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Sociology...has recognized that there are neighborhoods in cities which many people know to be dangerous; these are the functional equivalent of the unexplored areas covered by the olden-days cartographers' rubric: Here be Dragons.
  DAMER, 1974

When you live on a dead end street, you gotta be tough and strong.
  COWELL-WINFIELD BLUES BAND
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25.1. INTRODUCTION

Crime, delinquency, and fear are unevenly distributed in space. Evidence regarding this nonuniform arrangement has been accumulating since the first half of the nineteenth century when European cartographers such as Guerry, labeled by Morris (1857) as the first social ecologist, collected data linking crime to environmental characteristics. And with the advent of surveys on crime-related issues in the last 20 years, we have found that fear of crime is higher in some places than in others (e.g., cities vs. rural areas). The well-established nature of this patterning has drawn the interest of social scientists from a range of fields. Consequently the spatial structuring of crime, delinquency, and fear of crime has been of interest to criminologists, sociologists, geographers, and economists. Consequently one might well wonder; What could environmental psychologists possibly contribute to this already investigator-crowded area of inquiry?

And, indeed, that central query is one with which I intend to grapple in this chapter. What I see as perhaps the key issue in this area of inquiry is: What does an environmental psychological perspective bring to the study of delinquency, crime, and fear of crime that has been lacking in other theoretical perspectives? Obviously the inclusion of this chapter in this volume suggests that environmental psychology does have a contribution to make and that that contribution is multifaceted. More specifically, the nature of this contribution is as follows:

Two well-developed theoretical perspectives in environmental psychology—human territoriality and behavior-setting theory—can provide excellent answers regarding why there is more crime, delinquency, and fear of crime in some places than in others.

Environmental psychology contributes a distinct unit of analysis or level of focus on these issues; it considers small groups and individuals (Stokols, 1977) in, and as part and parcel of, their larger social and physical contexts (Stokols, 1983). This center of attention is unique to environmental psychology.

Environmental psychology is committed to understanding the role of the physical environment, as both a factor contributing to delinquency, crime, and fear of crime, and as a feature influenced by these matters.

Thus in contrast to economists, criminologists, and geographers who are often concerned with larger scale, areal-level dynamics, environmental psychologists have a more fine-grained concern with individuals and small groups. In contrast to sociologists who have treated the physical environment only as a clue to social facts (Dunlap & Catton, 1983), environmental psychologists are wedded to understanding all the roles that the physical environment may play in any given set of causal processes. In short, there is a place, or to state it even more strongly, an urgent need for an environmental psychological perspective on these matters. There are significant theoretical and empirical gaps in the work on crime, delinquency, and fear of crime that environmental psychologists can help close.

Consequently the first part of this chapter develops an environmental psychological perspective on issues of delinquency, crime, and fear of crime. I admit at the outset that other, equally tenable environmental psychological perspectives on these issues could, and probably should, be developed. The framework proposed here by no means exhausts the ways that environmental psychologists can construe these issues. But at least it gives us a starting point.

Once we have such a perspective in hand, we can use it as a lens to examine work already completed in this area. Accordingly the next section reviews theories and related findings in the areas of crime, delinquency, and fear of crime, which touch on, or have implications for, the role of the physical environment. My theoretical and empirical review is not exhaustive but rather seeks to provide a familiarizing outline. Where appropriate, theoretical deficits are illuminated. And once the theory and research in an area has been considered, each theory will be examined from the previously described environmental psychological perspective to see how the theory might be altered and developed to incorporate the insights of the latter. Although perhaps too visionary, these suggestions are nonetheless of considerable importance; they indicate the lines along which more powerful, truly multidisciplinary perspectives on these social problems might be developed.

Following the review and reconsideration of work in these areas, I attend to more recent studies that have, either implicitly or overtly, been more environmental psychological in nature due to their more careful consideration of person-place bonds: the attitudes, sentiments, expectations, and involvements linking a person or group to his, her, or their place of residence. Despite some false starts in this vein, we have considerable theoretical refinement and empirical support that have emerged in just the last 8 to 10 years.
The two final sections contain a caution and an exhortation. The caution is a partial list of the theoretical difficulties and methodological limits that beset research in this area. The enumeration is not meant to dissuade people from areas of inquiry but rather to help them develop more informed lines of attack. The exhortation discusses some research futures. What kinds of issues have yet to be considered, and what are the possibilities of developing appropriate models for such inquiries? The possibilities of, and mandate for, action research are considered.

