- There is a growing, multidisciplinary body of evidence on the effects that neighborhoods have on family outcomes.
- 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.

- This study attempts to help disentangle the mutual effects of neighborhood disorder and social cohesion on how residents evaluate their neighborhoods.
- The authors draw upon data from the 2009 Las Vegas Metropolitan Area Social Survey to understand how neighborhood cohesion, physical disorder, and perceptions of crime and safety influence neighborhood satisfaction and neighborhood quality of life among residents in the dynamic, yet understudied, urban context of Las Vegas, Nevada.
- The results show that even with significant neighborhood disorder, social connectedness with neighbors remains a significant predictor of neighborhood satisfaction.

- The current work assesses the relationship between respondent perceptions of collective efficacy and neighborhood violence.
- Data used in the analysis combined a community survey from Mesa, Arizona, with census data.
- Analyses found that community structural characteristics including concentrated disadvantage and residential instability significantly predicted perceptions of collective efficacy, social cohesion, and willingness to intervene.
- In turn each of these variables was related to violent crime after controlling for levels of concentrated disadvantage, residential instability, and individual demographic characteristics.
- When social cohesion and willingness to intervene were included in a single regression model, only social cohesion was predictive of neighborhood violence.
- Social cohesion and violent crime had reciprocal effects that were both negative and statistically significant.
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- In this study, the authors use neighborhood-level data from the city of Miami to test hypotheses regarding the effect of drug activity and traditional indicators of social disorganization on rates of aggravated assault and robbery.  
- The results show that drug activity has robust effects on violent crime that are independent of other disorganization indicators.  
- The authors also found that drug activity was concentrated in neighborhoods with low rates of immigration, less linguistic isolation and ethnic heterogeneity, and where nondrug accidental deaths are prevalent.  
- The authors found no independent effect of neighborhood racial composition on drug activity or violent crime.

- This study examined relations among neighborhood-, family-, and individual-level variables, and perceptions of neighborhood collective efficacy.  
- Data were examined from 1,105 individuals (56% female, 42% African American, and 58% White) nested within 55 neighborhoods and 392 families.  
- At the neighborhood level, the study examined relations between Census, police, and neighborhood representative indicators.  
- At the family level, the model examined the influence of marital status and family income.  
- At the individual level, gender and age were examined.  
- Results indicated that age at the individual level, marital status at the family level, and poverty and perceived gang activity at the neighborhood level predicted levels of neighborhood collective efficacy.

- This article assessed the sources and consequences of public disorder.  
- Based on the videotaping and systematic rating of more than 23,000 street segments in Chicago, highly reliable scales of social and physical disorder for 196 neighborhoods are constructed.  
- Census data, police records, and an independent survey of more than 3,500 residents are then integrated to test a theory of collective efficacy and structural constraints.  
- Defined as cohesion among residents combined with shared expectations for the social control of public space, collective efficacy explains lower rates of crime and observed disorder after controlling neighborhood structural characteristics.  
- Collective efficacy is also linked to lower rates of violent crime after accounting for disorder and the reciprocal effects of violence.  
- Contrary to the "broken windows" theory, however, the relationship between public disorder and crime is spurious except perhaps for robbery.


---
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This study examined whether violent behavior is reduced by neighborhood "collective efficacy," which refers to "mutual trust among neighbors combined with willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good, specifically to supervise children and maintain public order."

This aspect of the study divided Chicago into 343 "neighborhood clusters," each inhabited by approximately 8,000 people, and each defined by specific geographic boundaries and internally homogeneous on a variety of census indicators.

Questions asked of residents were intended to elicit their views of how much informal social control, social cohesion and trust, and violence existed in their neighborhoods.

The researchers found that in neighborhoods scoring high on collective efficacy, crime rates were 40 percent below those in lower scoring neighborhoods.

This difference supported the study's basic premise, i.e., that crime rates are not solely attributable to individuals' aggregate demographic characteristics; rather, crime is a function of neighborhood social and organizational characteristics.

The researchers found that various dimensions of social composition influence the level of neighborhood collective efficacy.

In neighborhoods where concentrated poverty was high, collective efficacy was low.

Ethnicity/immigration was another important dimension, because areas of ethnic and linguistic heterogeneity may have less capacity to realize common values.

Where this dimension was high, collective efficacy was low.

In contrast, neighborhoods where residential stability was strong also tended to be strong on collective efficacy.