2006

Understanding the psychosocial development of neighborhoods: Implications for situational policing

Jeri Kirby
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Kirby, Jeri, "Understanding the psychosocial development of neighborhoods: Implications for situational policing" (2006). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 712.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/712>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Understanding the Psychosocial Development of Neighborhoods: Implications for
Situational Policing

Jeri Kirby

Thesis submitted to the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Sociology

James J. Nolan III, Ph.D., Chair
Ronald Althouse, Ph.D.
Corey Colyer, Ph.D.

Division of Sociology and Anthropology

Morgantown, West Virginia
2006

Keywords: Situational Policing Model
Copyright 2006 Jeri Kirby

ABSTRACT

Understanding the Psychosocial Development of Neighborhoods: Implications for Situational Policing

Jeri Kirby

Community policing strategies are aimed at reducing crime and getting neighbors more involved. These goals of achieving safe neighborhoods seem just outside of the police department's reach. The police have been unable to achieve sustained satisfaction with the residents while also deterring crime and disorder. Research has suggested that collective efficacy within neighborhoods has a strong relation to the level of crime and disorder (Sampson, 1999). Assuming that neighborhoods have unique properties/characteristics, other researchers explored the idea that neighborhoods behave like groups and develop through identifiable stages (Nolan, 2004). Using qualitative methods inside the Pittsburgh Police Department and in four neighborhoods on the North side of the city, this research examines whether the police and community share the same psychological boundaries of "their neighborhood," the beliefs of who is responsible for maintaining order in the neighborhood, and beliefs about the effectiveness of police for maintaining order in the neighborhood.

Dedication Page

I want to thank my wonderful family for their support, Robin for her patience, and my committee for their dedication. Certain people have pushed me forward and I would like to thank Gerald and Cynthia Kirby for their wonderful encouragement and Steve and Ruthie Coulson for their wonderful encouragement and support. I also would like to dedicate this to Robert Primm. A wonderful man that changed my dad's life forever, we will forever celebrate your life.

Table of Contents

Chapter I	
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Definition of Terms	4
Limitations of study	4
Significance of Study	5
Review of Literature	5
• Social Disorganization Theory	6
• Broken Window Theory	7
• Self-efficacy	8
• Collective efficacy	10
• Small group research	11
• Evolution of policing	13
• Policing Eras	14
• Situational Policing	16
• Neighborhood as a unit of analysis	18
Chapter II	
Design and Methodology	
Research Design	21
• Table 1. Basic characteristics of the four neighborhoods	22
• Neighborhood Descriptions	
• North Side	23
• Manchester	24
• Central North Side	26
• East Allegheny	28
• Fineview	30
Methods	33
Research Findings	34
Research question 1	35
• Manchester	35
• Fineview	36
• East Allegheny	38

• Central North Side	39
Research question 2	40
• Manchester	40
• Fineview	42
• East Allegheny	43
• Central North Side	44
Research question 3	45
• Manchester	46
• Fineview	47
• East Allegheny	49
• Central North Side	50
Police	52
Chapter III	
Discussion	59
Conclusion	65
Epilogue	66
• Relinquishing Control	69
• Leadership and Community Power	73
• Neighborhood Disorder	76
Bibliography	78
Appendix A Questions	79
Appendix B	79

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Arriving in Manchester at 12:00, I pulled up in front of the beautiful brick home and nervously began to step out of the car when I was startled with a loud crashing sound coming from the house directly across the street from my destination. Two heavy-set African American women came smashing through the front screen door of the run down house, fiercely pushing and punching at each other. The women had a solid hold on each other just letting go long enough to throw back their arms to swing their fist.

Fighting in the middle of the road the women were cursing while throwing punches, pulling hair and ripping the clothes off of each other. The women stumbled back – falling against a Stanley Steamer truck while refusing to let loose of their grip of each other's clothing and hair.

Finally, the women let go of each other long enough to head back into the front door of the house. I realized during this time that I had sunk deep down into the front seat of my car after locking myself in. I was determined not to let this display of disorganization stop the scheduled interview. I was completely confident that the police were going to roar up at any second asking for statements from me and the Stanley.

Just as I felt confident enough to get out of the car, a crashing sound came from the inside of the house that the women had just disappeared into. I thought: I better make a run for it, I opened my car door only to quickly slam it shut when the women came back out the front door again with their hands tangled in each other's hair. Again, I was sure the police would arrive any second to stop this nonsense and escort me safely to my interview with their apologies for my dramatic experience.

The fight lasted only about 5 minutes before the women just let go of each other out of exhaustion and again headed into the house. I wasn't about to chance their dramatic re-entry into the street again. I grabbed my notebook and pen and jumped out of the car heading toward the front gate of the house where I was to conduct my interview. The Stanley Steamer guy must have had the same idea as he started his van and took off out of the area.

The home I ran into was a beautiful brick historic looking house, which had obviously been restored. The house sits up off the street separated from the road by a heavy metal fence. As I stepped onto the porch the front door opened and a lovely older African American woman appeared. Unsure on whether to comment on what had just happened I extended my hand wondering if these events occur on her street, regularly. As I walked inside, she quickly closed the glass door behind me with confidence of someone who had experienced this many times before.

With nothing said about the incident, the interview lasted a pleasant forty-five minutes. The resident described her neighborhood as a place where she has felt safe for years. She described a cohesive neighborhood that had a good relationship with the police, who were viewed as being responsive to the needs of the area. After the interview was over, I thanked her graciously for her time and headed to the front door. As we reached the door I noticed that she had locked the glass door behind me as I had entered. As she unlocked the door she commented, "I always keep it locked."

As I went down the front steps I asked myself: how safe could she truly feel if she always felt the need to lock her door even though her home sits up off the street, secured by a fence. As I made my way out of the fenced in area, I was facing the neighbor's front

porch that had just recently been the starting gate for the fighting women. The door was open and the battered screen door was closed. I heard no crashing and I saw no one throwing punches. I saw nothing, not even the police. The police, who I was sure would have long ago arrived keeping peace for the residents, like the woman I had just interviewed, who were confident they would respond to protect and to serve.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine some of the aspects and claims about collective efficacy and the psychological development of neighborhoods. More specifically, the research is depicted in the opening scenario; individuals living in neighborhoods have expectations of their neighbors and the police when it comes to dealing with events that threaten their safety. In this situation, what appeared threatening to me was not a threat to the woman interviewed, at this point; locking her door was enough to mitigate the threat. I wondered what would it take for her to call the police. Could she count on her neighbors to help, or was she alone to deal with the situation with or without the police.

More specifically, the researcher examined the geographic space the residents view as their neighborhood, their relationship with in their neighborhood pertaining to the control of public space, and the belief in the ability of the police to protect them from crime and disorder. Sociologists have found that “neighborhoods” have a group level property called collective efficacy. It is a characteristic of the neighborhood as a whole and can predict whether rates of crime and disorder will be high or low. The relationship is inverse: low levels of collective efficacy predict crime and disorder.

Definition of Terms

- *Self-Efficacy refers to the beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments (Bandura 2000).*
- *Collective Efficacy is a group's shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments (Bandura 1997).*
- *Social Disorder is behavior usually involving strangers and that is considered threatening such as verbal harassment on the street, open solicitation for prostitution, public intoxication, and rowdy groups of young males in public (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999).*
- *Physical Disorder is the deterioration of urban landscapes, for example, graffiti on buildings, abandoned cars, broken windows, and garbage in the streets (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999).*

Delimitations and Limitations

A limitation of this study is the small number of interviews conducted may not be representative of the population. This study was conducted on the North Side of Pittsburgh where individuals volunteered and were not randomly selected. Although the area still offered a great deal of diversity in culture, demographics, and economic standings. The participants were selected based on their willingness to talk with the researcher. The researcher attended community meetings and asked for volunteers to participate in the study.

Significance of Study

Much has been written about group level phenomenon and their impact on efficacy. Sampson and Raudenbush applied this to neighborhoods. The research attempts to find out whether collective efficacy exists and if so what form does it take. It also extends the finding into the policing field and seeks to find out the impact of neighborhood dynamics on policing.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Collective efficacy, to this point, has only been applied to the study of small groups. Sampson and Radenbush (1997) were some of the first researchers to recognize that neighborhoods possess the group level property, collective efficacy. If this is true about neighborhoods, that they are like small groups in the way they take on collective properties, e.g., share a common “mentality”, then this research offers advantages to applying the knowledge about small groups to the study of neighborhood.

Nolan, Conti, and McDevitt (2004) saw an opportunity to apply small group concepts to neighborhoods in an attempt to understand how police could be more effective. Specifically, it has been argued that neighborhoods like groups pass through stages on their way to having collective efficacy. The activities of the police can either enhance or inhibit this development. Claims regarding neighborhoods and police practices, by Sampson and Raudenbush (1999) and by Nolan et.al. (2004), are what prompted this research.

In this study we examine the Social Psychology literature on groups and group level properties viewed as efficacy. Social disorganization theory (defined below) and its proven relevance to neighborhood safety (Sampson 1999) are also examined. Finally, the

evolution of policing in the United States beginning in its earliest days is reviewed. This review provides the foundation for the research questions and methods that follow.

Social Disorganization Theory

Social Disorganization, in relation to neighborhood level efficacy, reflects the ability of residents to work together to take control of activities in the public sphere. Social disorganization theory refers to the inability of a community to realize common goals and solve chronic problems. (Kubrin and Weitzer, 2003).

The residents interviewed in this study clearly wanted to feel safe in their area without the threat of crime and disorder. Unsure of who was responsible, residents blamed apathetic residents, the police, and even the city for the disorder in their area. The residents struggled feeling as if they were missing essential tools to construct an ideal neighborhood. “One of the most central of common goals is the desire of community residents to live in safe environments free of predatory crime and disorder” (Sampson 1999, p611).

Is the disorder of cities something that people have just come to expect? It has become clear that violence has become one of the major concerns in urban residents lives (Anderson, 1999). It seems logical that more densely populated cities have a higher percentage of deviant acts, although we may be aware of this, it doesn’t become an issue until these acts land on the front steps of our neighborhood. “Vandalism can occur anywhere once communal boundaries – the sense of mutual regard and the obligations of civility – are lowered by actions that seem to signal that ‘no one cares’” (Wilson and Kelling 1982, p33).

Different situations can change the entire dynamic of a neighborhood and its residents. What happens when a neighborhood has reached a point that it is escalating from a safe family occupied area to an area where residents are afraid to walk down the streets? Often this disorder will matter very little to some because the neighborhood is not their 'home' but just a place where they live.

Broken Window Theory

In 1982 James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling developed the "Broken Window Theory." The premise of this theory being, that if someone doesn't care enough to fix the broken windows disorder will overwhelm the area. When a neighborhood is not cared for, the area is left open for vagrancy and disorder that would not normally occur if someone was tending to the upkeep of the area. If a community breaks down in its ability to combat social and physical disorder the residents of these areas become disconnected from their investment in the community and this will welcome more disorder. The residents of the area need to want to become involved and willing to take action against disorder. Often, residents desire to get involved is based on conditions of mutual trust and cohesion among neighbors." (Kubrin and Weitzer, 2003.).

Wilson and Kelling propose that residents must be willing to come out of their homes and consider the stake they have in the area. They must also realize that their individual voice and actions can influence declining situations by displaying their determination and self-efficacy to control the events in their lives. Self-efficacy is someone's belief in their capabilities to organize and execute whatever action is required to obtain specific goals (Bandura, 1997).

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is an inherent desire and belief in one's own ability to achieve personal goals and desires. Self-efficacy also is a determinant of motivation, which directly effect how much effort they will exert and how long they will persevere in the face of obstacles (Bandura and Cervone, 1986). The desire to succeed in each individual person includes the ability of him or her to function in a social world. "Individuals do not define themselves as detached from their family and society; a persons' obligations are to sustain harmony with the social order" (Sampson, E.E., 1988).

Individuals possess the ability to rationally consider what type of environment they wish to live and function in. This individual choice to make a difference is often short lived and obsolete when a single person feels helpless with the impossible task of making change on his or her own. "The individual cannot be the basic unit of society. Since he or she is part of a system of mutual influence that includes the groups they interact with, the group they are born into, and the physical and social factors operating in the world around them" (Wheelan, 1994). Individual self-efficacy is a reflection of our feelings of worth and our ability to make changes if necessary; these feelings directly affect the family and groups in which we are part of. "Society is shaped by the goals and desires of the individuals who live within it" (Wheelan, 1994).

Psychological research has heavily examined self-efficacy over the last few decades. An efficacy expectation is a belief that one can successfully perform and achieve a particular task. If someone feels they have the personal ability to make accomplishments throughout their life – their efficacy level is higher then someone who doesn't. As (Bandura 1997) states, the self-assurance that people approach and manage

difficult tasks determines whether they are able to use their capabilities. Self-doubts can easily overrule anyone's capabilities. Someone's self-efficacy is a predictor to their ability to achieve personal goals throughout their life while also assessing their effectiveness, competence, and ability to maintain personal relationships.

