

**Brisson, D. and S. Roll (2012). "The Effect of Neighborhood on Crime and Safety: A Review of the Evidence." *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work* 9(4): 333-**

- In this article the authors present findings from a systematic, integrative review of neighborhood effects specifically for crime and safety.
- Thirty-seven research studies using random samples from urban, U.S. areas between 2002 and 2008 are reviewed.
- Findings suggest socio-demographic characteristics of neighborhoods and neighborhood processes are both predictive of crime and safety.
- Further, some neighborhood conditions may affect crime and safety in unexpected ways.

**Maxwell, C. D., J. H. Garner, et al. (2011). *Collective Efficacy and Criminal Behavior in Chicago, 1995-2004*: 147. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/884408696?accountid=26333><sup>1</sup>**

- This study reproduces and extends the analyses about the neighborhood-level effects of collective efficacy on criminal behavior originally reported by Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls in a 1997 Science article entitled Neighborhood and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy.
- Based on a 1995 citywide community survey of 8,782 residents in 343 neighborhood clusters conducted as part of the NIJ-sponsored Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods, it was reported that collective efficacy directly affects perceived neighborhood violence, household victimization, and official homicide rates (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls, 1997).
- Also reported was that collective efficacy moderates the relationship of residential stability and disadvantage with each measure of violence.
- This study uses Earls, Brooks-Gunn, Raudenbush, and Sampson's (Earls et al., 1997) archived community survey database, archived U.S. Census summary data (United States Department of Commerce, 1993) and Block and Block's (2005) archived Homicides in Chicago, 1965-1995 study to assess the extent to which Sampson, et al.'s (1997) reported results can be reproduced by using measures and statistical methods specified by Sampson, et al. (1997) and Morenoff, et al. (2001).
- The authors then extend the analyses conducted by Sampson, et al. (1997) by adding ten additional years of more detailed crime data in statistical models that address temporal and spatial correlation and multi-collinearity.
- The findings reproduced the direction and statistical significance of all the key theoretical results reported by Sampson, et al. (1997).
- In addition, an extension of their analyses finds a direct connection between collective efficacy and rates of homicide and rape from 1995 through 2004.
- However, the authors did not find that collective efficacy was negatively related to officially recorded measures of robbery and assaults in 1995, nor was collective efficacy related to most property crimes during any period covered by the study.
- These latter findings suggest some of the limits to the influence of collective efficacy on crime.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/235154.pdf>

**Cancino, J. M. (2005). "The utility of social capital and collective efficacy: Social control policy in nonmetropolitan settings." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 16(3): 287-318**

- This article provides a review of major findings from two recent nonmetropolitan studies using survey data from 1,125 citizens nested in 31 nonmetropolitan residential units (RUs) located in the state of Michigan.
- The results provide empirical evidence that the differential ability of nonmetropolitan Michigan residents to realize mutual trust and solidarity (i.e., social cohesion) is a major source of RU variation in citizens' perceived incivility and burglary.
- Toward this end, several policy recommendations are endorsed in nonmetropolitan communities, whereby resources of social capital can help facilitate collective efficacy for the purpose of social control and improvement of citizen quality of life.
- Using a social capital framework is likely to benefit rural researchers and policy makers alike.

**Hawdon, J. E. (2005). "Social Networks, Social Capital, Collective Efficacy and Crime: Extending Social Disorganization Theory." *Southern Sociological Society*.**

- This research attempts to synthesize social disorganization theory with the systemic model of crime, the collective efficacy perspective, & recent criminological works that use the concept of social capital.
- The results indicated that the neighborhood's levels of collective efficacy & bridging capital directly influenced violent victimization.
- Social networks & bonding capital, while important intervening variables, did not directly influence victimization rates.

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

- In this study, the authors describe and test an alternative theory of urban violence that highlights the tension between two dimensions of social organization — social networks (ties and exchange between neighborhood residents) and collective efficacy (mutual trust and solidarity combined with expectations for prosocial action) — in the regulation of neighborhood crime.
- The authors argued that while social networks may contribute to neighborhood collective efficacy they also provide a source of social capital for offenders, potentially diminishing the regulatory effectiveness of collective efficacy. This negotiated coexistence model is considered alongside two competing theories of neighborhood crime drawn from the systemic and cultural transmission perspectives.
- The authors tested these theories using 1990 census data, the 1994–95 Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods Community Survey, and 1995–97 Chicago Homicide Data.
- The results indicated that the regulatory effects of collective efficacy on violence were substantially reduced in neighborhoods characterized by high levels of network interaction and reciprocated exchange.

**Pridemore, W. A. (2002). "What We Know about Social Structure and Homicide: A Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature." *Violence and Victims* 17(2): 127-156.<sup>2</sup>**

- This article reviews what the field has learned about social structure & homicide during the last 30 years, paying close attention to empirical tests of subculture, strain (both absolute & relative deprivation), & social disorganization theories.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://search.proquest.com/docview/60465418?accountid=26333>

- First, this review reveals that researchers have difficulty operationalizing culture in terms of values & instead often rely on regional location or group membership as a proxy for subculture. Though the findings relating subculture to homicide are inconsistent, however, culture should not be ignored.
- Second, the positive relationship between poverty & the spatial distribution of homicide rates is the most consistent finding in this literature, while empirical evidence of the effects of inequality on homicide is neither as strong nor as consistent.
- Finally, social disorganization is more consistent in explaining the variation of homicide rates than the subcultural & relative deprivation models, with elements of disorganization such as city size, family disruption, & heterogeneity all showing relatively consistent effects.

**Sampson, R. J. and S. W. Raudenbush (2001). Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods--Does It Lead to Crime?- Research in Brief. Washington, DC, National Institute of Justice.<sup>3</sup>**

- This study assessed the "broken windows" thesis (social and physical disorder in urban neighborhoods can lead to serious crime) and its implications for crime-control policy and practice.
- The amount of disorder in the neighborhoods studied was measured by directly observing what was happening on the streets during the day.
- Disorder and crime alike were found to stem from certain neighborhood structural characteristics, notably concentrated poverty.
- Homicide was among the offenses for which there was no direct relationship with disorder.
- Disorder was directly linked only to the level of robbery.
- In neighborhoods where collective efficacy was strong, rates of violence were low, regardless of socio-demographic composition and the amount of disorder observed.
- Collective efficacy also appears to deter disorder.
- The findings thus imply that although reducing disorder may reduce crime, this occurs indirectly by stabilizing neighborhoods through collective efficacy.

**Sampson, R. J. (1997). Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective. Science, vol. 277, pp. 2**

- This article proposes that collective efficacy, defined as social cohesion among neighbors combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good, is linked to reduced violence.
- The hypothesis that collective efficacy is linked to reduced violence was tested on a 1995 survey of 8,782 residents of 343 neighborhoods in Chicago, Illinois.
- The basic premise of the survey was that social and organizational characteristics of neighborhoods explain variations in crime rates that are not solely attributable to the aggregated demographic characteristics of individuals.
- The analyses showed that a measure of collective efficacy yielded a high between-neighborhood reliability and is negatively associated with variations in violence, when individual-level characteristics, measurement error, and prior violence are controlled.
- Associations of concentrated disadvantage and residential instability with violence were largely mediated by collective efficacy.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/186049.pdf>