselves patrol or hire guards to patrol a residential area, maintaining some surveillance routine to the exclusion of other occupational activities. Some patrols cover neighborhood sections, with members driving cars and maintaining contact through citizen band radios. Other patrols cover specific buildings or projects, with members stationed at a building entrance and monitoring passage by strangers into and out of the building.

The field interviews and review of existing literature on patrols revealed that patrol activities are difficult to document and have not undergone formal evaluation. Nevertheless, the preliminary evidence suggested that resident patrols can serve as a potentially effective deterrent to residential crime, require small amounts of money to be operated, and generally enjoy good support from local police as well as other residents. Almost all of the resident patrols were oriented toward reducing residential crime rather than, as in the past, toward dealing with civil disorders. Although patrol members occasionally took to harassing residents and other dysfunctional behavior (especially in periods of boredom), little evidence was found that contemporary patrols engage in much vigilante-like behavior.

The study concludes by recommending further research, both evaluative and nonevaluative, regarding the patrols. For example, the legal status of patrol members and their legal liabilities for causing harm or inconvenience to other citizens are unknown. The study reaches no firm conclusion with respect to recommending LEAA or other federal support for patrols (which were generally not currently supported by public funds), but if such support is initiated, the study suggests several ways in which the support might be effectively provided.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

Disturbed by rising crime rates, many urban residents are actively seeking to help control crime in their communities. This study centers on one particular form of community crime prevention -- the resident patrol. It is one of four assessments of community crime prevention activities funded by the National Institute. The others are: Operation Identification, Premise Security Projects, and Crime Reporting. Taken together, they provide an overview of some of the more organized community responses to crime.

The researchers estimate that more than 800 resident patrols are currently active in a wide variety of neighborhoods. Most have been initiated since 1970. They often arise in response to a sudden spurt in local crime, and continue on an average for 4 to 5 1/2 years. Most are voluntary efforts, operating on low budgets independent of public funding.

The study identified four types of patrol: building, neighborhood, social service, and community protection. Of the four, building patrols appear to be effective in reducing crime and increasing a sense of security. In public housing projects they seem to act as a mediating force in encounters between residents and the police. Lack of data makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the other types of patrol, although there is evidence that neighborhood patrols perform valuable services.

Overall, those patrols with carefully selected and well-trained members, established administrative procedures, affiliations with community organizations, and positive contacts with local police are most likely to succeed.

These findings suggest that citizen patrols can be an economical way to help prevent crime in the community. A common concern about such groups -- the threat of vigilante activity -- is not borne out by this study. It appears only an occasional problem, one that can be minimized by careful planning and review of patrol operations.

Gerald M. Caplan

Gerald M. Caplan
Director
National Institute of Law
Enforcement and Criminal Justice

PREFACE

This is the executive summary of an exploratory study intended to identify and assess available information regarding resident patrols. The study was funded under the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice's Phase I National Evaluation Program. The full report, *Patrolling the Neighborhood Beat: Residents and Residential Security*, The Rand Corporation, R-1912-DOJ, Santa Monica, March 1976, contains the complete description of the relevant policy issues, assessment of available evidence, and research methods and field procedures that guided the study. A third volume, *Case Studies and Profiles*, The Rand Corporation, R-1912/2-DOJ, Santa Monica, March 1976, contains the products of our fieldwork, including brief profiles of more than 100 patrols and detailed narratives that describe 32 of the patrols. These volumes are also available through the U.S. Department of Justice's National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Appended to the end of this summary, for the reader's reference, is a bibliography of readings related to resident patrols.

A. RESIDENT PATROLS AND GUARDS

In the face of rising crime rates and a reduced sense of public safety during the 1960s and early 1970s, urban residents initiated a variety of crime prevention efforts. This exploratory study examines one citizen response--resident patrols and guards--and reviews the available evidence about them.

The range of functions performed by resident patrols varies considerably. In New York's wealthy Upper East Side, parents of private school students patrol streets to deter narcotics dealers and street gangs from harassing children on their way to and from school. Residents of Garfield Park in Chicago patrol the neighborhood on foot, check depots for loiterers and other signs of potential danger, and provide escort services. Not all groups, however, are committed to nonintervention, nor do all groups act cooperatively with the police. When municipal officials of Oakland, California, squelched civilian proposals to establish a community police review mechanism in 1966, black militants led by Huey Newton established the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense. The Black Panthers subsequently initiated patrols to observe the police, minimize acts of police brutality, inform citizens of their rights when interacting with the police, and protect the community from harm.

Definition of Patrols and Guards

For the purpose of this study, a resident patrol was defined in terms of four major characteristics. *First*, there had to be a specific patrol or surveillance routine. *Second*, the routine had to be safety-oriented, aimed at preventing criminal acts. *Third*, the patrol or guard activity had to be administered by a citizens' or residents' organization or a public housing authority. *Fourth*, the activity had to be directed primarily at residential rather than commercial areas. Even given these definitional criteria, the problems of identifying patrols in the field are complex. In the end, although the use of various definitional criteria can maximize consistency, there always remains the possibility that a new study could arrive at a slightly different universe.

Policy Issues

LEAA officials in the various State Planning Agencies were the main policymaking audience for this study. The study was intended to assist these officials in: advising local groups that undertake crime prevention activities, recommending potential guidelines for developing new state legislation, and deciding what types of patrol projects to support, if any. SPA officials in 11 states[1] were polled to identify the facets of resident patrols about which new information would be most helpful. Among the policy issues of greatest interest were the following questions, which guided our study:

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

Although every attempt was made to address these questions, it should be noted that this study was one of several conducted during Phase I of LEAA's National Evaluation Program, and the Phase I goal was only to provide an assessment of existing information but not to conduct a definitive evaluation of any patrol activities.

B. A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING PATROL ACTIVITIES

Typology of Patrols

A wide variety of resident patrols can fall within our definitional constraints. These include: a uniformed private police force;

[1] California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

an all-volunteer pedestrian patrol; an armed self-defense league; a volunteer automobile radio patrol; hired guards roving in marked autos; a youth escort service; elderly watchmen and gatekeepers at a retirement village; a public housing vertical patrol; and a public housing stationary patrol. To interpret the value of these patrol efforts it was necessary to partition the patrols into a few analytically useful groups. Such groups would help develop generalizations about the various patrol efforts.

Possible Criteria for a Typology. The ideal typology would be one classifying all patrols on the basis of some simple characteristic and allowing the clustering of patrols that have had the same experience. The clusters could then even be the basic groupings for designing an evaluation.