Self-efficacy is developed through personal interaction with individuals, tasks, and the environment. Individuals are both the products and the producers of their social world. Through our development in life, different attributes shape the person we have become (family, peers, circumstances that we have faced). "The individual is viewed primarily as an actor in the environment, shaping and creating his/her world as well as being created by it" (Mead 1934). People's self-efficacy beliefs determine their level of motivation that is in direct relation to the effort they are willing to put forth and how they will cope when confronted with obstacles. These different attributes help us as individuals to form through life and become participants and contributors (whether good or bad) in a collective group.

Some individuals have formed a level of efficacy that can either inhibit or help escalate them as well as their group, through life. "The capacity to exercise control over one's own thought process, motivation, and action is a distinctively human character. Because judgments and actions are partly self-determined, people can effect change in themselves and their situations through their own efforts." (Bandura 1989).

There are constraints that affect self-efficacy that should be considered such as, low socio-economic status, instability in the home, health and mental issues, etc., these issues should be acknowledged, as they will later influence the collective group. "Perceived environmental constraints and opportunity structures alter how efficacy and outcome

information are cognitively processed. When both adversity and prospects for change are dismal, families with a high sense of efficacy are apt to move elsewhere in search of a better life.” (Bandura, 1991. Page 195).

Collective Efficacy

Bandura moves onto recognize that each person must become part of a group throughout their life, whether this is a family, school, and/or work. Many of life’s challenges center around what most of us would consider “common problems.” These “common problems” require people to work together as a collective group to change our lives for the better (Bandura, 1997). Over the years, collective efficacy has also been applied to small group research in teaching, sports, and work environments. Within an organization, perceived collective efficacy represents the beliefs of group members concerning “the performance capability of a social system as a whole” (Bandura, 1997).

Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls (1997), propose an analogy between individual efficacy and neighborhood efficacy: both refer to the capacity for achieving an intended effect. At the neighborhood level, the shared willingness of local residents to intervene for the common good depends, in addition, on conditions of cohesion and mutual trust among neighbors. “One of the most central of common goals is the desire of community residents to live in safe environments free of predatory crime and disorder.” (Sampson, 1999).

In his Chicago study, Sampson recognized collective efficacy to have an inverse relationship with crime and disorder: The more collective efficacy exist the less crime and disorder was observed. (Sampson and Raudenbush, 1999). At the neighborhood level, the shared willingness of local residents to intervene for the common good

depends, in addition, on conditions of cohesion and mutual trust among the residents of the neighborhood. One of the most central of common goals is the desire of community residents to live in safe environments free of predatory crime and disorder (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999). There is no question that people want to feel safe in their own homes and in the area surrounding their home. For collective-efficacy to be present within in a neighborhood, social cohesion must be present among the residents combined with their collective willingness to intervene in the face of disorder for their fellow residents. With the residents of a neighborhood in pursuit of a common goal of lowering crime and disorder – the direct effect of adjoining will likely lower the level of fear associated with crime and disorder.

The greater the level of residential stability that exists in a neighborhood, the less likely it is that networks of crime and disorder are able to survive through control of their environment, in turn they would likely diminish. Social ties accumulate and allow for more collective efficacy, which allows for the possibility to reach the desired goal of a safe neighborhood. Taylor (1984) found significant impacts of local social ties and territorial functioning on fear of crime; they also found that the effects of local social ties on fear were mediated by territorial functioning. They observed this connection at the group and individual levels.

Small Group Research

According to decades of research by Bandura (1986, 1997, 2000) efficacy beliefs play an important role in both individual and group motivation since people have to rely, at least, to some extent, on others to accomplish their tasks. Indeed, one reason why scholars and practitioners are interested in collective efficacy is because this variable has

been shown to be significantly related to a variety of organizational outcomes. When people are faced with difficulties, people with self-doubts lack effort to pursue their goals and end up settling for less than favorable circumstances, whereas those with strong belief in their abilities will exert greater effort to take on the challenge (Bandura & Cervone 1983, 1986). Strong perseverance usually pays off in performance accomplishments.

Organizations with strong beliefs in-group capability have the ability to tolerate pressure and crises and continue to function without suffering huge consequences. Organizations that possess collective efficacy learn to rise to challenges they are confronted with and cope with possible disruptive forces may become present. Less efficacious organizations, however, are more likely to react dysfunctional, which in turn, increases the likelihood of failure.

Much of the research on efficacy has included student – teacher efficacy in the work place. The research has mainly focused on the link between personal efficacy and ability to accomplish different tasks. “Teachers’ sense of efficacy and perceived collective efficacy provides evidence that organizational socialization involves the communication of influential normative expectations for achievement” (Goddard, Hoy and Hoy. 2000). Teachers’ sense of efficacy is a significant predictor of productive teaching practices and inevitably more successful.

In reference to schools, collective efficacy often refers to the judgment and ability of the teachers and faculty to organize together to execute and accomplish the courses of action required to have positive results from the students. Compared to teachers with lower self-efficacy beliefs, teachers with strong perceptions of self-capability tend to

employ classroom strategies that are more organized and better planned (Allinder 1994). Research suggests that a strong sense of collective efficacy enhances teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. This relationship supports findings that suggest collective efficacy is a significant factor in reaching group goals. The research also suggests "when teachers' are empowered to make instructional decisions that are relevant to the children and the school, they are likely to report a higher confidence level in their organization" (Bandura, 2000).

Sampson connected collective efficacy to neighborhoods recognizing that neighborhoods, as do small groups, have the ability to concern themselves with issues surrounding their well-being. Those who believe they cannot manage potential threats experience high levels of stress and anxiety arousal. They tend to dwell on their coping deficiencies and view many aspects of their environment as fraught with danger. Through such inefficacious thought they distress themselves and constrain and impair their level of functioning (Bandura, 1988b, 1988c).

In many areas fear is one of the main constraints of collective efficacy in a neighborhood environment. Residents avoid potentially risky situations in fear that they will be unable to cope with the outcomes (Bandura, 2000). In sum, it is the cohesive nature and the willingness of the residents to intervene that determines whether the residents will be able to achieve common goals (Sampson and Raudenbush, 1999).

Evolution of Policing

Policing has been through many changes over the years, in search of the "ideal policing" style that accomplishes lowering crime and disorder but also prevents it from reoccurring. "The essence of the police role in maintaining order is to reinforce the

informal control mechanisms of the community itself. The police cannot, without committing extraordinary resources, provide a substitute for that informal control” (Wilson and Kelling, 2001). The informal control mechanisms police depend on are participation by the neighborhood residents, mobilization in community groups, and varying neighborhood watches.

Early history of crime fighting consisted of police attempting to control specific problem groups (mostly slaves and Native Americans). Volunteers mainly performed policing duties, until the city populations began to grow. The increased population created a need for public order; resources were made available to develop the first police departments. These police departments were strongly rooted in British society and mirrored the early English policing system.

Policing Era's

During the evolution of policing, departments have faced three notable eras.

- 1) The political era
- 2) Professional era
- 3) Communal era.

The Political Era lasted roughly from 1840 to 1930. During this time, policing was practiced in a very poor manner; for example, recruitment and promotion of police officers were tied politics. This has become known as the spoils system (to the political victors go the spoils) a common practice when political parties award anyone that supported them through an appointment to a position. “All bureaucracies risk becoming so preoccupied with running their organizations and getting so involved in their methods of operating that they lose sight of the primary purposes for which they were created.

The police seem unusually susceptible to this phenomenon” (Goldstein, 1990). These positions paid very little, leaving the officers to susceptible to corruption.

Because this era was so politically motivated, it became clear to the politicians running for election, that by offering social services to the citizens, they could win their vote. Police officers took an active role in campaigning for their bosses by providing services for their constituents. Presidents Herbert Hoover finally noticed the abuses performed by political leaders on the police departments. In response, Hoover appointed the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement to evaluate the American criminal justice system.

Through the reform, ordered by the appointed commission (which came to be known as the Wickersham Commission), the Professional Model of policing, (developed by O.W. Wilson among many others) was put into place. This era of policing emphasized centralized police organizations, increased use of technology, and a limitation of police discretion through regulations and guidelines. The police chiefs were finally running their departments without the influence of the politicians. What did suffer was the relationship the officers had with the surrounding communities; they were seen as intruders as the communities felt disconnected from the police.

The 1960's was one of the most turbulent, violent decades to this day. The civil rights movement and the Vietnam War coupled together created a violent divide in the United States. The movements created a collision between the police and the citizens as the police became seen as a contributor to the problem rather than a keeper of peace. The division occurred because of the poor relations between the police and the communities, this relationship would have to change for successful policing to occur.

In 1968, the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was passed which gave the state and local police departments federal funds to create a wide variety of police-community programs, the community era of policing began. Many initiatives were developed in attempt to bridge the gap between the communities and the police. In the 1970's, when departments were working to resolve relations with the communities, the country was hit with a crime wave. The departments were then forced to combine their community relation efforts with hard crime fighting strategies. This entailed a reactive response which focused on the police responding to calls quicker, and a proactive responsive which centered on stopping crimes before they were committed.

In the 1980's new types of policing were experimented with in cities across the country. Team policing, community outreach, community crime prevention, and problem oriented policing collectively changed the face of policing. The 1990's brought the era of community policing. Community policing has often been seen as a varying tactic, as police departments practice it in different ways. In general, community policing focused on the partnering of police officers and community residents leading to prevention of crime. "Greater sensitivity to communal as opposed to individual needs that helps explain why the residents of small communities are more satisfied with their police than are the residents of similar neighborhoods in big cities. (Kelling and Coles 1999).

Situational Policing:

Studies have found that collective efficacy and neighborhood cohesion have a direct negative correlation with disorder and crime in neighborhoods. Community policing was developed in an attempt to work with communities to raise collective efficacy within them, while also reducing crime and disorder. Community policing is a

very broad policing concept that offers little specific instruction. Rather than calling only for more traditional policing in worthwhile areas, Wilson and Kelling (1982) advocate that police take the initiative in targeting and counteracting disorder in accordance with what they call “communal needs”. Skogan recognizes the need for police to identify the many variations of order that neighborhoods want. Also, police would have to develop ways to recognize not only the problems of the neighborhood but also the priorities of local residents (Skogan 1990).

Nolan, Conti, and McDevit (2004) present “Situational Policing” which proposes to add a different perspective to the concepts of community policing. Nolan et al. (2004), posit that neighborhoods pass through, regress to, or get stuck in different identifiable psychological stages of development. There are three developmental stages (1) Dependence is when a neighborhood is in the early stages of development and relies completely on the police as their leader, (2) Conflict, when the neighborhood feels the police are not fulfilling their obligation of keeping them safe and there is also little trust and agreement within the neighborhood its self and, (3) Interdependent, a neighborhood that works together and with the police to prevent crime and disorder.

By knowing a neighborhoods developmental stage, the police will have the knowledge to properly respond to the needs of that area in a way that moves the neighborhood toward interdependence. “It is our intention to advance the idea that policing styles should not be selected based on a police organization’s standard mode of operation, but should reflect the conditions of the neighborhood” (Nolan, et. al. 2004). Although the police are asking the residents to step forward and take part in the protection of their neighborhood, the police recognize the need to initially act as the

leader of the community group. As the group continues to develop the police can begin to step back and allow the group to work more on their own.

This is what some may refer to as Transformational leadership. Bass views transformational leadership as when a leader is able to move the follower beyond their own self-interests through idealized influence (Bass, 1997). Therefore, Bass suggests that transformational leadership can influence collective efficacy. Similarly, a transformational leader through the use of intellectual stimulation can help followers to think through more deeply the obstacles confronting their success, thus leading them to develop a better understanding of what needs to be done to be successful.

The process of thinking through the best ways to approach problems and challenges should help raise their individual and collective confidence to perform exceptionally, resulting in job satisfaction and commitment to the organization. Furthermore, a transformational leader can affect collective efficacy by raising followers' awareness of other group members' contribution by emphasizing the value and self-sacrifice through idealized influence for the good of the group (Bass, 1997).

Neighborhood as a unit of analysis

The following section examines the literature on neighborhoods, specifically the area of research that deals with defining neighborhoods. This section also identifies the four-targeted areas in this research. These neighborhoods are located on the North Side of a large city in the Northeastern Region of the United States. These areas will be described from the perspective of the researcher, the resident, and the community groups (which would usually also consist of residents in the area). These four neighborhoods are in many ways, similar such as their concern for the juveniles in the area, keeping their

neighborhood safe, and combating drug problems. On the other hand, these neighborhoods also offer a diverse variety of thinking that leads to differing priorities in each neighborhood.

Previous research suggests there are a variety of working definitions of neighborhood. It is apparent that different researchers define neighborhoods based on their own areas of focus. Part of this research examines the psychological or emotional state of the neighborhood as a whole. Therefore, neighborhood is defined as a small geographic unit where residents have some face-to-face contact and clearly recognize that they all belong to the same place.

Sociologists have approached research of neighborhood and communities by types of social relations, such as Tönnies' (1887) *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, by Milgram's (1977) psychological maps, and by geographic boundaries. This research closely considers psychological maps and the geographic boundaries of each area.