25.2. TOWARD AN ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY OF DISORDER

In this section, I weave together several theoretical strands to develop an environmental psychological perspective on disorder. The disorder continuum is introduced and explained. The main indexes of disorder that are the focus of this chapter — crime, delinquency, and fear of crime — are related to an larger continuum. The nature of disorder suggests that theory on human territoriality can be fruitfully applied, and I outline the theory of human territoriality. The territorial perspective enuncates spatially relevant and the implications of which are explored, as well as a focus on the possible roles of the physical environment, which are discussed. By linking the territorial perspective with behavior-setting theory (Wicker, 1979, Chapter 16, this volume), the temporal and spatial distribution of disorder can be more clearly understood. Finally, the environmental psychological perspective is confronted with some sociological (or perhaps philosophical) questions, in order to ascertain the limitations of the perspective.

25.2.1. Disorder Continuum

Crime and delinquency are not isolated issues divorced from other problems and concerns with which individuals and communities must deal. Rather crime and delinquency are perceived and experienced as part of a large web of social problems (Podolefsky, 1983; Podolefsky & DaBow, 1981). Crime and delinquency in middle- and upper-class areas are viewed as stemming from, and contributing to, the larger breakdown in society of the moral order, whereas in lower income areas they are viewed (partially) as responses to the inequitable treatment and blocked opportunities experienced by such groupings (e.g., lack of employment opportunities or recreational facilities). Crime and delinquency are phenomenologically linked to larger difficulties and problems. The latter link is particularly apparent in the case of collective or political disorders such as riots and terrorist attacks but is also made in the case of isolated incidents (e.g., vandalism; Fisher & Baron, 1982) that are perpetrated by and experienced by individuals or small groups.

Also reflecting these same social problems are less serious events and conditions that, although less serious than crimes per se, nonetheless point to the same societal processes in the eyes of the residents. These less serious matters include "street hassles" such as insulting remarks or threats from deranged individuals, chronic social situations such as wayward kids or teens, vandals, street bums, and panhandlers hanging out, and instances of physical deterioration or lack of upkeep such as vacant houses and lots, littered yards or playgrounds, accumulations of trash and garbage, and graffiti. These social and physical conditions suggest that one is surrounded by moral outcasts (Rainwater, 1986), individuals who neither respect nor can be coerced by formal agents to respect the public order.

Consequently, in urban and suburban areas, people can be confronted with a range of disorders, varying from violent robbery or murder or assault to vandals smashing car windows, to requests for money from vandals, to kids jumping the fence to retrieve an errant ball. This continuum is suggested in Figure 25-1. Most serious are actual crimes, particularly those involving person-to-person violence. Less serious are property crimes and FBI Part II, nonserious crimes. Crimes have been rated on seriousness (cf. Gottfredson, Young, & Lauber, 1980), and people in the main can agree on which crimes are more or less serious.

At the midrange on the disorder scale are incidents that have the potential for interpersonal vio-
lence, alteration, or simple disagreement. These incidents are threatening due to their unpredictability. When one encounters some wayward teens or unstable people, it is always difficult to predict how the interaction will go. This is because one is uncertain whether or not these others will follow accepted (in the eyes of ego) norms of public behavior (Wilson, 1975). The incidents themselves suggest the norms will probably not be observed. Such incidents are of a moderately serious nature. Delinquent acts could come under this category. Finally, least serious are chronic social and physical conditions indicative of the unraveling of society: people hanging out who should not be and signals of physical deterioration. These are of an even less serious nature than day-to-day stressors such as street hassle because the direct immediate threat to the ego is minimal. However, the conditions may have significant implications for the long-term stability and viability of the neighborhood.

The reasons, to recap, for treating these matters as tied together on a continuum, are several. First, in the eyes of residents, these may often be interpreted as indicative of the same underlying processes: the progressive breakdown of the moral order and the inability of officials to stem this deterioration. Second, these events vary in perceived seriousness, ranging from very serious to only minimally serious. Third, all of these events are capable of inspiring fear in the perceivers. We will turn to the links between the events and fear momentarily. And finally all of the events and conditions represented on the disorder continuum are potentially relevant to territorial control. Thus although the continuum is somewhat speculative, several sound reasons for its proposal can be offered.