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

Types of Patrols. The main set of decisions related to patrol activities had to do with: (a) whether the police, in addition to potential criminals, are the object of patrol monitoring, (b) the type of area being patrolled, and (c) whether the patrol engages in other than crime prevention activities.

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

A second important aspect is the type of area being covered. Among the patrols that perform crime prevention activities only, *building patrols*[1] are organized mainly to protect residents of a specific building or group of buildings and usually operate as stationary guards or foot patrols. The universe of residents being protected by building patrols is easily identified, and the residents often form a tenant or homeowner association that directly represents the residents and supervises the patrol (the public housing authority can serve in this capacity as well). *Neighborhood patrols* cover a less well-defined group of residents and a much larger geographic area, and the patrols usually operate on foot or in automobiles. Further, whereas building patrols have little obvious need for coordination with the police (the local police are seldom concerned with the protection of specific buildings or private residential compounds), this is not the case with neighborhood patrols, where the activities of the patrol overlap, at least in theory, with those of the local police.

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

Patrol Evaluation

The main question of interest to a decisionmaker in considering any policy alternative is that of outcomes. Few policies, no matter how inexpensive to mount or feasible to implement, are likely to be supported unless their ability to achieve policy-relevant goals has been proven or convincingly argued. The few studies that have addressed

---

[1] This term will be used throughout to refer to patrols that cover a single building, a housing project, or a well-defined residential compound.

the issue of evaluation have suggested a variety of standards by which patrols might be assessed. From the numerous criteria mentioned, six outcomes were most frequently identified, and we decided to focus on them:

- o Crime reduction;[1]
- o Increased sense of security on the part of residents;
- o Improved police and community relations;
- o Improved police coverage;[2]
- o Absence of vigilantism;[3] and
- o Increased citizen participation.

Assessing Outcomes

Measurement of these outcomes requires a distinction among three sorts of measures--those that one would ideally like to use in an extensive and comprehensive study of resident patrols, those proxy measures that may be used but nevertheless still require data to be collected for a period of time, and reports about patrol activities made on the basis of one-shot interviews. Although our study relied mainly on the last type of information, the following discussion covers all three to indicate how more comprehensive studies might be conducted.

Crime Reduction. Ideally, the assessment of a patrol's crime preventive effort should be based on victimization data for a clearly defined area. Reported crime would not be a substitute for such victimization data, because the crime statistics reflect only crimes actually reported to the police. Even the direction of changes in

---

[1]Crime reduction is viewed as either a decrease in crime or a decline in the rate of increase. Further, crime reduction would be measured only in terms of those crimes that a patrol might affect, excluding, for example, fraud.

[2]Although police officers may be redeployed out of an area because of a resident patrol's activity, police response time when summoned could be improved due to the patrol's presence.

[3]Vigilantism is defined as patrol behavior that is illicit or violates civil liberties.

reported crimes is less than helpful. For example, improved police and community relations due to the patrol's efforts might augment the tendency of residents to report crime, thus producing an apparent increase in crime as a result of the patrol. In the same area, victimization data might simultaneously decline despite the apparent increase in reported crime.

In the absence of any victimization data, the crime preventive capacity of patrols might be reflected in (1) the number and types of incidents reported or intervened in by the patrols, or (2) the most serious incident handled by the patrol relative to the seriousness of incidents in the neighborhood. These data might be collected by a patrol over a period of time, or in the case of our study, merely reported on the basis of an interview by someone knowledgeable about the patrol. Such measures convey at least a rough indication of the level and seriousness of patrol activity in relation to crime reduction.

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

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

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

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

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

C. METHODS OF GATHERING EVIDENCE ABOUT PATROLS

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

The result of an exhaustive search for existing studies indicated that the first alternative was not feasible. There is little written information about resident patrols. Our study therefore uses data collected mainly from interviews with patrol personnel at 16 sites, supplemented by a few citations from the literature.

Fieldwork

Given the paucity of prior research, the main objective of the study was to locate various types of patrols throughout the country and to collect available evidence about them. This was done over a four-month period, July through October 1975, using the field procedures described below. Sixteen sites were studied and approximately 400 persons contacted.

For each patrol project studied, a personal or telephone interview was conducted with the individual responsible for coordinating the patrol, and basic descriptive information was obtained on an instrument called the *patrol profile*.[1]

---

[1]The patrol profile is a three-page, structured checklist covering such basic project information as patrol duties, hours, size of membership, funding, and goals. This instrument was used for all field and telephone interviews; 109 profiles were completed. A single-page summary of the key information collected on the patrol profiles is presented in Robert K. Yin et al., *Patrolling the Neighborhood Beat: Residents and Residential Security (Case Studies and Profiles)*, R-1912/2-DOJ, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, March 1976.

In addition, up to four detailed interviews were conducted at each geographic location, depending on the time available to the interviewer. These interviews were usually conducted in person with patrol coordinators, patrol members, and local police, and resulted in a complete, written *case study* about the project (covering more topics than were included in the profile) and a chart depicting the history of the project.[1]

Site Selection. Since resources did not permit us to identify all the patrols that exist in the United States, we conducted our fieldwork in a sample of sites. At each site an attempt was made to identify all patrols, and then a sample of them was selected for further study. The sites were chosen to represent different geographic regions of the United States and different types of urban areas. Among the urban areas that were candidates for selection were all areas whose central city belongs to at least one of the following groups:[2] (a) the 15 largest cities (according to 1970 population), (b) cities in which criminal victimization surveys have been conducted, and (c) LEAA Impact cities. The sites finally selected from the pool of candidate urban areas are listed below:

Northeast	*South Central*	*North Central*
New York	Houston	Chicago
Boston	Dallas	Detroit
Newark	New Orleans	Indianapolis
Worcester	Memphis	St. Louis

South Atlantic	*West*
Baltimore	Los Angeles
Washington, D.C.	San Diego
Norfolk	San Jose

For three sites (Dallas, Detroit, and Los Angeles), a suburban jurisdiction was chosen for study; for all the other sites, the central city was chosen.[3]

---

[1]The case studies covered a variety of topics which were identified for the interviewer by a list of key words rather than structured questions.

[2]These characteristics would be relevant for designing and conducting a subsequent national impact evaluation, if one were deemed desirable.

[3]Because of time limitations, the final fieldwork was unable to include Indianapolis or Memphis.