Sampson and Raudenbush (1999) defined "neighborhoods" as census tracts. They were using the ecological surroundings of the area instead of considering the psychological aspects of the neighborhood-as-a-whole. Their main point is that there are criminogenic forces at work in neighborhoods and that it is "collective efficacy" that is best able to neutralize these forces. Sampson and Raudenbush (1999) wrote the following, "Disorder is a manifestation of crime-relevant mechanisms and collective efficacy should reduce disorder and violence by dis-empowering the forces that produce both".

On the other hand, Suttles (1974) defined neighborhood as appearing on four specific levels: Face blocks, are the most basic of levels. These are places where

residents live together on the same block, use many of the same resources and have the most face-to-face encounters. Defended neighborhoods are the next level out in composing a slightly larger area than the face blocks. Defended areas are the smallest unit with a corporate identity where residents “assume a relative degree of security on the streets as compared to adjacent area”. Moving out from defended are the Communities of Limited Liability. These areas are defined by external commercial or governmental interests (i.e., having institutionalized boundaries for statistical reporting of social characteristics and problems, among other things). For Suttles the next larger areas (short of the entire city as whole) are the Expanded Communities of Limited Liability. These are areas are large sections of the community such as the East Side of Chicago or the North Side of Philadelphia.

Kearns and Parkinson (2001) adds to this discussion by defining neighborhood as the home area such as a 5-10 minute walk from one’s home. Nolan et al (2004), defined neighborhood as the geographic area closes to one’s home where residents are most likely to meet face-to-face and share mutual public safety problems and concerns. The definitions used by both Kearns and Parkinson (2001) and Nolan et al (2004) are similar to Suttles (1974) Defended Neighborhoods.

More recently, Skogan (2004) defined the community according to functional boundaries. Recognizing that certain administrators of the city, along with assorted building owners, business operators, and others have a stake in the area. According to this definition Skogan suggests that any attempt to organize communities or call together representatives of the community there should be attempts to have participants match neighborhood characteristics such as demographically, socially, economically. In this

regard he wrote the following: “Although sheer numbers are important, it is also important that beat meetings represent the interest of the residents. Even a small meeting can do this effectively, if those who attend represent the interest of residents.” (Skogan, 2004: p59).

CHAPTER II

Research Questions

Specifically, the researcher examines how the police and community view:

Research Question 1:

The geographic boundaries of “their neighborhood.” How do they identify their neighborhood? What physical boundaries do they recognize as the beginning and end to their neighborhood?

Research Question 2

Who do the residents of these neighborhoods believe is responsible for maintaining order in the neighborhood? Do they believe the responsibility falls only on the police, only on themselves as residents, or is it a joint effort between the residents and the police?

Research Question 3:

How do the residents of these neighborhoods view the police? What are their beliefs about the effectiveness of police for maintaining order in the neighborhood? Do they feel the police know what is in the neighborhoods best interest?

Research Design

This is a qualitative study that will use resident interviews in four neighborhoods in the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to attempt to answer the three research questions. The interviews were designed to examine the geographic space the residents view as their neighborhood, their relationship within their neighborhood as it pertains to the control of

public space, and the belief in the ability of the police to protect them from crime and disorder.

The city of Pittsburgh has an approximate population of 334,563 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). The Pittsburgh city is divided up into 7 zones with 90 corporately identified neighborhoods. This research focuses on the North Side of Pittsburgh, also known as “Zone 1” by the police. The North Side is divided into 18 neighborhoods that are identified by a corporate names such as; Manchester, Brighton Heights, Spring Garden, among others.

With the assistance of the Pittsburgh Police Department, 4 diverse neighborhoods were chosen. Attempts were made to include neighborhoods that were racially, ethnically, socially, and economically diverse. The neighborhoods selected have varying different levels of crime and disorder. They are different from each other in identifiable ways. The Zone 1 police department patrols all 4 of these neighborhoods. Table 1 presents a summary of the characteristics of each of the four neighborhoods within the study.

Table 1. Basic characteristics of the four neighborhoods selected for this study.

Neighborhood	Total Pop.	Avg. House Income	Adult Unemployment	% Black	% Below Poverty Level
Central N. Side	3200	No Info.	9.8%	56%	76.9%
East Allegheny	2635	\$17,267	8.3%	24%	57.3%
Fineview	1751	\$17,535	10%	49%	86%
Manchester	2506	\$24,055	6.3%	86%	29.2%

Neighborhood Descriptions

The North Side of Pittsburgh is the focus of this study. In Suttles terms, this would be the Extended Community of Limited Liability. Within this North Side area, the four neighborhoods outlined in table 1 were selected for in depth interviews. The North Side of Pittsburgh has a web-site that is used to describe the area. The following is an excerpt from this web site.

“Founded in 1897, the North Side Chamber of Commerce (NSCC) began helping merchants at the turn of the century in the North Side Market District. The NSCC is a service organization that creates, develops, and fosters a supportive climate that serves the interests of its members. As a partner with business, the Chamber is a resource of services that help to promote, maintain and enhance business activities on the North Side.

The flat lands of the North Side cover a handful of residential and commercial neighborhoods that once formed a separate town - Allegheny City - until it was annexed by the City of Pittsburgh in 1907. The land, originally given as payment to Revolutionary War veterans, eventually turned its attention to production of goods - rope, iron and textiles.

The latter is what attracted a weaver by the name of William Carnegie to immigrate to Allegheny City from Scotland in 1848. His wife Margaret stitched shoes for an Allegheny City cobbler. Their son, Andrew Carnegie, changed bobbins in an Allegheny City cotton mill. He went on to build an industrial empire and left a personal legacy with his gifts of libraries,

museums, church organs and music halls”

(www.pittsburghnorthside.com/8_neighborhoods).

Manchester

The following is a description of the four target neighborhoods in this study.

Manchester sits on the South Western edge of Pittsburgh near Heinz field, outlined by the Ohio River. My first encounter with Manchester was on a ride along with an officer. As the officer described the area, I was unsure of how to categorize the area while questioning whether it was a place I would visit alone; “There is a high level of drug activity in Manchester. The blocks are divided with drug saturated areas and nice developed homes.” Pulling into the area my first impression is that this is an industrial area with wide streets and block buildings. I actually was impressed with how clean the streets and sidewalks were.

Manchester is a designated historic district, which requires that the homes be maintained in a specific manner in an attempt to keep the original development of the area. Manchester doesn’t actually have much of a business district but they do have a large postal hub inhabiting several blocks of the area. During the ride along I participated in the Officer clarified for me that the Postal hub actually sits adjacent to a rental area which is plagued with heavy drug problems and recently home of some shootings.

The initial Officer described the visual of Manchester well when he said the blocks were divided. One side of the street consisted of adjoined apartments that were somewhat run down while across the street sat beautiful brick historic homes. The gentrification in the area is visually apparent. In attending the Manchester Community Meeting, I had the great pleasure of meeting some very interesting residents of the area. I was obliged to get the opportunity to interview a few of them regarding Manchester.

Manchester residents are predominantly African American and usually have a long standing in the area. I wanted to be sure that I talked with residence of Manchester that have been in the area for awhile. That was not a problem in Manchester as the majority of the residents have lived here their entire lives. When enquiring about the history, of Manchester, it quickly became clear that I was talking to the right people: “I’ve worked and lived in this neighborhood all my life”, “Grandparents purchased house that we still own”.

The group is well organized with thanks going to the Manchester Community Center and the hard workers that lead it. I will not mention them by name but they deserve all the credit for having one of the most adjoined community groups of the four neighborhoods examined.

Community web-site: Manchester

“The English immigrants who first settled in the area named the community Manchester after its industrial English counterpart. Situated along the banks of the Ohio River, Manchester is a National Registered Historic District in the city of Pittsburgh.

One of the city's oldest National Registered Historic Districts, this diverse residential neighborhood boasts fine examples of Gothic Revival, Queen Anne, Italianate, and Romanesque Revival architecture. Many structures date back to the 1800s and have been beautifully restored. New construction has been carefully planned to conform to surrounding buildings. Non-profit organizations, several houses of worship, and a handful of businesses round out the neighborhood. Nearby, the Manchester Industrial Park is home to companies such as UPS, the world

renowned Manchester Craftsmen's Guild, and the Harbor Gardens.

Manchester was largely built up between 1860 and 1900. The installation of a streetcar network in the late nineteenth century linked Manchester to Pittsburgh and simulated its development as a suburban neighborhood.

The community grew into a middle-class neighborhood that was largely populated by local businessmen and their families.

Manchester was an important industrial center for the City of Allegheny.

The neighborhood was originally supported by the industrial and wharf activity that flourished on the shore of the Ohio River and factories loosely woven into the community. The Pittsburgh Locomotive and Car Works was a notable Manchester industry, which produced the first Allegheny built locomotive.

In an effort to continually improve the neighborhood and attract homeowners, Manchester Development Corporation assists both individuals and developers. Recent efforts include the construction of 76 new townhouses and the restoration of 17 buildings throughout the neighborhood”

(www.pittsburghnorthside.com/8_neighborhoods/manchester.php).

Central North Side

Central Northside offers a very diverse area including racial, economic, and shared business and residential land use. Central Northside surrounds the Mexican War Streets that are well known for the historical homes restored and owned by young,

wealthy working class, which is often referred to as “yuppies” by the surrounding residents and the police.

Central Northside has the largest business district on the North Side. This district stretches approximately 4-5 blocks long facing the Allegheny Commons. The business district is a central cite to drug activity, prostitution, and public intoxication near local problem bars on the strip. Other mitigating factors the Central North Side faces are boarding houses, homeless shelters, and XXX movie theaters. The residents believe these factors are a contributor to the crime and disorder that plaque the area.

Community web-site: Central North Side

“People from nearly every ethnic, social and economic group have forged a vital urban neighborhood in Central Northside. Located one mile from downtown Pittsburgh, this residential community is bordered by green hills, the Allegheny River and the two interstates connecting it to downtown Pittsburgh and the northern communities of Allegheny County.

Historic Character

Central Northside prides itself in being a neighborhood where people work together to maintain the unique charm of the area. The area boasts some of Pittsburgh's most beautifully renovated Victorian homes, including the Mexican War Streets Historic District. Spacious row houses with carefully tended window boxes adorn the tree-lined streets. The area is home to several "mom and pop" businesses that cater to residents, while nearby arts and cultural attractions draw people from around the region and the country.

An Ongoing Revitalization

Recent projects include: West Park Court and Arch Court (housing for the elderly); the Alpine Projects and Buena Vista Street (renovations and sales of homes); Federal Hill (townhouses and apartments); and the Parkhurst Project (building new homes and renovating townhouses).

Community Involvement and Pride

Neighbors of all ages take part in the Annual Picnic in the Park and Giant Yard Sale, the Halloween Parade, Thanksgiving Dinner, and Lunch with Santa. The Mexican War Streets Society's annual House and Garden Tour, held each September, is the longest-premier tour of its kind in the city” (www.pittsburghnorthside.com/8_neighborhoods/central.php).

East Allegheny

East Allegheny has its quaint points and also areas of visual disorder. Through out the interviews I conducted with E. Allegheny residents, I went to several different areas of the neighborhood. It was interesting to me to see how diverse the area was while also offering an “old style” feeling. Some parts of East Allegheny appeared well maintained and cared for, while other parts were harboring built up trash and abandoned buildings. Sitting in front of a small corner tavern waiting for my second interviewee, I noted three people (2 white 1 black) pushing trashcans on wheels picking up garbage. They were dressed in everyday clothes, but something told me they were not doing garbage duty out of the good graces of their heart. As they pushed their garbage cans past my car, an African American man that was walking up the street passed beside one of the men pushing the trashcans. They smacked hands with one another and the man pushing the

trashcan said; “Driving drunk – DUI”, the other man chuckled to himself and kept on his way.

The block I was sitting on had trees planted off of the sidewalks, showing obvious signs that an attempt is being made to make the area look nice, but there is still a depressed feeling apparent. Some of the buildings look run down and the grass is high in some yards, the windows are broken, and garbage is sporadically thrown astray.

Community web-site: East Allegheny

“Neighborhood Character

East Allegheny offers historic streetscapes, easy access to downtown and major highways, and an energetic mix of homes and businesses.

Neighbors gather on their front stoops, say "hello" on the streets, pitch in on neighborhood projects, and tend community gardens.

Blending Neighborhood and Business

East Allegheny is home to the North Side's largest commercial district with more than 90 businesses on and around East Ohio Street. Adjacent to 84-acre Allegheny Commons park and North Shore development, it's also within comfortable walking distance of many regional attractions.

Humble Beginnings

The growth of East Allegheny dates back to the mid-1800s, as the City of Allegheny prospered and expanded eastward. Prior to the 1850s, this area was largely farmland, but was subdivided into residential lots, first for the growing German population, later for Croatians. Fine examples of Queen Anne, Italianate, Gothic Revival, and Romanesque structures survive and

are being restored. It also was the home of Avery College, the first African-American post-secondary school in the United States.