Crime and other events and conditions on the disorder continuum are capable of inspiring fear. The amount of fear generated, however, depends on several factors. These parameters will be illuminated more fully when we discuss theory and research on fear of crime; therefore they are only touched on briefly here.

Events or conditions indicative of disorder are more fear-inspiring the more serious they are. Perhaps even more importantly, where the incident takes place, or where the condition occurs, is also of considerable import. Why this is so has to do with the nature of territorial functioning. Also important is the extent to which they recur regularly in the same place or type of place. Predictability diminishes the threatening impact.

As mentioned before, incidents and conditions reflective of disorder are potentially amenable to pre-
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mine who does and who does not belong there or
who will be encountered there, and is less tolerant of
problems or annoyances or stressors. Territorial func-
tioning is stronger in these more proximal spaces be-
cause these locations are more central to the daily
life of the individual and household. Stated differ-
ently: In terms of general well-being and mental
health impacts on the individual and household,
events occurring in the front or backyard are more
important than events occurring on the sidewalk in
front of the house or the alley behind the house.
which are more important than events happening on
the street block, which in turn are more important
than events happening elsewhere in the neighbor-
hood, and which are more important than events hap-
pening outside the neighborhood. Moving away from
the most central of all places—the home (Rainwater,
1966)—one crosses a series of mental boundaries or
psychological cliffs, passing into locations where par-
ticular events, et ceteris paribus, are of decreasing im-
portance for the safety, security, and well-being of
the individual and his or her household. Rowdy young
men standing drinking beer are much less of a threat
if they are three blocks away rather than on your
corner. The closer they are the more they must be
encountered, or at least seen, in the daily round.
Consequently if we could construct an individu-
centric, psychographic map representing the strength
of territorial cognitions of individual households on a
block, we would have, on either side of the street, a
row of “mounds,” the peak of each centering on each
particular household, and sloping downhill to the
yard, sidewalk, streets, and alleys. The cognitions
weaken the further from home the space in question.

And, as importantly, the cognitions are weaker
with respect to locations that are heavily used, more
public thoroughfares. Thus territorial control is
weakest surrounding locations such as playgrounds,
alleys (Brower, 1980), small corner shops, commer-
cial strips or nodes (McPherson, Silloway & Frey,
1983), institutional land use (Sutles, 1968), or even
heavily trafficked streets (Appleyard, 1981). Control
is weaker not only because such locations lack natu-
ral guardians (Cohen & Felson, 1979) or are less sur-
veillable but also because such locations are more de-
cidedly public and open to all, more heavily used by
a wider variety of people coming from a greater dis-
tance; thus they are anonymous. These “valleys” in
the topography of territorial control, as viewed from
the resident point of view, represent intersitual
spaces that should perhaps be avoided at particular
times. Of course, and as shall be explored further
later, what may be a dangerous area for residents
may represent opportunity to delinquents, potential
offenders, or marginal members of the local society.

To clarify a previously mentioned point about ter-
itorial functioning: It is an open system. Con-
sequently, as the social climate on a block varies
(from fractional to harmonious), strength, scope, and
configuration of territorial functioning vary also. As
social climate becomes colder and/or stability in the
larger neighborhood decreases, territorial control is
further restricted, and residents are less able to influ-
ence events outside the home (Taylor, Gottfredson,

The focus on territorial functioning as a system
regulating interactions between residents (insiders)
and strangers or miscreants (outsiders) should not
obscure the role of the system in influencing resi-
dent-to-resident attitudes and interactions. Territorial
markers and behaviors play an important role in this
respect. Daily or routine maintenance, upkeep, and
beautification activities such as washing steps,
sweeping sidewalks, trimming lawns and bushes,
painting, and planting flowers all send a “nonverbal”
message (Rapoport, 1982) to other residents. The
message is that “I’m invested in where I live, I care,
I’m a good neighbor, and I can be counted on to as-
sist in meeting local needs or emergencies that may
arise.” Such messages are decoded by others as in-
dexes of reassurance. In cases where such signs are
lacking, residents may mistrust or at least be wary
and unsure of other residents. To the extent that
these territorial behaviors are widely shared on a
block, they approach the status of a norm, such that
failure to adhere to the norm may result in directives
from others, or possibly even censure (Gans, 1967).