Identifying the Universe of Patrol Projects. At each site, the first step of the fieldwork consisted of contacting four organizations by telephone for information about local patrols and for referrals to other contacts who might be familiar with any patrol activity in the area:

- The chief executive's office (e.g., mayor's or county executive's office);
- The police department (e.g., community relations officers or crime prevention specialists at headquarters);
- The public housing authority (e.g., security director or director of tenant relations); and
- The local newspaper (e.g., crime reporter).[1]

In addition, an effort was made to elicit information about patrols from the coordinators and members of the patrols that were contacted for interviews. At the end of this process, a final list of known patrols was constructed; this list constituted the *universe* from which a random sample of patrols for patrol profiles and a selected sample for patrol case studies were taken.

Selection of Patrols for Detailed Case Studies. When patrol projects were identified in the course of the initial telephone conversations, an attempt was made to obtain sufficient demographic information so that certain patrols could be selected for detailed interviews.[2] The objective of these interviews was to provide complete information about at least one example of different kinds of projects.

For this purpose, projects were classified according to a two-dimensional scheme that reflected (a) the nature of the persons constituting the patrol (paid residents, volunteers, or hired guards) and

---

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

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

(b) the characteristics of the buildings or neighborhoods in which they were located. A project was chosen for a detailed interview if no project in a similar neighborhood had previously been selected for this purpose. Of course, in the first urban areas visited, this process was essentially random; but later the choices depended on what types of projects had already been covered.

In general, detailed interviews were conducted by pairs of fieldworkers.[1] An attempt was made to identify as many of the following respondents as possible for inclusion in the interviews:

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

At the conclusion of the fieldwork, narratives had been completed for 32 projects. Table 1 shows, for each site, the universe of all patrols identified, the random sample for which profiles were collected, and the selected sample for which case studies were collected.

Data Analysis

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

The data from the 109 profiles were used to answer several questions about patrol characteristics, including the age, size, cost, and

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

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF PATROLS BY SITE

Name of Site	Universe of Patrols Identified	Number of Patrol Profiles	Number of Patrol Case Studies
Baltimore	29	13	4
Boston	18	11	4
Brooklyn	48	14	3
Chicago	27	15	2
Dallas (suburb)	1	1	0
Detroit (suburb)	22	14	4
Houston	1	1	1
Los Angeles (suburb)	1	1	1
New Orleans	11	11	4
Newark	11	3	1
Norfolk	3	2	1
San Diego	5	3	1
San Jose	1	1	1
St. Louis	16	12	2
Washington, D.C.	32	7	4
Worcester	0	0	0
TOTAL	226	109	32

location of patrol projects. The 32 case studies and the existing studies were combined, but not quantitatively, to form the basis for our discussion of the four types of patrols (building, neighborhood, social service, and community protection) in terms of patrol outcomes and the factors that appear to affect those outcomes. The case studies and existing studies were also used to develop our findings on the implementation process.

Because of the exploratory nature of the study, we believe that this approach to data analysis was appropriate. In general, the findings and conclusions of our study are thus more of a hypothesis-generating than hypothesis-testing nature. Because so little has been known about resident patrols up to this time and because resources were not available to conduct a definitive evaluation of specific projects or a larger sample of them, we believe this approach to be more useful than any premature quantification of important issues (as might follow, for instance, from a content analysis of the case studies).

D. THE PATROL EXPERIENCE

Our poll of LEAA state planning officials, previously described, uncovered several common questions about resident patrols. We have tried to assess the available information about patrols in terms of these questions in the hope of making the analysis as useful as possible to SPA officials. Estimates for the first five of these questions were derived from the universe of patrols and the 109 project profiles. The last three questions, however, were difficult to deal with on a profile basis and therefore were based on the 32 narratives.

The Universe of Patrols

Through our field procedures, 226 patrols were identified in 16 urban areas. From these data, we derived an estimate of the number of currently active patrols at each site. In general, prosperous growth cities had few patrols; the same was true for Worcester, which was selected as an example of northern cities with a declining white population. To make rough estimates of the resident patrols in all urban areas of the United States, we extrapolated the findings for our sample of sites according to their representation of different types of urban areas.[1] The results of this and other methods of estimation indicated that *there are between 800 and 900 resident patrols currently operating in urban areas with over 250,000 people*. Our estimate is therefore substantially larger than has been suggested by any previous studies.

Patrol Characteristics

Life Expectancy of Patrols. For each patrol in our sample, we determined the year in which it began operations and, if defunct, the year it ended. It is possible to estimate the life expectancy of

---

[1]The classification of urban areas is based on E. Keeler and W. Rogers, *A Classification of Large American Urban Areas*, R-1246-NSF, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, May 1973. A full explanation of our use of this typology in estimating the universe of patrols can be found in our full report, Robert K. Yin et al., *Patrolling the Neighborhood Beat: Residents and Residential Security*, R-1912-DOJ, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, March 1976.

patrols on the basis of the current age of active patrols. Having plotted the patrol ages and examined the data under several different interpretations, we believe that *patrols last, on the average, 4 to 5-1/2 years, more than half cease to operate within 4 years, and fewer than 15 percent survive for more than 10 years.*

Patrol Origins. The patrols emerged from a wide variety of neighborhood conditions and as a result of a variety of needs. Patrols were initiated both because of serious crime problems in some neighborhoods and for preventive purposes in others. Generally, with the exception of public housing, building patrols tended to emerge for preventive purposes in relatively low crime areas, whereas neighborhood patrols more frequently emerged in areas that were experiencing a crime problem.

For all types of patrols, about half were located in racially-mixed[1] neighborhoods (see Table 2). In relation to the general income level of the neighborhood, about 55 percent of all patrols were found in low-income neighborhoods, 35 percent in middle-income neighborhoods, and 10 percent in high-income neighborhoods (see Table 3). Naturally, these findings may be biased by the sites that were selected, mainly large central cities, but a tentative conclusion from these two distributions is that *patrols can be found in neighborhoods of all major income levels and in both white and racially-mixed neighborhoods.*

Patrol Membership. Table 4 shows the distribution of patrols according to the nature of the patrol membership. Paid residents were concentrated mainly in racially-mixed, low-income neighborhoods; volunteers and hired guards were distributed throughout neighborhoods of all income levels and racial compositions. As might be expected, hired guards were more frequently found in high-income neighborhoods than in others. In addition, data showing whether patrol members were paid or volunteers exhibited striking variations by geographical region. Twelve of the 13 paid resident patrols were found in the South Atlantic region, and all patrols in the South Central states were hired guards.

---

[1] Inclusion in this category indicates an estimate that at least one-third of the residents are black; some of these neighborhoods were of course predominantly black.