Since 1978, the East Allegheny Community Council has promoted civic causes and development as a Community Development Corporation. The council is responsible for dozens of new and renovated houses, ranging from historic rehabs to a new 32-unit town home complex.

The area south of East Ohio Street and all of Cedar Avenue is designated a City Historic District and the entire neighborhood is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Major preservation efforts have included the transformation of St. Mary's Church and Priory into The Priory and The Grand Hall and the conversion of the former Latimer School into The School House apartments”

(www.pittsburghnorthside.com/8_neighborhoods/east_all.php).

Fineview

Fineview residents always offered open arms, as they seemed more than willing to participate in the study. Sitting in the community meeting, you would think that we were talking about a neighborhood in suburbia heaven. The residents were talking about a walk-a-thon coming up, and a possible street fair. I thought to myself wow, now this is a community that is integrated and working together – I have found interdependence in a neighborhood.

The Fineview neighborhood has a center point they call – The Overlook. When you pull up onto this area, you cannot miss it as it offers a stunning view of the city of Pittsburgh. The residents of Fineview have restored the Overlook, placing fresh paint on

the fencing and planting some shrubbery to make the area comfortable. As you turn the corner from this area, you start down a street that is tightly housed with cars parked on both sides of the road. To your right you can see the community groups newest endeavor of beautiful town homes – not quite finished but well on their way.

All this wonderful neighborhood make-up sits on one street, what you may call the main street of Fineview – even though it has no businesses what so ever, nothing but homes. I can't offer enough glamour to describe the coziness of this one street. The problem with this is, this one street does not represent most of Fineview in its glamour. The rest of Fineview sits on twisted and curvy roads that look to be treacherous during the wintertime. To get to Fineview, you have to drive through what has been described to me, by the officer, as “a drug thoroughfare”. This area is home to visual hotspots and also one of the most problem jitney stations in all of the North Side.

To sum up Fineview, I believe it has great potential for organization but they also have some serious skeletons in their closet. Most of the community group members come from a very small area, centered on this suburbia heaven discussed above. Their main issue is the large government-housing that sits only a short distance from their Fineview's new town homes. Fineview knows their issues, as they address them in their board meetings with concerns to being able to sell their newly built \$160,000 town homes in an area that does show visible signs of disorganization.

Community web-site: Fineview
“The Best of Both Worlds

Rural living right in the city—that's Fineview. Almost totally residential, this tiny neighborhood is perched high on the hillside behind Allegheny

General Hospital. Residents boast that their views of downtown Pittsburgh are the finest on the North Side.

Close, Convenient and Charming

Fineview offers quaint, tucked away places, breathtaking city views, and yards and green space not expected in a community so close to the city proper. Virtually all of the North Side and downtown Pittsburgh are within walking distance. Although there are historic houses located in Fineview, the neighborhood is not an historic neighborhood. Recently, the charm of this neighborhood has been rediscovered.

A City Getaway

Early residents built homes on the hill as an escape from the continuous soot of the city's industry. Public staircases were built on the hillside to allow residents access to streets above or below, and most importantly, to employment in the businesses and factories of the North Side and Pittsburgh. When streetcars rambled their way through city streets, it was the route through Fineview that was considered the most scenic of the entire transit system.

Ongoing Development

Through the Fineview Citizens Council, Fineview Crest 1 became its first development effort. The success of this 12 home project spurred the Council to continue developing along Meadville Street and several scattered sites with Fineview Crest II. Again, this new development met with success, and phase III is in planning. The council successfully

completed the restoration of the Catoma Street Overlook and is finalizing a special project, in collaboration with the Art Institute of Pittsburgh, for the refurbishment of the public staircase and historic fencing at Carrie Street. In addition, the community has been working toward the designation of much of the hillside as a public greenway” (www.pittsburghnorthside.com/8_neighborhoods/fineview.php).

METHODS

Through attendance of community meetings the researcher was able to establish contact with residents of each neighborhood. Through the initial volunteers, further contacts outside of the community group was also established. Attempts were made to reach residents of each of these neighborhoods that would not be considered active in the community. The Interviews will attempt to measure several different developmental factors:

- Collective efficacy levels within the neighborhood.
- Resident’s confidence in the police and their ability to maintain order and deter crime.
- Resident’s ability to feel confidence and trust in their fellow neighbors.
- Cohesion among the neighbors
- Personal attachment to the neighborhood
- Fear of disorder, crime, and victimization.

The methods chosen were individual interviews in an attempt to provide a valid way to measure neighborhood development in terms of the resident’s collective thinking. It is important to note that the researcher is not claiming that the neighborhood as a whole

has a “psyche” or “mind” that transcends the individual residents. The claim made by others, in which I am attempting to research, is that the residents in the neighborhood think about each other and the police about the same way at the same time. For example in some neighborhoods most if not all residents think the police should handle all issues related to disorder. In other neighborhoods this is not necessarily the case.

Interviews will offer anonymity to the subjects while also giving them the chance to freely speak regarding any issues and views they may feel are important. In addition to interviews with residents, the researcher attended regular meetings of the official Community Organization, which existed in all four of the neighborhoods in the study. Finally, the researcher conducted interviews with four police officers that patrol these chosen neighborhoods. Two of the Officers are what is known as “community problem solving officers,” the other officers are higher-ranking and not only respond to the specific neighborhoods but also oversee the patrolling of the areas.

The proposed outcome of this study is to examine the geographic space the residents view as their neighborhood, their relationship within their neighborhood pertaining to the control of public space, and the belief in the ability of the police to protect them from crime and disorder.

FINDINGS

Research Question 1:

What do the residents consider the geographic boundaries of “their neighborhood”? How do they identify with “their neighborhood”? What physical boundaries do they recognize as the beginning and end to their neighborhood?

Manchester

Manchester residents have a strong connection not only with each other but also with the neighborhood. Many of the homes in the area are inter-generational and have now become part of the historic society. Each resident interviewed has fond memories of Manchester, it was obvious these residents “love this neighborhood.” The residents consider the Manchester neighborhood an “old neighborhood”. Some residents still view the geographic boundaries of the neighborhood the same as when their parents set their play area, *“My boundaries were defined as a child. My parents said, do not cross this point. Man, you couldn’t get away with nothing then. Someone always knew someone that knew your family.”* These geographic boundaries defined by the parents avoided the more industrial areas and heavily traveled roads.

Some neighborhood residents face problems with disorder in the area. One resident, which only recognized the street she lived on as her neighborhood, was plagued with fear: *“I recognize Nixon Street as my neighborhood, it’s only 1 block long.” I know all my neighbors on this street but I wouldn’t go off this block. At this end of the street (the resident points to the end of the block that is only about 10 yards from her front door step), they built that highway and wiped 500 homes out of Manchester. At the other end of Nixon they built government housing and now that area is bad news. Those kids don’t like pretty -they don’t like anything nice.”*

Some residents of Manchester recognized that parts of the area have disorder. Regardless, they still felt conjoined to these areas even though they are several blocks away from their homes. *“North Ave. to Pennsylvania Avenue is my neighborhood”* (this area covered approximately an 8-10 blocks of Manchester). Manchester residents

seemed defensive and protective of the neighborhood, which could explain why they were willing to accept the corporate identification of the boundaries the city assigned to them.

When I asked the residents to tell me what they considered their personal neighborhood, the answer was relatively the same, “*I consider all of Manchester as my neighborhood.*” The residents felt this way even though the Manchester neighborhood stretches over many blocks. The residents seemed to identify with what Suttles would consider a – “defended neighborhood”. A defended neighborhood is the smallest unit with a corporate identity where residents “assume a relative degree of security on the streets as compared to adjacent areas” (Suttles 1973). These residents recognize with the corporate identity designated by the City of Pittsburgh.

As the interviews progressed, the story was the same. The residents had no problem saying that they grew up in the area and recognized “*all of Manchester as their home.*” Although, when the same residents were asked to identify the boundaries of the neighborhood on a map – they only claimed approximately half of the Manchester area. What was not included, were specific areas of Manchester. The postal plaza represented a boundary, the relatively new highway represented a boundary, and the back streets that are home to a higher level of disorder also represented a boundary.

What is clear in the neighborhood is a common feeling of cohesion and a shared conception of spatial boundaries. As the research questions are explored, it becomes clear that Manchester residents share more than just an emotional connection to their neighborhood, the majority also recognized the same boundaries that are outlined above.

Fineview

Based on the interviews, Fineview residents seem relatively cohesive. The community group is working hard to make the neighborhood a better living area. The community group meets on a regular basis and has invested in the area by restoring old homes and building new ones. The concerns present in Fineview are similar to the other neighborhoods but are also equally distinct with conflicting issues. Through examination of the research questions – it will become clear what the issues in Fineview are.

This area, as does Manchester, also claims all of Fineview as their neighborhood. *“When trying to identify with a specific neighborhood of Fineview – there is no boundaries, if there is, they are virtually invisible.”* Fineview residents do seem to be more precise when considering their “safe area” than Manchester; *“Belleau Street and Marsonia Street - 2 blocks from home. I recognize my block as only 5 to 6 houses surrounding my home.”*

What is different in Fineview? When they are asked to identify their boundaries the residents of the neighborhood don’t include a fairly large section of the area. Sitting at the bottom of hill, just below a striving residential section of Fineview, is what the residents call “The Dwellings.” The Dwellings is a government funded apartment (i.e., “the projects”) complex that shares the same boundaries but is far disconnected from the community of Fineview. I asked the residents how they believed other residents of Fineview would define the neighborhood. Offering an interesting answer that helps to show the division in the community - *“Territorial depending on where the residents live.”* The police laughed as I asked them about The Dwellings; *“Oh – that’s what they are calling it now. We have always just called it the projects.”*

The residents actually acknowledge the separation between Fineview and The Dwellings: *“Fineview and The Dwellings are two different worlds that don’t interact at all. They don’t want to be bothered with us and we leave them alone.”* As the researcher recognized earlier, there are different theories about why a section of a neighborhood may not be included in the over-all identification of the area. There is usually some type of constraint restricting the connection between the specific area and the residents. The residents of Fineview at no point declared their fear of the Dwellings but went into great detail giving examples of disorder. It is the researcher’s belief that fear is at the root of the division between Fineview and the Dwellings

East Allegheny

East Allegheny has obvious structural limitations with pockets of businesses and restored homes while also housing several deteriorated buildings. East Allegheny also has an interstate that divides the area almost in half, leaving the residents recognizing with one side of the highway or the other: *“The neighborhood consists of about 3 blocks long and 8 blocks wide. That is the majority of E. Allegheny up until the highway divides the area”*. The residents recognize the highway as a boundary of their neighborhoods but also as a structural constraint to disorder, *“My defended neighborhood is below E. Ohio Street, up until the highway. The highway divides the good area of E. Allegheny and the bad area.”*

Some residents of East Allegheny live in a section that offers a convenient walk to the downtown city. This section doesn’t fight much crime and disorder, but is mainly concerned with litter and loud music and minor issues of disorder. *“My defended neighborhood is all of E. Allegheny, I jog the streets every morning. I’m familiar and active in this area, (about a 10 x 5 block area).”* In the case where disorder is not as

much of an issue, the residents seem to recognize their block on a much larger scale. Some East Allegheny residents have more serious issues with disorder, such as drug dealing and prostitution. The residents seem to see their neighborhood on a smaller scale. *“Three blocks and the 2 alleyways within them, I would consider my neighborhood. The block is not significant, I consider all of Avery Street my neighborhood.”*

Central North Side

Attending the Central North Side community meeting was an interesting event by itself. The community group felt that it is beneficial to hold the community meetings in the center of their problem area. This particular meeting was held on the front porch of a home on Monterey Street, which is rumored to be a large gang and drug area. During the meeting, cars with loud music circled the area and occasionally stopped at the corner where 5 or 6 young African American men stood. The residents attending the meeting didn't even seem to notice the music or the eyes watching them from the corner.

In an attempt to examine the residential view of Central North Side, I simply asked them; “How would you define your neighborhood?” Much like Fineview, the residents considered Central North Side and the Mexican War Streets as two separate areas, even though they are both within the corporate boundaries of the Central North Side neighborhood. *“Central North Side is an area within an area. Some residents recognize with Central North Side and some recognize with the Mexican War Streets as their neighborhood.”* The area is not only defined by the “corporate identity” given to them by the city, the area is also defined in terms of class, *“The front streets (the Mexican War Streets) are a young modern area. The Back streets (Central North Side) are Section 8 housing.”*

Research Question 2

Who do the residents of this neighborhood believe is responsible for maintaining order in the neighborhood? Do they believe the responsibility falls only on the police, only on themselves as residents, or is it a joint effort between the residents and the police?

Manchester

Maintaining order in Manchester seemed to be more of an issue to the police than it did the residents of the neighborhood. The residents expressed feelings of safety in the area as their main concern was in confronting issues before they became problems. Although they recognize some problem areas, the residents didn't feel their neighborhood had any serious problems they needed to address.