As in the classic deviance experiment by Schacht-
er (1951), others may try to convince the errant indi-
vidual to go along with the group, and, should that
fail, ultimately give up on the person. To the extent
that the appropriate territorial behaviors are widely
disregarded, fear instead of trust may ensue. This
is a topic that has been explored by several fear
of crime models and will be discussed later. Widespread
disregard, lack of upkeep or maintenance, improper
garbage disposal, and so on may lead one to con-
clude that one is living among moral outcasts and
that therefore one is potentially in danger. Nearest
neighbors may even be the most threatening because
they know the most about one: times of coming and
going, recent major purchases, and so on.

Thus territorial functioning is relevant not only to
serious incidents on the disorder continuum where
there is the possibility of interpersonal confrontation
but is also relevant to physical conditions on the less serious end of the disorder continuum.

25.2.3. Street Blocks as Behavior Settings

This section outlines reasons why it is justified and fruitful to think of street blocks as behavior settings (Parker, 1968; Wicker, 1979). This treatment of behavior settings agrees, in several respects, with Wicker's treatment (Chapter 16, this volume) of behavior settings as dynamic, fluctuating, open systems, which emerge from and help structure local social life.

There are several reasons for suggesting that the street block is a behavior setting, including a standing pattern of behavior, or program, and a circumstantial physical milieu. First, the street block is physically bounded. At the ends it is traversed by two cross streets, marking its boundaries. The sides are bounded by the housefronts, or, to extend it somewhat more, the backs of backyards, or alleys. The physical environment thus surrounds and encloses the setting. The boundaries are, of course, not completely impermeable. Nonetheless, for residents, generally speaking, events occurring within the setting are of more importance to them than events occurring outside of the setting—all else being equal.

The physical surround acts as a loose boundary, defining the arena of resident-to-resident interaction.

Nested within the setting are smaller scale synomorphs, which are also to some extent physically delineated. These include individual front and backyards and driveways. Less delineated but equally important as synomorphs are stretches of sidewalk or alley in front or behind particular dwelling units or single commercial establishments. Multiple commercial establishments or public amenities such as parks or playgrounds may be interspersed between residential behavior settings.

A standing pattern of behavior or program exists in that particular activities recur on a routine basis—daily (e.g., walking the dog), weekly (e.g., mowing the lawn), monthly (e.g., waiting for welfare or unemployment checks and going to the local store to cash them), or yearly (e.g., outdoor Christmas decorations), or on an occurrence basis (e.g., shoveling walk after a snow). These activities are not advertised, like basketball games, in local newspapers but they are predictable and routinized, and residents can inform one about these regularities. The regularities are also supported by the physical environment, as when groups of men sitting out in lower income neighborhoods switch sides of the street to stay in the shade during summer.

The linkage between physical setting and setting program is also apparent when we consider teen or young adult segments of the setting population or groups that may be viewed as marginal by the residents. The interstices in the larger fabric of territorial control become points of convergence for small groups or gangs. In the interstices, where control is weak and surveillance is minimal, such groups are less likely to be bothered by regular residents and less likely to be perceived as bothersome. They shoot crap in the alley, drink or smoke on the playground, and hang out in front of the corner store. The (as perceived by resident) marginal activities are taking place in the peripheral areas of the setting or in the ambiguous areas between settings.

Physical environment and program are also linked in that territorial markers and cues serve as nonverbal messages (Rapoport, 1982), suggesting to people what kinds of behaviors are expected in particular locations. A block with well-kept-up houses, trimmed lawns, and immaculate flower beds indicates that residents care and that outsiders or passersby should likewise respect the locale. They should behave in an appropriate "guestlike" role.

Further, levels of participation in the program can be distinguished, as in traditional ecological psychology. On a block, some people may be heavily involved in various activities such as organizing meetings or cleanup campaigns or just spreading rumors, whereas others may be peripherally involved. In the case of stable corner groups, some individuals may hang out regularly with the group or club, whereas others are involved only on an intermittent basis.