Table 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEIGHBORHOODS WITH PATROLS

Neighborhood Characteristic	Percent of Patrols in Study Sites	
Racially mixed[a]		
Public housing	23	
All other	28	
Subtotal		51
White		
Public housing	12	
All other	24	
Subtotal		36
Ethnically mixed[b]		10
Combined[c]		3
TOTAL		100

[a]At least one-third of the residents were estimated to be black (some neighborhoods were predominantly black).

[b]At least one-third of the residents were estimated to be members of a white ethnic group.

[c]Inclusion in this category indicates an estimate that two or more distinct minority groups were present.

Type of Patrol. We found no active community protection patrols, and of the active patrols we estimate that about 27 percent are neighborhood patrols with the rest divided evenly between building and social service patrols. The relative frequency for these three categories also varied substantially by geographical region. Social service patrols were most common in the South Atlantic area, and building (more particularly, public housing) patrols were most common in the Northeast. No active social service patrols were found in the South Central region.

Cost and Organizational Affiliation. The average annual costs of patrol operations are difficult to estimate. We asked each respondent to estimate the annual costs (excluding major capital expenditures),

Table 3

INCOME LEVEL OF NEIGHBORHOODS WITH PATROLS

Neighborhood Characteristic	Percent Distribution of Patrols Among Income Levels			
	Median Annual Income of Neighborhood			
	Low < $10,000	Middle $10,000-20,000	High > $20,000	Total
Racially mixed	67	33	0	100
Public housing	100	0	0	100
All other	41	59	0	100
White	44	31	25	100
Public housing	100	0	0	100
All other	15	47	38	100
Ethnically mixed	22	61	17	100
All patrols[a]	54	35	11	100

[a]The total excludes patrols in neighborhoods described as "combined" (see Table 2).

Table 4

NATURE OF PATROL MEMBERSHIP

Membership	Percent of Active Patrols in Study Sites
Volunteers	63
Hired Guards	18
Paid Residents	7
Mixed	12
TOTAL	100

and in a few cases the respondent had records that could corroborate the estimate. For the most part, the estimates we used should be

considered rough ones. The cost estimates suggest a bimodal distribution--many patrols incur few costs (less than $1,000 per year), but other patrols may be quite expensive (more than $10,000 per year). As might be expected, the most expensive patrols included a preponderance of hired residents or guards. About half of the patrols were part of some neighborhood association; patrols without organizational affiliation were usually those with low costs.

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

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

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

Patrol Outcomes

The remaining questions posed by the SPA officials deal with more complex facets of the patrol experiences, including the outcomes of the patrol efforts. We have chosen to deal with these issues by

relying on the information from: (1) the 32 patrols that were interviewed more intensively and (2) existing evaluation reports. The discussion is organized according to the four categories of patrols--*building*, *neighborhood*, *social service*, and *community protection*.

Building Patrols. Building patrols are distinguished by the fact that the protection of specific buildings or compounds is usually the main focus of patrol activity. The buildings may vary from high-income dwellings to public housing projects for the elderly to detached homes whose only access is from a private road. The patrol may operate only within a building, or the patrol may have a car to cover the grounds surrounding a building complex.

Whatever the physical setting, building patrols are a distinctive type of resident patrol for several reasons. First, the patrols operate in an area over which local police activity is minimal. The local police are seldom concerned with the protection of specific buildings, and this means that a building patrol may be expected to have little field contact, if any, with the police. Second, the building patrol is generally supervised by an official organization that in some way represents the tenants of the buildings being protected. In one case, a housing authority had organized over 800 volunteers to serve over 20 high-rise projects.

Third, the main duties of the patrol are related to the goal of deterring crime and keeping unwanted strangers out of the building or compound. Surveillance is often made easier by the existence of fences and other natural barriers separating the building from the surrounding community. Thus, the patrol routine typically involves stationing a guard at a building entrance or gate to sign in and check the credentials of visitors and to watch for suspicious activities, often with the aid of television monitors and other electronic aids. Fourth, except for public housing projects, the patrol members are usually paid guards selected from among residents or furnished on a contractual basis by a private security firm.

These four distinctive features of building patrols appear to provide some tentative explanations for the outcomes reported in our project narratives. First, despite the paucity of supporting evidence, we

believe that building patrols may reduce crime (or prevent its rise) and increase residents' sense of security in their homes or apartments. The small, enclosed areas protected by building patrols may facilitate the effective screening and identification of intruders or potential troublemakers. Further, although previous research includes no extensive survey research or behavioral observations, anecdotal evidence suggests that residents feel safer in the presence of visible building patrols even though there may not have been a serious crime problem prior to the patrol's inception. Public housing raises a few exceptions dealt with below.

Second, building patrols are the subject of few complaints or reports of vigilante activity. The fact that building patrols frequently are sponsored by organizations representing the residents being protected legitimizes these patrols in carrying out their work. Virtually all complaints regarding these patrols were minor, and paid guards who performed poorly were replaced.

Third, changes in police coverage and police-community relations did not generally ensue from building patrol activity. Because these patrols operate in areas in which the police generally do not patrol, there is little contact between building patrols and police and little effect on police coverage.

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

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

Beyond these general characteristics, neighborhood patrols can take a wide variety of forms. The patrols may operate on foot or in cars. The patrol may cover certain areas in relation to such activities as children walking to and from school, or the patrol may watch the streets from a strategic vantage point inside an apartment. Most neighborhood patrols, however, cover their beat in automobiles. The car may be marked or unmarked, manned by a volunteer or a private security guard, and follow a regular or irregular routine. In most cases, when the patrol observes a suspicious incident, it radios the observation to a base station or to the police. In some cases, an armed patrol will itself intervene. In one case, the patrol covered a small area; on observing a suspicious incident, the patrol would blow a whistle to call the police.

These characteristics of neighborhood patrols both distinguish them from building patrols and establish constraints on any evaluation of them. The following tentative statements may be made about the outcomes of this type of patrol.

First, it is unclear to what extent neighborhood patrols reduce crime or increase residents' sense of security. In the absence of previous surveys, anecdotal evidence suggests that patrols do report numerous crime incidents to the police, ranging from assaults and robberies to juvenile pranks. The patrols, however, because they rarely receive feedback from the police about the disposition of the incident, are often uncertain about the outcome. The anecdotal reports suggested, regarding residents' sense of security, that neighborhood patrols occasionally generate more unease than do building patrols, apparently because residents are uncertain about what the patrol activities entail and whether they are legitimate and in the best interests of the neighborhood.