In Manchester, who is responsible for maintaining order? It was established in earlier writing that Manchester is an "old style" neighborhood. Some of the ways in which this neighborhood monitors its surroundings shows that Manchester residents are working together. They rely on each other to keep an eye on their surroundings. *"If we see the mail in the mail boxes for too long, we want to know what is going on, we watch out for each other."*

Manchester residents seem to know whom they can rely on and whom they can't. Residents in Manchester feel a loyalty to other residents of the area, even if these residents would be considered somewhat untraditional, *"There is an old homeless man that lives in the abandoned house adjacent from mine. He is always playing music for the kids and out sitting on the front steps, I know he would let me know if anything was going on in the neighborhood."*

Residents of Manchester feel as if they can trust their neighbors and feel secure that they would intervene in times of trouble. *“If there was a problem, my neighbors would call us or we would call each other. I once had an electrical line fall down and across the top of my car, a neighbor called us and let us know.”* The residents here feel secure that their belongings and homes are safe. When issues arise Manchester residents are prepared to take on whatever arises, *“Manchester will rally around issues if needed to get results. For example, the gas company tore up the sidewalks and didn’t bother to fix them. We called up the city and made enough noise until they finally did fix them. People that have been here for a long time rally to keep things nice.”*

When faced with issues that could easily be considered serious, Manchester residents have joined together as a neighborhood to make changes; *“We had some drug dealers hanging out on the corner, so the neighborhood held a prayer circle for 45 minutes every evening until drug dealers moved on.”* This is a neighborhood that is willing to address the tuff issues and seems to be prepared for any future problems.

When asked what the residents view as the main issues of the area, it was unanimous that the concern centered on the lack of productive pro-social activities for juveniles. Due to budget cuts over the years, the local pool and recreational center has been closed down. The juveniles have nothing but time on their hands. *“Kids are out of control. Kids are loitering and being loud, and they even refuse to move away from the front of your house when you ask them to.”* Some residents have even been victims of the kid’s destruction, *“some kids I guess painted all over the side of my house”,* the residents still didn’t directly blame the juveniles or take responsibility for creating activities themselves, *“There are no programs in this neighborhood that serves the youth*

at all. I wish the police would make an effort to do something with our youth, maybe a softball team or some kind of activity.”

Fineview

“If I see something, I'm telling but that is not the consensus in my neighborhood”.

I wouldn't normally start out a paragraph with a quote, but I think this sentence holds a lot of meaning, especially when trying to sum up Fineview and their view of maintaining order in their neighborhood. The important question here is to whom and what are they telling?

The Fineview residents interviewed were endearing and genuinely had a love for their neighborhood. What was obvious to me was that the love they felt was for the way things used to be in the area – not the way they are now. *“This place used to be safe ten years ago. We never locked our doors or had problems. We used to sleep on our porches, now - I wouldn't close my eyes on my porch.”* The residents didn't only share a sense of safety in the area; there was also a feeling of camaraderie, *“People used to pick-up the neighbor's paper or mail when they were out of town. The residents would get together and send flowers to funerals as a neighborhood when someone died, and if someone were sick we would do their laundry for them”.* What changed in the area? The residents felt the Consent Decree changed a lot around the city. *“Thirty years ago Fineview was 70% white, now it is 100% black”.*

Even though the area does have to deal with some problems, Fineview ranks among the lowest in crime on the North Side. They are an active community group that has worked hard to revitalize their neighborhood by taking the initiative to build new homes and restore old ones. Knowing this, what are they afraid of? *“I'm afraid. I don't*

feel safe. There is a lot of noise and violence in the area.” The noise and violence is coming from “The Dwellings” a low income-housing unit that sits below their neighborhood.

The Dwellings foster a lot of fear into the Fineview neighborhood, even though the crime statistics tell us the area has relatively low crime. The fear is specific to the residents of the area, even if the crime statistics tell us “this is the place to live.” The residents have seen things to fuel their fear, *“I viewed 3 men shot, out my front window and 1 of them died right there,”* this resident’s front window faces the Dwellings. When I asked the residence if they felt safe in the area, ranking 5 as very safe, and 1 as not safe at all, *“On a scale of 1-5: maybe a 2. If drugs become anymore prevalent in this area, it will drop to a 1. Although, we do look out for one another and call the police in times of trouble, the drug dealers are taking or trying to take over Fineview.”*

East Allegheny

East Allegheny is unique in the fact that it sits so comfortably close to the downtown city. The residents recognize that much like the Mexican War Streets, East Allegheny is the home to many young, working, middle class residents. This in itself could be a problem, as they seem to have different expectations of the area. They could become easy targets for motivated offenders as they leave themselves vulnerable, believing their area has less crime then it actually does.

Who do the residents of East Allegheny feel is responsible for their safety? It is clear that there is a high level of dependence on the police among these residents. They feel the police should be tending to everything from litter to drug dealers. *“When you see something happening, the other residents don’t understand they have to be pro-active,*

they have to call 911.” I’m not saying they are completely wrong with this thinking, but they offer little help when tending to the needs of the neighborhood, “I have a cell phone just for calling 911. I call for people drinking in the park, kids throwing asphalt or garbage in the pool, drinking on steps or in the playground, graffiti. I call the police to take care of these things, it is beyond the power of the residents.” The residents of East Allegheny seem to feel that as taxpayers, they have the right to the police’s full attention. The police should tend to the disorder in the area, such as graffiti and litter, *“Citizens are not feared or respected as the police. It is more affective to have extra hours of policing. Police need to take stronger action such as issuing citations and arresting for nuisance crimes. That could solve a lot of problems.”*

Central North Side

Central North Side has problems not specifically exclusive to the area such as litter, drugs, truancy, loud music, juveniles, and people fighting in the street. These problems include the complaints of all four neighborhoods to some degree or another. One of the main problems this area faces is their discrepancy in the perception of safety between the Mexican War Streets and Central North Side.

The residents of MWS believe their area is separate from the types of disorder that is occurring throughout CNS. They believe this even though it contradicts the crime statistics that show that the crime is also heavy in the MWS. *“MWS is safe; their priority is restoration of older homes.”* Even when there has been prevalent crime in the area the residents down play it. *“There was a rash of burglaries between 2000 and 2001 on the War Streets border but that was quickly resolved without further incidence.”* The MWS residents seem to be cohesive but only on the faceblock level, *“My neighbors on this block are trustworthy; we share keys to each other’s houses.”* This keeps them feeling

safe until you begin to drift out of the MWS and back into the neighborhoods of Central North Side, *“I feel safe in my area but I wouldn’t drive up into the upper blocks at night.”*

It is clear that the safety and cohesion level among residents in the MWS is different than the residents of CNS. The CNS residents realize they have big problems in the area and are up against desperate odds, *“This area is not a safe area, people here are scared.”* *“People won’t even answer their doors around here because they are so fearful.”* This story is very different than what the residents of the MWS are saying. Only a few blocks separate these residents. They share the same front streets and must deal with the same transients passing through their neighborhood going to the only grocery store in town.

Some of the residents believe they are responsible for taking control of the area, but feel this way out of desperation, *“I feel the need to protect myself.”* This could become an issue of the innocent becoming the accused if neighborhood residents feel the need to carry, and if necessary, use weapons. A particular resident that was interviewed was literally forced to take measures to protect themselves, as they became a target of discrimination, *“I was driven to get involved; it became a survival mode for me.”*

Research Question 3

How do the residents of these neighborhoods view the police? What are their beliefs about the effectiveness of police for maintaining order in the neighborhood? Do they feel the police know what is in the neighborhoods best interest?

Manchester

Manchester is unique in this study due to the relationship this neighborhood has with the police. Manchester residents are relatively dissatisfied with the police and the job they are doing. They do recognize that the police are under constraints due to the budget cuts, but the issues here go further than that. Manchester residents don't share a feeling of cohesion with the police, they don't feel as if the police are working towards the same goals as they are, *"The police don't answer the needs of this neighborhood. The relationship the police have with this area could be a lot better."*

What is the underlying problem that plaques the relationship between Manchester and the police? You won't hear it from the police but it is clear that there is tension present for specific reasons, *"Community was not happy with how the police chose to deal with our gang problem. Officers ruffed up kids for being disrespectful. In the past, the police were not called because of racial tension."* In the prior section, it was obvious that the residents of Manchester recognized they have an issue with juveniles on the street. The way the residents want to deal with the problem and the way the police choose to deal with the problem are two very different tactics.

What are the consequences of this division between the residents in Manchester and the police? There is some communication between the Manchester Community Center and police in the area – but the communication is not regarding the issues of concern in Manchester. Because these residents are so tight knit, they often work among themselves to solve issues in the area instead of looking for leadership from the police. *"I think it depends on the police and their attitude towards you whether you can trust them or not."*

My neighbors wouldn't normally call the police unless it was something real bad. I would expect the police to respond to shootings and fighting's."

In some ways this attitude is good as it shows that this neighborhood is relatively interdependent and working with each other to address issues of disorder. It also shows that there is a great deal of conflict in the area specifically between the residents and the police, *"The police are on the take. The only thing this neighborhood feels confident about is that the police will shoot someone if they call them."* The lack of trust and confidence in the police varied in degrees, but it was obvious the relationships had been taxed and didn't foster much confidence in the abilities of the police. *"The police do a good job but not as good as they used to when Robin B. (a patrol officer that recently retired) was here. She had the drugs under some control but now they are creeping back into the area."* The residents were willing to admit that police relations had improved but they were still not meeting the needs of the neighborhood. *"The relationship with the police has gotten better. The police respond most of the time."*

Fineview

The Fineview residents are willing to volunteer in the defense of their neighborhood. They are clearly invested in the area – historically and financially. The residents also feel a close tie to the police that work the area, *"Police come to the community meetings and the festivals; we have a good relationship with them."* The researcher later found out that several of the Zone 1 police officers live in the Fineview area, but the officers do not actually want anyone to know this, including their fellow neighbors. They feel this will make them vulnerable to the other residents of the area.

Some residents are willing to volunteer their help to the police by opening up their homes and driveways to the police for the purpose of combating issues, *“People always zoom through the stop sign by my house. When I’m out in the yard working and they can see me, they always stop because I will yell at them if they don’t. I’ve let the police come and sit in my driveway to pull anyone over that doesn’t stop.”* The residents also watch out for each other, especially when it comes to the elderly in the area, *“there used to be quite a watching out for each other. We would have this older lady that lived down the block, flicker her lights just to let us know she was ok.”*

The residents initially stated that they trust the police and feel they share any information they have concerning the neighborhood. Initially when the interview began, the researcher was getting good comments from the residents. As the interviews continued, most of the residents began to speak in a different manner regarding the police in the area. *“I do trust the police the majority of the time, unless they are part of the problem. (I inquire for the interviewee to elaborate): A cop in the neighborhood was related to a problem person in the Dwellings. That cop refused to arrest them even though they were actually known to be drug dealing. The trust I have with the police is ‘situational’.”*

The residents agreed on one thing, *“people do not feel the police are as responsive as they need to be.”* It seems as if the police have not been responsive to the residents of the area, *“I would take the license plate #'s of cars coming there for drugs, I would take the license #'s straight to the police station, they would say - call narcotics and narcotics would say – call your state representative.”* By the time the interviews ended, it became clear that there were some issues between the residents and the police.

East Allegheny

The residents in East Allegheny do not have a favorable of the police. That is directly connected to the level of dependence the residents have on them. The police cannot completely accomplish the needs of this neighborhood, in turn the residents feel they are not trying, *“Police can’t do everything for the most part but also, they just won’t do it.”* In general, the residents seem to lack confidence in the police, *“Police generally respond to disorder issues.”*

Much like the Mexican War Street residents, the East Allegheny residents feel the police are not compassionate to their situation, *“I was talking to a young officer that came around while I was working on fixing my house up; the officer said, you should just tear it down.”* Along the same lines the residents feel disconnected from the police, feeling as if there is not any real relationship between them, *“People do not know the officers – the officers do not communicate and this creates a barrier between the residents and the police.”*

Some residents of East Allegheny expressed satisfaction with the police and were pleased with the way they patrol the area, *“Police listen well and communicate well, they do a descent job - I’m satisfied.”* The researcher believes that resident satisfaction is based more on the geographic location - where these residents live. Even these residents that portrayed satisfaction with the police recognized that the neighborhood has their problem areas. They felt the police could handle these areas better, *“We need a stronger police presence on E. Ohio Street.”* Like many other residents in the North Side, people would like to see the police get back to their old way of patrolling, *“We would like to have more police around especially beat cops.”*

The residents that expressed disappointed and were less willing to get involved, lived on the opposite end of the East Allegheny neighborhood than the residents that portrayed satisfaction with the police. These residents live in an area where the City has worked to plant trees and flowers along the sidewalk – and where visible restoration of buildings was being done. Police crime stats do not denote a higher or lower rate of crime in any of these areas, but there is a distinguishable difference in neighborhood design. From outsider looking in – I question who is really to blame here. If the neighborhood design plays that strong of a role in the satisfaction of residents, why are the police being questioned for the willingness to engage and participate?