The notion of a program implies agreement on what behaviors are acceptable and when and where they are acceptable; it implies setting- or synomorph-specific norms. Working on cars may be acceptable in the alley, but not out front, for example. A "bum" sitting on the curb may not be acceptable at any time. The clarity of these norms varies, depending on the nature and homogeneity of the block population and the stability of the surrounding neighborhood context. Norms will be less clear and/or less widely shared in heterogeneous blocks or in changing neighborhoods or in neighborhoods with high turnover rates. But although the clarity and latitude of the norms may vary, they still do operate from block to block and reflect the underlying programs.

Finally, street blocks have deviation-countering and vetoing mechanisms. These mechanisms are part and parcel of territorial control such as instances
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considering the setting of a neighborhood or region, the residential fabric of certain areas may be characterized by a high degree of stability and cohesion, whereas others may be more fluid and dynamic. This can affect the way people relate to one another and the activities they engage in. For example, in a stable neighborhood, residents may feel a strong sense of belonging and mutual support, whereas in a dynamic area, there may be more transient residents and a greater emphasis on individual achievement.

For all of these reasons, neighborhood characteristics can shape the way people interact and the behavior they exhibit. The effects of these neighborhood dynamics can be seen in the way people define themselves and their roles in the community. For example, in a stable neighborhood, residents may be more likely to engage in community-oriented activities, such as volunteering or participating in local events, whereas in a dynamic area, there may be more emphasis on individual success and personal achievement.

25.3. TOWARD A PLURALISTIC PERSPECTIVE: DISORDER AND TERRITORIALITY FROM THE VIEW OF THE DISORDERLY

Now comes a difficult task. So far I have suggested that the nature of territorial functioning and its spatial distribution, particularly when street blocks are treated as behavior settings, provide powerful tools for understanding why events and conditions along the disorder continuum are more prevalent in some locations than others. All of this territorial synthesis, however, has been from the resident point of view. How are these dynamics to be understood from the perspective of those who are viewed by the residents as disorderly? How do we make sense of this from the viewpoint of corner gangs, loiterers, and delinquent youth? Based on extensive theorizing and empirical work with delinquents or gang members (Gloward, 1959; Ley & Cybriwsky, 1974; Miller, 1958; Suttles, 1968; Whyte, 1943), the following suggestions can be made.

First, the routine conduct of the disorderly or delinquent is not viewed by them themselves, as disorderly. Regularly occurring behaviors such as purse snatchers, breaking into cars, or “gettin’ high” may be viewed as legitimate ways to get “thrills” (Miller, 1958). “Hanging” or “hanging out,” which involves talking with peers, swapping stories of exploits, and matches of verbal wits, is regarded as routine and acceptable.

Perhaps what is more important is that where these activities occur is a reflection of the overarching texture of territorial control. It makes sense for such groups to hang out and carry out their activities in locations and at times where and when resident control and surveillance is minimal; in short, to gather and carry on in the territorial interstices.

There are several factors that make such locations desirable activity nodes for the individuals and groups involved. First, in such locations the likelihood of their being confronted or “hassled” by residents is minimal. There is less threat of being forced to move elsewhere because residents have less concern for such locations. Consequently in these interstitial areas a larger number of persons can gather, and they can be noisier or more exuberant than they could be elsewhere. These interstitial areas include places such as corners, alleys, playgrounds, and around stores, bars, or institutional land uses. In such locations, the individuals or groups have greater behavioral freedom. Third, many of these locations ensure significant opportunities for interaction or “thrills.” In the case of a corner store, for example, during operating hours there are always people coming and going. Thus one has a good chance of meeting and perhaps chatting with, a large number of local acquaintances. There is lots of “action.” Persons may be badgered into buying something at the store or sharing what has been bought. There are also significant criminal opportunities. Such locations may draw older women or older men, who can afterward be followed and purses snatched or robbed on the street. Areas around commercial establishments are often not supervised by proprietors during hours of operation and in many instances lack natural guardians when the store is closed. Finally these individuals and groups may feel that their “hanging” contributes to the stability of the locale in that they can keep an eye on who is coming and going and be sure that other groups that “don’t belong” are not allowed, or, if allowed, that they are closely watched. These “corner” groups have their own “system” of territorial control.