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

Third, more serious complaints were raised regarding vigilante-like behavior on the part of neighborhood patrols than on the part of building patrols. Among the factors frequently associated with vigilante behavior were: recruitment from among friendship groups and operation of voluntary patrols in low crime areas. In the latter case, members tended to grow bored and to seek interesting although sometimes illicit activities.

Social Service Patrols. Social service patrols may be organized around a variety of community responsibilities, among which patrolling is only one. The patrol may, for instance, operate an ambulance service, perform civil defense functions, such as giving assistance during a tornado, or be formally involved in other community projects, such as beautification and clean-up, youth placement, family counseling, food co-ops, and collective gardens. In addition, the patrol may be organized to provide employment opportunities for youths as much as to perform crime prevention functions. There may be a purposeful

attempt, in other words, to recruit as patrol members youths who are suspected of causing some of the neighborhood's crime problems.

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

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

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

Second, evidence concerning patrol effects on police coverage and police-community relations was again inaccessible. Although the fieldwork revealed a complex dynamic of police-community relations, the main

possibility appeared to be that, perhaps because of the greater visibility of the social service patrols, both positive and negative outcomes may have been more extreme than in the case of other patrols.

Third, the fieldwork suggested some vigilante-like behavior distinctive to social service patrols. Where such patrols had recruited from among the youth factions in the neighborhood, the patrol experience had the potential to become just one more occasion for strife among the factions.

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

The emergence of community protection groups has mainly been associated with the civil rights movement and urban riots during the 1960s. In particular, several black patrols were formed in Southern cities, often in response to urban disorders, to protect themselves and other black residents from recriminations from the white community. Our fieldwork, however, uncovered no active community protection groups at the sites contacted, although such groups may well exist among black as well as other inner-city residents. We believe it unwise to discuss community protection groups because of the limited evidence. For future research, special efforts would have to be made to locate such groups, as few would easily admit to such activities.

Implementation

The implementation of a resident patrol must be analyzed for two reasons. First, implementation factors determine in large measure what outcomes can be expected.[1] Second, an understanding of the implementation

---

[1]Although this may seem to be an obvious point, it has nevertheless been overlooked in a recent study of Project Identification which assessed the program in terms of the observed outcomes and concluded that Project Identification had failed (see Nelson B. Heller et al.,

process can help policymakers to decide how and when to help resident patrols if it is decided that assistance is appropriate. The issues considered are the organizational characteristics of the patrol (i.e., factors distinguishing one patrol from another at the same point in time) and organizational change (i.e., factors distinguishing the same patrol at two different points in time). In all cases, our evidence stems from the narratives or other case studies and our comments can be considered suggestive rather than conclusive.

Organizational Structure and Activities. Several organizational features seem to influence the capacity of a patrol to operate effectively and to achieve its goals. The most important of these features appear to be: patrol personnel, the organizational affiliation of the patrol, bureaucratization of patrol administration, and the patrol's relation to the local police.

Perhaps most central to a patrol's operations is its *personnel structure*. Membership size is the primary constraint on the level of coverage that a patrol can provide: A patrol that overburdens its members may face attrition, while a patrol that underutilizes its members may bore them and induce dysfunctional behavior. One important way in which patrols maintain their membership is by employing stringent selection procedures and providing members with intensive training--both features appear to increase members' commitment to patrol activity. Where no stable institutional leadership is operative, an individual, hard-working, strong leader appears to be a prerequisite to effective patrol operation.

Second, patrols that maintain an *affiliation with community organizations* tend to operate well to achieve their goals. Such affiliations appear to legitimize the patrol, to enhance patrol accountability to the residents, and to facilitate patrol access to community resources and new members.

Operation Identification Projects, The Institute of Public Program Analysis, St. Louis, August 1975). The study failed to make the distinction between conceptual failure and implementation failure.

Third, *bureaucratization* is a determinant of a patrol's ability to mount and sustain its operation. Bureaucratization, which may involve a paid administrator, maintenance of logs, prearranged scheduling, and systematic supervision of members in the field, generally appears to stabilize a patrol and enhance its productivity.

Positive contact between the patrol and the local police is a final factor that seems to enhance patrol operations. This contact may be in the field or at the administrative level and need not involve police control of the patrol unit. Beyond this, the dynamics of police-patrol relations are quite complex and a topic in need of further study.

Organizational Change. Many patrols face a major problem when the crime problem that the patrol was initially established to combat appears to have abated. The lack of a pressing objective may lead to boredom on the part of members. Virtually all patrols respond to this problem by operating at a reduced level of activity. Alternatively, patrols may also attempt to resist membership declines by expanding the types of activities that they undertake. Patrols may differentiate by expanding into other emergency-safety activities or even into social activities that are rewarding to members. Some groups undergo a complete metamorphosis and change the focus of their activities entirely.

The main lesson is that organizational changes reflect a patrol's response to changes in the local crime problem. Many of the voluntary groups began as a result of serious crime problems, and once the problems have been eliminated or appear to be alleviated, the patrol activity is difficult to maintain. The available evidence suggests that this period in patrol history is conducive to vigilante-like behavior by members and one when resident patrols should be encouraged to become dormant, terminate, or turn their entire attention to other activities. This scenario argues that if public financial support of patrols is deemed appropriate, the *timing* of such support is very important, for if funding is to be used for patrol purposes only, the funding should occur during crisis periods when citizens are easily mobilized. If funding occurs after the crime problem is perceived to have waned, the funds should provide flexibility for developing other than crime prevention activities where relevant.

E. FURTHER RESEARCH ON PATROLS

Evaluation Research

Building Patrols. The major issues and problems in conducting a national evaluation of resident patrols include the standard ones of research design and measurement, compounded by one factor unique to patrols: Because patrols are a citizen-initiated activity, it is difficult to plan experimental sites, one of which would have a patrol but the other of which would not. An analysis of evaluation problems nevertheless suggests that a national evaluation of building patrols, but not of other types of existing patrols, would be feasible at this time. Such an evaluation would be based on a post-treatment design and might prove extremely useful because building patrols, if proven effective, have the following advantages:

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

The evaluation of building patrols would require selecting a substantial number of existing patrols for study (the exact number would depend on the characteristics of patrols deemed worthy of study). For each patrol, one or more comparison sites would have to be selected on a post-hoc basis. For each site, there would have to be crime data covering at least a year's period of time. The data would be based on police records and victimization surveys of residents, with the surveys including questions related to both crime incidents and attitudes. The analysis would proceed by statistical comparisons between experimental

and comparison sites, with crimes aggregated into groups having numbers of incidents large enough so that meaningful statistical tests could be performed.