Central North Side

Attending CNS community meetings and hearing concerns made it clear that the residents in this area are unhappy with how the police are responding to the problems in their area. The residents believe that the police think they just shouldn't have moved here, and deserve whatever problems they may have, *"The police are less empathetic due to where we live. They blame us for owning homes around here. The police say: This is what you get when you move to a high crime area."* This is where the "cultures clash". Some residents have spent a lot of money to restore the beautiful historic homes in these areas. These residents have different expectations of police and the neighborhood than residents that have lived here all their lives. *"The police just blame it on the area."*

CNS does not have as high of a dependence on the police as other neighborhoods studied. These residents are willing to take action and fight disorder. They have a different way of handling issues with police than have been seen in the other neighborhoods. The Mexican War Streets consist of residents that are more financially

stable and often highly educated. These residents use the political arena to make changes within their neighborhood. *“The area has become more political so the police answer calls out of fear of harassment”*. Examining this comment, the police stated that, *“this area calls the chief’s office before calling us.”* *“A few years ago the police were just giving us “lip service. Now the police are more responsive because it has become more political”*. These residents know, that to get a street bureaucrats attention you contact the elected bureaucrat in charge.

These “take charge” attitudes from the residents have gotten the police’s attention. This attention has actually restored relationships between the residents and the police, to some degree. *“I trust the police more so then I did before. The police have their priorities. Loud music is low on the priority list for the police; you just have to be persistent”*. The CNS residents do acknowledge an attempt by police to make things better, *“The cops in the last year are patrolling the streets more. They do the best they can.”*

The residents feel that the police could do something’s better, which would help improve the relationship between them and the residents. *“They could communicate, be more sympathetic, and listen.”* One of the main issues inhibiting the relationship between the residents and the police is knowledge of the neighborhood. The residents don’t feel that the police understand or know the area well enough to perform policing successfully. *“The police need to be more aware and have more knowledge about what is going on in area. We expect them to have general knowledge about the area and the issues that affect us, but the police are limited.”*

Police

The officers assigned to North Side Police Department, also known as “Zone 1”, feel they are working against the odds. Financial cutbacks have shaved the department to the bone – leaving the officers feeling vulnerable with little support. *“Zone 1 is 29% understaffed, more than any other zone in Pittsburgh. The city, as a whole, took a 49% decrease in manpower.”* Pittsburgh suffered bankruptcy a few years ago, having to make major cutbacks to survive. The police seem to feel as if they have taken the hardest hit within the city. *“Manpower and budgets are the biggest enemies of police. The cops here dropped by a third. Name one other city that has as many firefighters as they do cops.”*

Pittsburgh isn’t known to be a high crime city, but with the staffing cuts there is concern whether the police can maintain control of the city. The concern comes from the staffing cuts, but also from the affects of the consent decree the City adopted. The consent decree broke up large clusters of section 8 housing in an attempt to make equal housing available within the city. The consent decree managed to develop gentrification in several neighborhoods within the city. *“The city is guilty of placing Section 8 housing into neighborhoods where they are out of their atmosphere. There is power in groups and the Section 8 housing is a big enough group to cause problems.”* The city had good intentions but actually ended up causing more problems then they solved. *“The mayor wanted to change the face of the city.”*

The police are not only suffering from budget cuts but also from the pressures of bureaucracy, brought on by elected officials. *“You can’t do anything unless you’re in charge. You have to address the citizens concerns.”* The officers feel as if they have the knowledge and the ability to express what is good for the area. Their ideas come from experience of working within the neighborhoods. They want to be considered by the

administration and the residents. *“We need more community problems solving officers; they need to be able to help address and control where money is spent in the neighborhoods. The residents need to ask us, “Where should the playground be built?”*

The police feel that community members are not aware or understand what the budget cuts have done to the department. *“Community members have to understand and gain knowledge that minor problems in the area that we are made to address can make us miss the big problems.”* The police often find themselves addressing issues that would not be considered emergencies. They must do this to keep some residents that know how to get the police’s attention, from calling the Chief of Police and making complaints. *“Community groups are no more than a voting block. They get what they done what they want by influencing the elected officials.”* The police feel as if they are being pulled away from serious problems to address issues that should be handled by residents. *“You always have to oil the squeaky wheel.”*

There is a feeling that some residents are completely disconnected from the reality of their neighborhood. *“New people come in and buy houses and they are sources of problems – I hear from them a lot.”* The residents have an illusion of how the area should be instead of what it really is. *“The Mexican War Streets (inside of Central North Side), residents believe they are living somewhere else - like Beverly Hills.”* This issue is the center of many problems within the North Side. The Consent Decree conjoined many high income and low-income residents together. *“People want to change the face of the neighborhood even when they don’t have any right to. What was once excepted action is now a problem. Like loud music; some areas like it and some areas don’t.”*

Some of the officers have developed hard feelings toward the residents that have moved into the area with unreasonable expectations of what the police can do. *“Just because you come in and buy a big house you want to change the atmosphere. The drug dealers should be gone; they also want the basketball hoop in the middle of the road moved and now the kids that were not hurting anything, now they have nothing to do.”*

The police feel that the new residents coming into the area have a misconception of what the area is like. Some officers believe that these residents have been deceived into purchasing the expensive restored homes without being made aware of the conditions of the area. *“These people were ‘dubbed’ into buying these houses. They are bailing against the tides.”*

The police feel the residents expect more than they can deliver. The high level of expectations placed on the police fosters problems as the residents feel let down and dissatisfied with the work the police are performing. When I asked the officers, “Do you feel the residents are happy with the work you are doing in their neighborhoods?” The officers made it clear that they feel as if they are fighting a losing battle, *“We are only a tool for people to use but no one explains to them how to use it. We are not ever doing anything according to them.”*

Some of the officers recognize that residents have come to expect certain things from police. With the budget and staffing cuts, residents feel that police practices have dropped. *“People expect a certain level of policing. You can’t give someone something and then take it away.”* The residents want the same level of policing they received prior to the staffing cuts. The police must stretch half the amount of officers over the same amount of area, which inevitably leads to dissatisfaction by the residents.

It is a hard to accept that the police cannot successfully do everything by themselves. Community groups that work with the police have the ability to confront disorder at its earliest stages. *“People have to make their area uncomfortable for the drug dealer to be there.”* I asked the officers what it would take for these neighborhoods to become active communities groups that are affective against crime and disorder? *“It takes a strong unified front. Participation - people who understand and have knowledge about what is going and can add insight to the situation.”*

The officers believe that residents are looking to the wrong bureaucrats to make significant change in their neighborhoods. *“Go after the formal controls more and quit ranting at the police and pressure the people that actually need to be pressured.”* The police believe the residents could be very helpful by just simply increasing their knowledge of what the law allows them to do. *“Our main issue with people is the public’s lack of knowledge regarding who the Officers can arrest and who they can’t. People are not aware of what the police can do and how to address the problem.”*

I moved onto to ask the officers about each of the neighborhoods. I wanted to know their initial impression of the area, what were the main issues, and was their trust between them and the residents? *“Central North Side is an area that has a lot of transients. They have a reality issue – they want us to take drunks from bar to bar to see who claims the wreckage. The silent majority probably trusts us but there is no opportunity to interact with them.”*

Fineview went back and forth in regards to their satisfaction with the police. Their issues are much like the other neighborhoods except there disconnect from the section of their neighborhood called the Dwellings. When I asked the officers about the

Dwellings the officers laughed saying, *“That’s what they’re calling it now, we just call it the Projects.”* The division in the neighborhood is also visible to the police, *“It is more than geographic that divides Fineview and the Dwellings. Those people stay over on their side. I don’t think they care what the people in Fineview think; they don’t give a thought to Fineview. The Dwellings and Fineview are 2 different neighborhoods.”*

The officers also say that they don’t hear from the residents in Fineview as much as they would like to. *“I never hear from them. What happens in the meetings, I hear from Forest.”* This silence from the neighborhood could mean different things such as distrust, as we have heard from other neighborhoods, but also because they are an active community group taking care of things. *“Good crew; a few issues regarding housing and drug problems. Themselves and housing have stayed on top of things until budget cuts.”* The police feel that these residents are generally satisfied with the job they are doing in the area, *“They voice their concerns – I respond to the problem (we address the issue).”*

East Allegheny is seen as an active area that has a descent size community group but the officers feel the residents are unreasonable and uncooperative. *“There is not a lot of cooperation. We only hear from them at meetings when they attack us”* Much of this uncooperativeness stems from lack of understanding on what the police can and can’t do. *“They don’t understand displaced crime. The people need to understand what we can do and what we can’t do. For every security you have, you give up a freedom.”*

East Allegheny seems to have the highest level of dependence on the police then any other neighborhood examined. Their expectations of what the police should be doing is conflicting as homeowners and business owners share the same streets but have different needs. *“We get a lot of business owners that don’t live in the area so they have*

different expectations than the homeowners. We get a lot of move along calls. I can solve the problem in one area but it will come back in another place.” The officers feel that the community group is active but is motivated more towards asking for response than responding to issues themselves. *“They want to be active but they want us to fix everything.”*

I asked the officers, “What do you think of the Manchester neighborhood?” *“A lot of good ideas – good approach with their community group. But there are members of the community that will not talk to us.”* “What do you mean they won’t talk to you?” *“Last week there was 3 shootings directly behind the Manchester Community Center building. I come into the department and there is a message from the community group regarding No Loitering signs, nothing about the shootings.”* As noted earlier in the thesis, the residents of Manchester have a distrust of the police. Only one officer interviewed seemed to realize this distrust existed. *“People don’t want the police presence. Kids are slinging drugs around and the families are aware of it.”*

When I asked the officers what the main issues in Manchester were, they believed the problems fell within the households. *“Manchester is a neighborhood in decline. There is no family unit so they don’t possess the ability to police and protect themselves.”* Outside of the household the problems lay within the streets, *“Areas main problems stem from drugs. It is our biggest drug supplying area.”*

In general, the officers felt that Manchester residents fared well considering what they were up against. Manchester faces drug problems, gangs, and unruly juveniles. The residents have also felt the affects of the consent decree; *“Manchester is very realistic regarding changes, making Manchester into a historic region (the city shot themselves*

right in the foot). The families that have lived there for a long time have had to move because they can't afford the homes or to restore the homes."

I asked the officers some questions regarding resources and what could be done in each of these neighborhoods if they were not a concern? *"Money is a huge issue – by not being able to police the neighborhoods well, were giving the criminals places where they are comfortable."* The officers feel confident that they could address the issues the neighborhoods have if the resources were available. *"We need manpower; good people in the police stations. We could load the areas with police power and develop programs where we could participate with the communities."* Without more resources the officers seem to have a grim outlook on their ability to police successful. *"Maybe the residents know what kind of cut backs were under but so do the criminals."*

I also asked the officers whether they believe these neighborhoods are able to work together and with the police to address disorder issues that may arise in the neighborhood? *"No – not with the fear level. If they don't know their neighbors, how can they trust them?"* The officers question whether the residents will be able to work with them to find resolutions to the criminal issues. *"Perceptions are different; there are some big misunderstandings with police and residents."*

As much as I tried to lead the officers towards discussion regarding the ability of the communities to police themselves, the conversation always lead back to what they (the police) were capable of doing. *"If you know what the problem is you can fix it. We go out and take away everything comfortable for the criminals and then the judges are not reasonable."* It seems the officers are not only fighting the dissatisfaction of the residents but also their own self-fulfilling prophecy that they are supposed to take care of

everything. *“We use zero-tolerance – who does that target? We have to get through the stigma to relate to the people.”*

The researcher also inquired what the police officers consider the boundaries of the neighborhoods. The answers were more than interesting as it became clear that the officers do not normally recognize the neighborhood itself, but by the disorder issues the area has: *“We do everything by paroles. There is a certain parole everyone is assigned to”*. *“We break it down per neighborhood and types of crimes.”*

Even if the officer did recognize the neighborhood by name, they still acknowledged how they operate: *“I major on census tracts”*, *“We see everything in sectors or zones.”* This is no fault of the police; they are working how they are trained. They are trained to recognize issues in the specific areas they are told to patrol. Even Commanders must recognize their problems on a zone level not on a specific neighborhood level.

Structural constraints to neighborhood development: Pittsburgh consent decree did away with large government housing units, spreading section 8 housing throughout the city with NO specific area un-included. This opened up doors to gentrification in white and black residential areas.