Externally Initiated Patrols. A second type of national evaluation could be conducted by using a classical controlled, pre- and post-treatment design. In this case, a new type of patrol would be initiated by external agencies and not residents. For example, a classical evaluation could be conducted if LEAA or a public housing authority wished to fund patrols and required that the grantees not begin operations until baseline data had been collected. The results of such an evaluation could not be statistically generalized to citizen-initiated patrols, but only to those that wished funding from external agencies and that were willing to abide by the specified conditions. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that such patrols might not differ substantially from citizen-initiated patrols and might thus be of considerable policy interest.

Other Research

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

Conditions of Patrol Emergence. The first question deals with the circumstances under which resident patrols emerge. It may well be that variations in the incidence of crime from place to place can account for the formation of patrols. Further research on emergence will involve determining the patrol population of several cities and collecting crime data specific to the neighborhoods where patrols operate. The level of police activity in such neighborhoods might also be an important factor that fosters or impedes the development of patrols and is one that should be examined.

Legal Status of Patrols. A second important prelude to any further policy initiatives concerning resident patrols is the investigation of legal issues bearing on both the authority and the potential liability of patrol members. The issues are important not only for the patrol members but also for organizations that might either employ

patrols or support patrols through financial contributions. The issues include:

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

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

Social Service Patrols. A final issue raised by the current study of resident patrols is the usefulness of a strategy employed by some social service patrols--that of recruiting or hiring as patrol members neighborhood residents who have themselves been perpetrators of crime.

Although the available evidence did little to shed light on the payoffs or problems associated with this approach, the strategy might raise such difficulties as conflicting loyalties on the part of the rehabilitated patrol members, attempts by the patrol members to extort money or favors from their former cronies, or the harassing of patrol members by their erstwhile peers on the street. Any further study of this topic should also attempt to assess the effect of participating in a patrol on the criminal careers of those recruited. Such an assessment would involve comparison of the criminal histories of delinquents or adult offenders before, during, and subsequent to their patrol participation.

F. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

This study, although it attempted only a preliminary assessment of existing information on patrols, provided the following previously unreported findings about patrols.

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

Second, *there appear to be numerous patrols across the country, in neighborhoods of varied income and racial composition.* Our fieldwork alone turned up 226 patrols at 16 sites. Based on the universe of patrols identified, it was estimated that more than 800 resident patrols are currently active in urban areas in the United States.

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

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

Fifth, *contemporary resident patrols appear to be only occasionally susceptible to vigilantism*, and not as frequently as the mass media would suggest.[1] Our evidence suggests that neighborhood patrols seemed more inclined to vigilantism than building patrols, particularly when members were recruited from a friendship group (e.g., a citizen-band radio group) or on the basis of social compatibility with other patrol members. In such cases, the patrol, often representing a splinter group within the community, was the subject of a greater number of residents' complaints than other patrols. Vigilantism may also emerge when patrol and surveillance becomes especially dull; neighborhood patrol members may engage in novel but dysfunctional ventures (e.g., harassment of teenagers, chasing speeders, etc.).

Sixth, *public housing patrols differ slightly to the extent that the crime problem may be partly attributable to perpetrators from among the residents themselves.* In this situation, monitoring the access of outside intruders may have to be supplemented by other crime prevention strategies if crime is to be effectively abated. In addition,

---

[1] For example, see "Vigilantes: Fair Means or Foul," *Time*, Vol. 105, June 30, 1975, p. 13.

public housing patrols sometimes affect police-community relations and police coverage, especially where the relation has been strained prior to the patrol's existence. By mediating encounters between police and residents, patrols in several cases appear to have eased police-community relations, with the consequence that the police encounter less harassment and respond more readily to calls from the project.

Finally, *several implementation factors influence a patrol's ability to operate and to achieve its goals:* personnel, organizational affiliation, and bureaucratization. Those patrols appear to operate best whose personnel are matched to the level of coverage the patrol seeks to provide. Patrols that maintain neighborhood organizational affiliations also tend to operate more effectively. Bureaucratization, involving a paid administrator, maintenance of records, prearranged scheduling, and quality control of members' behavior in the field, is a third implementation factor that seems to enhance a patrol's ability to operate effectively.

Recommendations

Further Research. The evidence gathered indicates that a national evaluation of building patrols, but not other existing types, is feasible. We therefore recommend that LEAA consider initiating such an evaluation. However, the type of study to be undertaken would be constrained in several ways. By its very nature, any social program initiated under circumstances beyond the control of an evaluator is not amenable to evaluation using rigorous, controlled pre- and posttreatment evaluation designs. A feasible evaluation design for some existing citizen-initiated patrols would be a "matched" posttreatment framework.

A new type of patrol could be evaluated with the classical, controlled, pre- and posttreatment design. This would be a patrol initiated by an external group such as a granting agency, and not simply resident-initiated. The patrol could be a new building patrol and could be evaluated by the classical design because experimental and control sites could be deliberately selected beforehand and because baseline data could also be collected. We recommend that LEAA consider funding such patrols, at least for evaluation purposes.

In addition to evaluation, our exploratory study also suggests four topics for further research. For example, little is known about the conditions under which resident patrols emerge, and neither previous research nor the present study has focused on that question. A second issue is that of the legal authority and potential liability accruing to patrol members, with a related concern being the legal position of those who employ patrols or support them with financial or in-kind contributions.

Third, resident patrols, along with numerous other crime prevention efforts, are being undertaken by citizens and police across the country. In some communities, these projects operate independently of each other with little communication or coordination. In other neighborhoods, an organization has occasionally adopted the role of integrator and fulfilled for neighborhood safety a coordinating function similar to that of a PTA in education. Information as to what organizational arrangements optimize the effective operation of these crime prevention activities seems a major but as yet unanswered question.

The fourth and last issue raised by this study concerns the value of efforts by some patrols to recruit or hire as members former delinquents or offenders among neighborhood residents with the hope of rehabilitating them. The use of this strategy may lead to the successful reintegration into society of such persons, but it may also produce conflicting loyalties on the part of the newly recruited patrol members, as well as harassment of those members by their former cronies. The costs and benefits of the high-risk approach therefore seems a useful avenue of inquiry.

Governmental Support of Patrols. Our study does not provide a basis for recommending whether or not there should be governmental support of patrol activities. Such a decision would have to be based mainly on political and social priorities. However, our study does suggest that if there is to be government support, such support might be most effectively made under certain conditions.

Whatever type of patrol is supported, it should be encouraged to report incidents but, because of the legal penalties that may be involved and the dysfunctions that may result, not to intervene in such

incidents unless the patrol members are professional guards. Neighborhood and social service patrols (but not necessarily building patrols) should be urged to plan their activities with the local police, and the police should provide all types of patrols with systematic feedback on the disposition of any incident reported by a patrol.

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

When financial support is provided, a major problem seems to be that of timing. Patrols often emerge in response to a rash of incidents that impels members to pay their own expenses. By the time a group applies for funding, the problem may have subsided, resident interest may have waned, and the patrol may have begun to outlive its usefulness. Patrol activity may become uneventful and dull, and vigilantism is more likely to occur at this time. It is therefore extremely important that public funds, if made available, be readily awarded and disbursed while crime is at a crisis level. When crime subsides or the crime problem is perceived by residents to be within the range of acceptable levels, governmental support might be used to encourage the group to undertake new activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Gerald, and Edward Lehmann, *Crimes and Crime Prevention: A Bibliography with Abstracts*, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia, May 1975 (NTIS PS-75/425).

"Addicts Victims Turn Vigilante," *The New York Times*, September 23, 1969, pp. 1, 34.

Albright, Ellen, et al., *Criminal Justice Research: Evaluation in Criminal Justice Programs--Guidelines and Examples*, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., June 1973.

Anderson, William A., et al., "Urban Counterrioters," *Society*, Vol. 11, March/April 1974, pp. 50-55.

"Arboreal Vandals in Queens," *The New York Times*, July 7, 1969, p. 32.

Arnold, Remmie L., Jr., "People Against Crime, Inc.: Origin-Operation-Results," Petersburg, Virginia, January 1974.

Becker, Theodore M., "The Place of Private Police in Society: An Area of Research for the Social Sciences," *Social Problems*, Vol. 21, 1974, pp. 438-455.

Bickman, Leonard, *Towards Increasing Citizen Responsibility: Surveillance and the Reporting of Crimes*, Applied Social Psychology Program, Loyola University, Chicago, in progress.

Bingham, Hon. Jonathan B., "Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act," *Congressional Record*, U.S. House of Representatives, Vol. 122, 94th Congress, Second Session, April 9, 1976, pp. H3208-H3209.

Bird, David, "Trees in a Queens Park Cut Down as Vigilantes Harass Homos," *The New York Times*, July 2, 1969, pp. 1, 29.

Black, Jonathan, "Block Power--The Jane Street Story," *The New York Times Magazine*, May 7, 1972, pp. 36, 38-40, 42, 44-45.

"Boston: Marshals of Southie," *Newsweek*, May 24, 1976, p. 30.

Bridges, John E., "Security System 'By' the Residents, 'For' the Residents Under Way in Public Housing in Kansas City, Missouri," *Journal of Housing*, Vol. 6, June 1973, pp. 293-296.

Brill, William H., "Measuring Residential Security," *HUD Challenge*, Vol. 5, November 1974, pp. 30-31.

Brown, Richard M., "The American Vigilante Tradition," in National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, *Violence in America, Volume I,* Washington, D.C., 1969, pp. 121-180.

"Cairo, Ill., Boy Shot; Vigilantes Accused," *The New York Times,* September 18, 1969, p. 95.

Calvin College, Sociology Department--Research Center, *An Evaluation of the Wealthy-Ethel-Franklin-Fuller (WEFF) Neighborhood Steward Program,* Grand Rapids, Michigan, March 1972.

Campbell, Donald T., "Reforms as Experiments," *American Psychologist,* Vol. 24, 1969, pp. 409-429.

-----, and Julian C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research,* Rand McNally, Chicago, 1966.

Carman, John et al., *Housing Authority Security Patrol-Evaluation Report,* Model Cities Program, Hartford, Connecticut, October 1972.

Center for Residential Security Design, *A Design Guide for Improving Residential Security,* prepared for the Office of Policy Development and Research, Division of Building Technology, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., December 1973.

Chaiken, Jan M., et al., *The Impact of Police Activity on Crime,* The Rand Corporation, R-1424-NYC, Santa Monica, January 1974.

Cizanckas, Victor I., "R_x for Vandalism: Junior Housing Inspectors," *Nation's Cities,* Vol. 12, March 1974, pp. 16-18.

Claiborne, William L., "New Yorkers Fight Back: The Tilt Toward Vigilantism," *New York,* Vol. 6, October 15, 1973, pp. 49-53.

Clancy, Daniel T., *Final Evaluation of the Guide Program for Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority,* The Law-Medicine Center, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, 1972.

Cochran, W. G., "The Planning of Observational Studies of Human Populations," *The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* Series A, Vol. 128, 1965, pp. 234-265.

Comptroller General of the United States, "Difficulties of Assessing Results of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Projects to Reduce Crime," Washington, D.C., March 1974.

Etzioni, Amitai, *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations,* Free Press, New York, 1961.

Fairley, William, and Michael Liechenstein, *Improving Public Safety in Urban Apartment Dwellings: Security Concepts and Experimental Design for New York Housing Authority Buildings,* The New York City-Rand Institute, R-655-NYC, June 1971.

"Fortress California," *Time*, Vol. 103, May 1, 1972, p. 84.

Fowler, Glenn, "Parents to Patrol Streets in the Central Park Area," *The New York Times*, August 16, 1974, p. 33.

Geniesse, Jane, "Blockwork Orange," *New York*, Vol. 6, October 15, 1973, p. 56.

Graham, Hugh Davis, and Ted Robert Gurr, *Volence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, Vol. 1*, A Staff Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, Washington, D.C., June 1969.

Granville, Samuel, "New York's Experiment in Tenant Safety," *HUD Challenge*, Vol. 5, September 1974, pp. 22-25.

Harville, David A., "Experimental Randomization: Who Needs It?" *American Statistics*, Vol. 29, 1975, pp. 27-31.

Hebert, Richard, "Is Everybody in Washington Scared?" *Washingtonian Magazine*, Vol. 7, April 1972, pp. 54-57, 96-98.

Heidt, Sarajane, and Amitai Etzioni, *Community Crime Control: An Exploratory Study*, unpublished manuscript, Center for Policy Research, New York, December 1973.

Heller, Nelson B., et al., *Operation Identification Projects: Assessment of Effectiveness*, The Institute of Public Program Analysis, St. Louis, August 1975.