CHAPTER III

Discussion

In the following section, I intend to present a context grounded in some of the sociological literature, described above, dealing with neighborhood-level social processes. I do not intend to repeat all the findings again in this section; however, I will provide some examples of group level phenomena that seem to support these theoretical perspectives. For example, Sampson and Raudenbush (1997) found that neighborhoods

possess the group-level property “collective efficacy.” They defined collective efficacy as “cohesion among residents combined with shared expectations for the social control of public space” (Bandura 1999 p603). They also found that collective efficacy and disorder, both social and physical, are related to each other in the following way: the more collective efficacy the lower the levels of crime and disorder. Following up on this insight, Nolan, Conti, & McDevitt (2004) proposed that collective efficacy didn’t just appear, but was the late stage of a developmental process that paralleled human development. They posit that neighborhoods (and other small groups) pass through, regress to, or get stuck in one of three developmental stages. As it applies in this research, the earliest stage is identified by residents being overly dependent on the police to solve all problems related to public safety, including small displays of disorder, such as groups of youths hanging out on the corner, loud radios, barking dogs, among other things. As long as the police are able to take care of these things, the residents of neighborhoods remain dependent. However, when the police can no longer keep up with relatively minor complaints of disorder, the residents become dissatisfied and move to a stage of conflict. In this stage, the residents are pitted against the police. If collective activity does exist it may be to make complaints against the police for incompetence. In order for neighborhoods-as-wholes to move out of the stage of conflict, they must resolve the conflict. Resolving it in favor of more efficient police services moves the neighborhood back toward “dependences” (stage 1 of the process). If the residents come to realize that the police alone cannot solve all their problems, and that they too must participate, they will then move to a more mature stage of “interdependence.” For Nolan et al. (2004), interdependence was the equivalent of collective efficacy. In other words, what Sampson

and Raudenbush (1997) established was that some neighborhoods have collective efficacy while others don't. What Nolan et al. (2004) proposed is that in order for neighborhoods to achieve this property, they must successfully pass through the three developmental stages.

It is important to stress here that none of the researchers mentioned above proposed that neighborhoods had "minds" that transcend the individuals who live there. Instead, they suggest that when group-level conditions exist, such as in neighborhoods and sports teams and work groups among others, there is a psychological (or emotional) state of the group-as-whole that affect how the individuals in the group behave.

The four neighborhoods in this study are undeniably different in multiple ways. What this research was clearly able to identify was that neighborhood residents generally do think alike about the situation they are in. The salient issues concerning the neighborhood residents were virtually all the same. The residents recognized the same types of disorder, felt the same in relation to their safety within the neighborhood, and also shared the same perspective in regards to the job in which the police are doing. More specifically, there appeared to be low variability within neighborhood groups and wide variability between these groups.

One of the first findings was in regard to the residents' perspectives on the geographical boundaries of the neighborhood. The residents in each of these areas recognized the same specific structural boundaries, such as business districts, the placement of highways, and the corporate identification given to them by the city. In other words they recognized that they lived together in the same place and that their corporately identified neighborhood was their neighborhood. This may seem very basic,

but in order to assert a group-level property, it is important to establish that the residents recognized they belonged to a particular group. Even in Fineview where the residents clearly did not include an entire section of their neighborhood (The Dwellings), the residents still claimed their entire corporately identified area as their neighborhood. In other words they accepted the boundaries of their neighborhood, but shared an “us-them” opinion of certain residents within that area. This same phenomenon occurred in Manchester as residents also did not include a section 8 housing unit, as they considered it dangerous and the juveniles disrespectful.

In addition to shared views of boundaries, it was also clear in the interviews that within neighborhoods there existed shared views of the police and specifically what was expected from the police in terms of service to the community. The residents were looking to the police for guidance in every neighborhood except Manchester. Manchester residents relied on each other to watch out for each other and their neighborhood. It was common to hear Manchester residents claim that the police were incompetent in the way they approached crime and disorder. They have one tool – make and arrest – and that was it. When Manchester residents wanted to work with each other to deal with drug abuse and delinquency in the area, but when the police got involved everything fouled up. According to Nolan’s et al (2004) model, Manchester was clearly in a stage of conflict with the police. Even though the residents of Manchester did feel as if they could trust each other, there was a great amount of distrust towards the police. The residents in East Allegheny and Fineview felt as if the police were the only ones that could stop the crime and disorder within their areas. These neighborhoods displayed high levels of dependence on the police not only for crimes but for all types of

services related to dealing with disorder. These two neighborhoods had strong community groups but felt as if they were helpless in combating the crime and disorder in the area unless the police lead the fight.

The fourth neighborhood, Central North Side, seemed to fluctuate between states of conflict and dependence. The residents were in conflict with each other because of diversity of lifestyles, demographics, and socioeconomic status is intermingled within the neighborhood that was being gentrified. The Mexican War Streets (MWS) are filled with transient “yuppies” who share particular expectations of what a neighborhood should be like. They are interested in growing their investments through “sweat equity,” i.e., rehabilitating housing stock and occupying these houses for some time until their investments mature. Surrounding the MWS are government housing units that also have different expectations of what a neighborhood should be. These residents want to live a more “relaxed” type of lifestyle that includes sitting on their porches with the TV’s and radios playing loudly, allowing the kids to play basketball in the street, and use their summer swimming pools on the sidewalk. These two different cultures clash causing conflict between and among the neighborhood residents. The residents are dependent upon the police to take care of these conflicts in culture while also controlling the crime and disorder in the area.

What seems important and interesting about the findings in this study is that one is able to see phenomena at the group level (or in this case the neighborhood level) that are imperceptible at the level of the individual. This is important especially when attempting to address issues of crime and disorder. As I have presented in the finding section of this

report, the police officers assigned to these communities viewed these neighborhoods as very similar in most aspects.

In general, the police felt many of the problems that each neighborhood battled was brought on by the residents living within these neighborhoods. For example, the police felt as if the “yuppies” were unreasonable. The police believed the residents bought homes before they new the dynamics of the surrounding neighborhood “*they got dooped into buying these homes. They think they live in Beverly Hills.*” With this mixing of cultures the police became plagued with what they considered “petty calls” as they attempted to deal with small issues of questionable disorder, such as the pool blocking the sidewalk, while also fighting gangs, drugs, and prostitution.

In dealing with Manchester, the police felt the neighborhood was truly a “bad area” and came down on the neighborhood with, what they believed, was the force necessary to curb the crime problems. The problem with this is the residents felt as if it was too much force and began to feel racially profiled by the police. The police seem to be completely oblivious to the residents thinking.

As I discussed earlier, all o f the neighborhoods fight similar types of disorder such as drugs and gangs. The dynamics of these neighborhoods do differ, but the police do not seem to recognize this. The police seem to view the problems of each neighborhood as just a, “North Side” problem. They do not seem to recognize the individual neighborhoods and their efforts or problems each area faces. The police, police these areas in a “one-dimensional” way. When I say this, what I mean is they police the same way in every neighborhood. The police foster dependence in each neighborhood as they continuously say, “*you just need to call us.*” They also do not

recognize the boundaries of each neighborhood the same way the residents do. The residents are invested in many ways in the area they consider “their neighborhood.” The police do not physically or emotionally recognize these boundaries as they work, not in relation to a specific neighborhood, but in sectors that could include several neighborhoods.

Conclusion

It seems that there is disconnect between neighborhood residents and the multiple actors that interact with them, specifically those that deal with crime and disorder. These actors range from the police acting as the street level bureaucrats to the political leaders running the city. Pittsburgh residents, like residents in many large cities, recognize the existence of many social issues contributing to high crime while at the same time police resources are being cut. This study identifies additional social issues, those that are often unseen. The psychological (or emotional) state of a neighborhood as a whole can affect both how residents view their own role in controlling their public space as well as their expectations of the police in helping them. When the expectations are not matched by observable conduct (on the part of the police), conflict can develop which gets in the way of productive activity aimed at reducing crime. Dependence on the police is also unhealthy because the police are never likely to provide a level of service that would protect all residents at all times. A more mature and effective emotional state would be one of interdependence where the neighborhood residents and the police work together synergistically to prevent crime and to respond appropriately when it happens.

Although this study does not prove once and for all that “collective efficacy” reduces crime or that it develops in sequential stages from dependence to

interdependence, the findings do support these arguments. The relationships between residents in some of the neighborhoods are strong and cohesive and in some areas and disconnected and in conflict in others. The police seem oblivious to these differences and how their behavior can either support movement out of dependence and conflict toward interdependence or cause the neighborhood to get stuck. According to Sampson and Raudenbush (1997), the ability of neighborhood residents to mobilize and develop a high level of collective efficacy is the strongest deterrent of neighborhood crime and disorder. If it happens that this proposition continues to be supported in research studies at the neighborhood level, then perhaps research such as the one presented here becomes more meaningful.

EPILOGUE

Community Representation

In the following section I offer some reflection on this research and in particular the issue of community representation. When I say community representation, I am considering the neighborhood residents participating in community groups. I propose that these residents assume they are representing other neighborhood residents that choose not to participate. Over the years, participation in community groups has fluctuated. Community group participation has changed from a common practice by neighborhood residents to a small minority of community volunteers. This section of the paper will consider how territory and community representation can place obstacles in front of development of community power structures.

In attempt to better understand the neighborhoods - I rode along with officers that policed the areas, while also observing the neighborhood residents on my own endeavors.

By the time I was finished, I had been in some local restaurants, community centers, corner pubs, and neighborhood churches. I feel as if I got a descent understanding of the neighborhoods in question.

While conducting my research, it became clear to me that the residents that I was observing in the neighborhoods and the participants at the community meetings seemed noticeably different. I never initially questioned who the people attending these meetings were, of course I just assumed they were residents of the area that were concerned enough to come out of their homes and get involved. I began to explore the demographics of the area and compared them to the residents I observed at the meetings versus the people I seen in the neighborhood. This is when I began to ask myself - who are the people actually attending these community meetings? What interest do they have in the area? And do these particular people actually represent the community in question?

Turning to my dictations, I was able to further explore what the voiced concerns of the residents attending the community meetings were. Some areas were concerned about litter and graffiti in the streets, others wanted the police to issue citations for intoxicated individuals and open containers in the park. Other areas had more serious concerns such as their juveniles getting involved with drugs and gangs due to the abundance of idle time they had on their hands.

It was easy for me to see that each community had their own specific concerns but were sure about one thing, they wanted someone to fix them. I had already researched the crime stats in each neighborhood versus their voiced concerns - after comparing the figures I had to wonder whether the real issues of the neighborhoods were being voiced?

For example, East Allegheny was very upset that the police did nothing about the litter on their streets when actually aggravated assaults were up significantly in this area. Is it possible that the true underlying issues of these neighborhoods went deeper than the voiced concerns of the people attending the community meetings, and why weren't these areas properly represented?

To answer these questions, I must take you through what I found that made me question the community representation in these neighborhoods. I began rehashing the meetings I attended while comparatively looking at the demographics of the neighborhoods. What I found may not be stunning but it is enough to bring concern:

- The first meeting I attended was in a rather depressed area on the N. Side called Spring Garden. The meeting was held in the basement of the local community church with fourteen people in attendance including the 2 officers and myself. The people in attendance were older in age with the youngest maybe being in their mid 50's. Looking at the 2000 Census, 62% of the Spring Garden population is between the ages of 20 – 45. If the community population were being equivalently matched, the age range of the meeting would have been much younger.
- The next meeting I attended was in East Allegheny. This meeting was held in a cafeteria of a nice high-rise retirement home. There were 19 people in attendance at the meeting with no more than 3 African Americans present. The people at this meeting were primarily white professionals (lawyers, nurses, judges, etc...) and seemed to be at least in the middle class range. The 2000 Census averages that over 25% of the East Allegheny population is African American. There are approximately

1,413 households in E. Allegheny, 31% have an average income of less than \$10,000.

More than 46% of the households have an average income of less than \$15,000.

- The third community meeting I attended was in the area of Fineview. The meeting was held in the boardroom of a very well known Pittsburgh television station. When I walked in, the meeting had already begun. The focus of the meeting at this point was the recently finished new housing units the Fineview Community Board had financed. The negotiation of setting prices for these homes was the topic, the debate was whether to sell the homes for \$150,000 or \$160,000. There were approximately 12 community members present for the meeting with 2 African Americans in attendance. The board members were using lap top computers to take notes with and seemed to be dressed as if representing the upper middle class. The 2000 Census states that Fineview is over 50% African American and has 33.5% of their total families living below the poverty level. Fineview also has one of the worst crime rates on the N. Side, but the majority of the community meeting rested on the selling of these newly built town homes that would be priced out of range for at least 33.5% of the Fineview population.

Relinquishing Control

There could be a number of reasons why the residents attending these meetings didn't necessarily mirror the members of the community. I will consider not only individual choices made by the residents choosing not to participate but also larger affects of group efficacy. One of the first reasons I would consider for lack of participation, is that other community residents are just unwilling to participate, "People are often willing to relinquish control over events that affect their lives to free themselves

of the performance demands and hazards that exercise of control entails” (Bandura, 1997). If the majority of the community members don’t want to get involved, they hand control of events that affect them directly to the people that will get involved.

By relinquishing control of the community over to the people that will participate, they seek their security through what is known as “proxy control.” “In this socially mediated mode of control, people try to get those who wield influence and power to act on their behalf to effect the changes they desire.” (Bandura, 1997). If this is a mutual agreement that advances the best personality forward to speak for the community, there would be no disagreement and the needs of the community will be voiced. If the community voice is not represented and control is still relinquished to whoever is willing to take the role, undesired results may occur. “All too often, people surrender control to intermediaries to spare themselves the burdensome aspects of direct control” (Bandura, 2000).

Freeloading is another common term that may explain lack of participation in community groups. Freeloading occurs when non-participants enjoy the benefits that active participants gain. “As long as enough people work collectively to accomplish desired changes, the inactive ones cannot be excluded from enjoying the benefits as well” (Bandura 1997). A freeloading individual may not even realize that their inactivity, in such things as community groups or politics, is even something of concern. An individual may not think that their own fate is linked to groups of others that do participate.

Linking community and political participation together is a comfortable fit. Often community participation leads to political decisions that consequently affect the

community. Neighborhood residents already informally are associated for social purposes and we assume they would be ready to come together for political purposes.

Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, link non-participation to three particular issues, 1) lack of resources, 2) lack of psychological engagement, and 3) the inability to be recruited by political or social networks. The authors call this the Civic Voluntarism Model.

Civic Voluntarism Model accounts for specific issues that seem to be an obvious factor in community participation – financial freedom to participate, willingness and knowledge to participate, and environmental surroundings that foster participation. “The literature on participation refers to a heterogeneous set of factors – ranging from such aspects of social position as a high level of education or income to such psychological predispositions as a sense of political efficacy or group solidarity – as resources of political activity” (Verba et al. 1995).

Another explanation of lack of participation is simply rational choice. Often individuals feel as if their participation means nothing in the grand scheme of things, “Mobilization of collective effort to further common interests poses participator dilemmas. This is especially true in large-scale endeavors where people can easily persuade themselves that what they have to contribute will not really matter in a huge collective effort. The larger the collectivity, the more insignificant the individual effort may appear” (Kerr 1996).

Individuals possess the ability to rationally consider what type of environment they wish to live and function in. This individual choice to make a difference is often short lived and obsolete when a single person feels helpless with the impossible task of making change on his or her own. “The individual cannot be the basic unit of society.

Since he or she is part of a system of mutual influence that includes the groups they interact with, the group they are born into, and the physical and social factors operating in the world around them” (Wheelan 1994). Individual self-efficacy is a reflection of our feelings of worth and our ability to make changes if necessary; these feelings directly affect the family and groups in which we are part of. “Society is shaped by the goals and desires of the individuals who live within it” (Wheelan 1994).

Some neighborhoods have strong community representation. I was lucky to find one of them on the N. Side of Pittsburgh. I felt that this neighborhood genuinely practiced proxy control as they entrusted the neighborhood issues to the neighborhood group organizer. This neighborhood might have been willing to relinquish control to a community representative, but the residents were still willing to participate in times of need.

Manchester is a majority African American neighborhood that has concerns regarding their juveniles and the local gang problem. Before attending the Manchester community meeting, I was introduced to a young African American man named Mr. Jackson. I was told that Mr. Jackson was the Public Safety Coordinator for the Manchester area. The Manchester residents formed a group called “The Manchester Citizens Corporation,” MCC for short. Through grants the MCC hired Mr. Jackson to represent them in various ways in relation to furthering the Manchester community.

I was already impressed at this point but only realized the community had even more to offer. The turn out for the meeting in which I attended was strong with 36 community members present with the majority representing the African American race. The meeting flowed well with their concerns regarding the juvenile curfew and local drug

problems in the area. There was no talk regarding political issues or even problems that could be considered confrontational within the community.

Mr. Jackson's name came up every time I brought up Manchester to the police or even local residents. It was clear that he had established strong ties within the neighborhood and the residents felt he was capable of representing the voice of the community. But when the Manchester residents faced issues that required them to form as a social bloc, there was no question that they would. For example, the water company had torn up the sidewalks to fix some lines but had let months pass without fixing the sidewalks. Mr. Jackson contacted the water company asking them to stop by the MCC (Manchester Community Center) to discuss some issues. When the water company representatives arrived, they walked into a room that contained 45 Manchester residents wanting to know why the sidewalks were not fixed yet. Needless to say this was an impressive display of group cohesion – it also was strong enough to make political change as the sidewalks were fixed almost immediately.

Leadership and Community Power

Bass (1997) views transformational leadership as “moving the follower beyond self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration”. This definition suggests a number of ways through which transformational leadership can influence collective efficacy. Similarly, a transformational leader through the use of intellectual stimulation can help followers to think through more deeply the obstacles confronting their success, thus leading them to develop a better understanding of what needs to be done to be successful.

Formal and informal leadership is a must in community groups regardless of their size. Often the police act as the leader that initiates group formation but over the years this has become less prevalent. “All bureaucracies risk becoming so preoccupied with running their organizations and getting so involved in their methods of operating that they lose sight of the primary purposes for which they were created. The police seem unusually susceptible to this phenomenon.” (Goldstein, 1990).

As community groups face problems that arise, their core structure and leadership will be tested. Thinking through the best ways to approach problems and challenges, should help raise the group’s individual and collective confidence to perform exceptionally, resulting in satisfaction and commitment to the organization.

Neighborhoods theoretically offer sensitivity to the individual while development of cohesion among the residents becomes a valuable asset to make accomplishments occur. The community however has a more developed hierarchy as it often has determined leaders. Floyd Hunter provided the initial ground for community power research. Hunter’s reason for studying community power is in hopes of improving the local quality of life by clarifying how local policies are conceived and obtained.

Hunter describes a class-structured distribution of power in the average community. Capitalist structures such as business owners and elitist actors shape the community agenda around their specific needs (sounds a lot like today’s congress). Often this plays a factor in what is considered when distributions of local police efforts are allocated. “Greater sensitivity to communal as opposed to individual needs that helps explain why the residents of small communities are more satisfied with their police than are the residents of similar neighborhoods in big cities. (Kelling, 1982).

Hunter's theory of community power came under great debate especially in the field of political science. Hunter virtually makes the claim that democracy is not working well at the community level and also that political scientist were concentrating on the local politicians instead of the true community leaders. Robert Dahl wrote, *Who Governs?* Dahl employed what has come to be known as *decisional approach*. This approach analyzed decisions made in three key areas: education, political nominations, and urban renewal. Dahl discovered what is considered a pluralistic power structure leaving only key actors able to move from one representative group to another.

Lyon attempts to describe characteristics of community power while recognizing that it is virtually an elitist arena:

1. Community power is multidimensional. Community power is influenced by elitist and pluralist group structures.
2. Communities vary substantially in the distribution of local power.

Lyon also offers causes of community power:

1. The larger the populations size of the community, the more pluralistic the power structure. The territorial again play a role in the ability of the community group to be represented. Although, I disagree with this finding on some levels because the larger the territory the more likely the less chance of representation.
2. The more economically diversified the community, the more pluralistic the power structure. Again, I disagree with this on some levels because there is no question the higher income are more likely to concern themselves with more conservative views that could ostracize particular populations.

3. The more “reformed” the formal political structure of the community, the more elitist the power structure.

I feel that this paper needs further clarification but due to time constraints I must wrap up this topic as it is. I see the need for further research in community power structures and their ability to access resources that could be available to them. Two important key factors that affect community power structure is the recognition of residential boundaries, designation between neighborhood and community structures, and most important is proper resident representation in the community groups.

I would like to further consider this research by continuing the initial study discussed in the beginning of this paper. I feel with proper guidance and interest, research could be conducted on a larger scale that will offer a stronger validation for the consideration of neighborhood boundaries and community representation.

Neighborhood Disorder:

What are the central concerns of these neighborhoods? Some areas concern themselves with what may be viewed as more of a disorder, such as litter, then issues of truly offensive crimes such as drug dealing and robbery. What this study points out is just how much variance there is within the perception of disorder even though there is little distance between these areas. Manchester deals with drug and gang problems when less than a couple miles away is the Mexican War Streets that consider litter and loud music their main issues.

The question is what is the difference between these relatively close neighborhoods that separates their concerns so extremely? “Disorder is a manifestation of crime-relevant mechanisms and collective efficacy should reduce disorder and

violence by dis-empowering the forces that produce both (Sampson 1999). Manchester residents are very proud residents of their area and yet there are divisions between these residents and police that could possibly be a main issue in the neighborhoods fight against crime and disorder.

Central N. Side currently has the highest level of part I crimes in all of the Zone 1 district with East Allegheny following very closely behind. These areas concerns are interesting considering the high level of violent and drug crimes occurring in the areas. stude of the “High levels of disorder appear to undermine the belief that problems can be solved locally, they increase people’s sense of personal isolation and spread the perception that no one will come to their rescue when they find themselves in trouble (Skogan, 1990).

Bibliography

1. Allinder, R. (1994). "The Relationship Between Efficacy and the Instructional Practices of Special Education Teachers and Consultants." *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 17, 86-95.
2. Bandura, Albert and Cervone, D. (1986). "Differential engagement of self-reactive influences in cognitive motivation." *Organizational Behavior Human Decision Processes*, 38, 92-113.
3. Bandura, Albert. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman and Company.
4. Bandura, Albert. (2000). Human Agency Theory. *The Journal of Social-Psychology*, 9, 75-78.
5. Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130-139.
6. Dahl, Robert. (1961). *Who Governs?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
7. Hunter, Floyd. (1953). *Community Power Structure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
8. Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
9. Kelling and Wright
10. Kubrin, Charis E. and Weitzer, Ronald (2003). New Directions in Social Disorganization Theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40: 374-402.
11. Lyon, Larry. (1989). *The Community in Urban Society*. Waveland Press. Inc.
12. Kearns, A. and Parkinson, M. (2001). "The significance of neighborhood", *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2103-2110.
13. Kelling, George and Coles, Katherine (1996). *Fixing Broken Windows*. The Free Press.
14. Kerr, N. L. (1996). Does my contribution really matter? Efficacy in social dilemmas. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 7, 209-240.

15. Kotler, Milton. (1969). *Neighborhood Government: The Local Foundations of Political Life*. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
16. Mead, George Herbert, (1934). *The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead*. The University of Chicago Press.
17. Milgram, Stanley, (1977). *The Individual in a Social World*. Addison-Wesley Publishing company.
18. Nolan, James J., & Conti, Norman and McDevitt, Jack (2004). The Situational Policing Approach to Crime and Disorder. *Policing and Society*, 20.
19. Park, Robert E. (1936). "Human Ecology." *American Journal of Sociology* 17, no. 1:1 – 15.
20. Sampson, E.E. (1988) "The debate on individualism". *American Psychologist*, 43, 15-22.
21. Sampson, Robert and Raudenbush, Stephen W. (November 1999). "Systemic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods." *American Journal of Sociology*, 104 (603-651).
22. Skogan, Wesley G. (2004). *Community Policing: Can it Work?* Belmont, CA: Thompson/Wadsworth.
23. Taylor, Ralph (1995). *The Impact of Crime on Communities*. AAPSS
24. Tonnies, Ferdinand. (1887,1963) *Community and Society*. Edited by Charles P. Loomis. New York: Haper & Row.
25. United States Bureau of the Census (2000). [www. Census.gov/](http://www.census.gov/).
26. Verba, Sidney, and Schlozman, Kay Lehman, and Brandy, Henry E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press.
27. Wheelan, S. A. (1994). *Group Processes: A Developmental Perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
28. Wilson, J.G., & Kelling, G.L. (1982). Broken Windows: Police and Neighborhood Safety. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 249 29-38.

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

Neighborhood Questions

1. How would you define your neighborhood?
2. How do you believe others would define the neighborhood?
3. Where do you consider the boundaries of your neighborhood to be?
4. Are there certain duties this neighborhood feels confident the police will perform?
  - If yes, please list some of these duties.
5. Acting as a whole, what does the neighborhood do to protect itself?
6. Can you describe the type of relationship you have with the members of this neighborhood?
7. Do you feel your neighbors would intervene if they seen disorder occurring?
Examples: Kids skipping school, children spray-painting graffiti on a building or structure, houses were being burglarized? Please express your views on this question.
8. What kind of disorder does this neighborhood depend on the police to take care of?
9. What kind of disorder does this neighborhood consider their responsibility for taking care of themselves without police intervention?
10. Overall, do you believe that your neighbors can be trusted and that they are able to work together with the police to improve the conditions of the neighborhood?

Police Questions

1. Tell me about your view of this neighborhood.
2. Do you think the residents view this neighborhood the same?
3. Where do you consider this neighborhood's boundaries to be? Can you describe this in relation to landmarks or identifiable boundaries?
4. Do you feel the residents in this neighborhood trust the police? Why or why not do you believe that?
5. Do you feel the residents of this neighborhood can be trusted? Can you explain why or why not you feel this way?
6. In general, how do you think this neighborhood view's the police and their performance?
7. What kind of action does this neighborhood take to protect itself from crime and disorder?
8. Do you believe this neighborhood is adjoined enough to protect itself from any crime or disorder that may arise?
9. Can you describe the relationship you believe these residents have with each other?
10. Do you believe this neighborhood is able to work together as a team and also with the police to address any disorder or issues that may arise in this neighborhood?
If no or unsure, can you explain why and what obstacles maybe standing in the way of this process?

APPENDIX B

Maps

To view maps of the neighborhoods go to:

www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/cp/maps/images/map_pdfs/centralnorthside

www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/cp/maps/images/map_pdfs/eastallegheny

www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/cp/maps/images/map_pdfs/fineview

www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/cp/maps/images/map_pdfs/manchester

www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/cp/maps/images/map_pdfs/policezonessm