Janson, Donald, "New Chief in Cairo, Ill.," *The New York Times*, June 17, 1969, p. 28.

Johnston, Marcia Slater, "Citizens Patrols: Just Folks Fighting Crime," *Chicago*, Vol. 24, September 1975, pp. 133-139, 202.

"The Juniper Gardens Project: A Study in Community Crime Control," Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, National Institute of Mental Health, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Kakalik, James S., and Sorrel Wildhorn, *Private Police in the United States: Findings and Recommendations*, Vol. 1, The Rand Corporation, R-869/DOJ, Santa Monica, December 1971.

Kalish, C. B, *Crime and Victims: A Report on the Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization*, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Keeler, E., and W. Rogers, *A Classification of Large American Urban Areas*, The Rand Corporation, R-1246-NSF, May 1973.

Kelling, George L., et al., *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment*, Police Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1975.

King, Seth S., "Cairo, Ill., is Quiet as Guard Patrols," *The New York Times*, May 1, 1969, p. 30.

-----, "In Cairo, Ill., Racial Tensions Remain High After Week of Shooting and Arson," *The New York Times*, October 27, 1970, p. 27.

Kleinrock, Leonard, *Queueing Systems, Volume I: Theory*, John Wiley, New York, 1975.

Knopf, Terry Ann, *Youth Patrols: An Experiment in Community Participation*, The Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1969.

"The Lavender Panthers," *The New York Times Magazine*, October 8, 1973, p. 73.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration,"Volunteers in Law Enforcement Programs, Staff Study, Washington, D.C., October 1972, (NTIS PB-214 529).

"Legal Controls on Neighborhood Defense Organizations," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 120, May 1972, pp. 952-982.

Liechenstein, Michael I., "Reducing Crime in Apartment Dwellings: A Methodology for Comparing Security Alternatives," The New York City-Rand Institute, P-4656, June 1971.

Lipstein, Daniel J., "Loch Raven Radio Watch Evaluation," Office of the Mayor, Baltimore, January 1975.

"Living with Crime, U.S.A.," *Newsweek*, Vol. 83, December 18, 1972, pp. 31-34, 36.

Maltz, Michael D., "Crime Statistics: A Mathematical Perspective," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 3, 1975, pp. 177-194.

-----, *Evaluation of Crime Control Programs*, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., 1972.

-----, "Measures of Effectiveness for Crime Reduction Programs," *Operations Research*, Vol. 23, May/June 1975, pp. 452-474.

Marx, Gary T., and Dane Archer, "Citizen Involvement in the Law Enforcement Process: The Case of Community Police Patrols," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 15, September-October 1971, pp. 52-72.

-----, and Dane Archer, *Community Police: An Exploratory Inquiry*, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Massachusetts, June 1972 (NTIS PB-220 332).

-----, and Dane Archer, "The Urban Vigilante," *Psychology Today*, Vol. 6, January 1973, pp. 45-50.

Mattick, Hans W., and Broderick E. Reischl, "Some Problems in the Evaluation of Criminal Justice Programs," Center for Research in Criminal Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago, 1975.

"More and More Vigilantes--Legal and Illegal," *U.S. News and World Report*, Vol. 78, February 4, 1974, pp. 40-42.

Nash, George, et al., *The Community Patrol Corps: A Descriptive Evaluation of the One-Week Experiment*, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, May 1968.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Call for Citizen Action: Crime Prevention and the Citizen*, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C., December 1974 (NTIS PB-238 863).

National Crime Survey: Basic Screen Questionnaire and Crime Incident Report, Forms NCS-1 through NCS-4, U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., 1974.

"Neighborhood Patrols and the Law: Citizens' Response to Urban Crime," *Fordham Law Review*, Vol. 41, May 1973, pp. 973-990.

New York City Police Department, Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Community Affairs, "The Civilian Patrol Program," June 1972.

Office of Youth Opportunity Services, District of Columbia Government, *The Washington, D.C. Youth Courtesy Patrol.*

Piro, Neil S., "Jersey City's Experiment in Tenant Safety," *HUD Challenge*, Vol. 5, May 1974, pp. 16-18.

"Police Protection and Public Housing," *Connecticut Law Review*, Vol. 3, Winter 1970-1971, pp. 316-334.

Ponting, J. Rick, "Rumor Control Centers: Their Emergence and Operations," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 16, January-February 1973, pp. 391-401.

"Queens Block Associations Press Patrol Plan," *The New York Times*, May 18, 1975, p. 47.

Reppetto, Thomas A., *Residential Crime*, Ballinger Publishing Co., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1974.

Rosenhouse, Leo, "San Francisco Gives Birth to Vigilante Justice," *California Highway Patrolman*, Vol. 32, January 1970, pp. 10-12.

Ross, Murray G., *Community Organization: Theory, Principles, and Practice*, Harper and Row, New York, 1967.

Russell, Dick, "What Citizens Are Doing to Fight Crime," *Parade*, June 22, 1975, p. 8-10.

Sagalyn, Arnold, et al., *Residential Security*, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., December 1973.

Scarr, Harry A., *Criminal Justice Research: Patterns of Burglary*, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., June 1973.

Schumach, Murray, "City-Backed Private Drive on Midtown Crime Opens," *The New York Times*, December 22, 1972, pp. 1, 36.

Shephard, Jack, "A West Side Report," *New York*, Vol. 6, October 15, 1973, pp. 58, 63.

Suchman, Edward A., *Evaluative Research*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1967.

Survey of Victims of Crime, For QHS-771, U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., 1971.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce, *Marshaling Citizen Power Against Crime*, Washington, D.C., 1970.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Residential Security," *HUD Challenge*, Vol. 4, September 1973, pp. 2-27.

U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, *Deterrence of Crime In and Around Residences*, Washington, D.C., June 1973.

"Vigilantes: Fair Means or Foul," *Time*, Vol. 105, June 30, 1975, p. 13.

"War on Crime by Fed-Up Citizens," *U.S. News and World Report*, Vol. 79, September 29, 1975, pp. 19-22.

Washnis, George J., *Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention*, Center for Governmental Studies, Washington, D.C., in press.

White, Thomas, et al., "Police Department Programs for Burglary Prevention," unpublished manuscript, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Wilson, James Q., "If Every Criminal Knew He Would Be Punished if Caught . . .," *The New York Times Magazine*, January 28, 1973.

Yin, Robert K., and Douglas Yates, *Street-Level Governments: Assessing Decentralization and Urban Services*, D.C. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1975.

☆US. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1977 O—241-03 (2113)