Related to this control are territorial markers. What may be graffiti from the viewpoint of residents are signs of gang control and possession. In the eyes of the markers (Ley & Cybriwsky, 1974). This is more true in cities such as Philadelphia, New York, and Newark where groups are stronger. But vandalizing
buildings and property can, in nonterritorial gang instances, be included under the category of activities that provide a "thrill" (Greenberger & Allen, 1980). By adopting the perspective of the disorderly we can see that on or around a particular street block there is a contrast between what is defined by stable, committed residents as outside the purview of the standing pattern of behavior, and what is viewed by teens or delinquents or marginal members of the group as part of their standing pattern of behavior. What is viewed as troublesome by the first is viewed as acceptable and indeed legitimate (as long as one avoids getting into serious trouble) by the second group.

What are the implications then of these two competing orders? The first implication is that conflict, which may be more or less frequent or more or less serious, is inevitable. There is a continual give-and-take between the residents and those whom they view as troublesome. This conflict is more intense in areas where the resident population is more sociodemographically heterogeneous. In such locales, the residents' standing pattern is more diffuse and more open to challenge; territorial control is weaker or more spotty (spatially). Nonetheless in many locations an equilibrium can be achieved between these two orders. This equilibrium is achieved by a spatial and temporal sorting process. The residents accept that at certain times of day, and in certain places, certain marginal groups can be found. After dark, one group may gather at the corner store and sit on the mailbox. On weekend evenings when the weather is warm enough, another group may gather on the playground to "get high," knowing that as long as they do not make noise they will not be hassled. Another group may gather on an intermittent basis for a crap game at the end of the alley, obscured from view by large garages between the alley and the backs of the houses. This temporal and spatial sorting is in response to the topography of territorial control. In short, there is a loose kind of mutual accommodation that goes on between the two orders, resulting in an imprecise equilibrium.

25.3.1 Change, Disequilibrium, and Fear of Crime

The equilibrium can be disturbed in two ways. First, residents may wish to expand their domain of territorial control, feeling they have a right to do away with annoyances. In such actions, there is the possibility that residents may seek to exercise too much territorial control. They may seek to exclude those who are merely different or nonconforming, as opposed to those who are genuinely troublesome. In fact, this was one of the problems in the first half of this century with neighborhood covenants, which often sought to exclude blacks or Jews from buying into a neighborhood (Issacs, 1948). Such attempts to expand the zone of adherence to the block-setting program require considerable effort because collective action is required. Such a move has limited chances of success. And negative side effects can ensue when the targets of the controllers decide to retaliate. In other words, it is difficult to conceive of how the map of territorial control can be successfully applied to the interstitial areas between blocks and between neighborhoods. Opportunity areas of disorder and delinquency, then, are probably not erasable.

A second way the loose equilibrium between order and disorder can be disrupted is when an area experiences a change in the composition of its population, as in the case of gentrification or racial succession, or when an area experiences significant physical or other land use changes such as the building of a shopping mall or highway, demolition or construction of other buildings, or increased vacant units.

Consider for example the sequence of events depicted in Figure 25.2. An interstitial area, along a major artery that is also a neighborhood boundary, is depicted. The location, type of land use, and traffic pattern make this an opportunity area for disorder. At Time 1, a corner store is vacant. People may hang out there and perhaps bother or even attack passersby. Proprietors and residents may not "hassle" those who hang out there unless the group becomes too troublesome. Because the stores close early and residents avoid the area after dark, the group is tolerated and has free reign after that time.

But imagine that the situation changes somewhat, as is shown in the diagram at Time 2. Due to economic recession and changing neighborhood composition, the small commercial area is less viable, and one or two more stores are forced to close their doors. It could also be the case that in the row of houses behind the store vacancies increase somewhat, as one or two landlords decide that their properties are unsalable and that "fixup" would be too costly. So they abandon the units. Remaining tenants are evicted, and the units are boarded up. Some individuals may get a crowbar though and pry some of these boards off, so the vacant units may be used as shelter by a couple of homeless men and as a rendezvous for some drug pushers.

What these ecological changes bring about is an expansion in the number and size of the opportunity-for-disorder areas. Along the main artery, individuals feel free to hang out there are fewer prop closed stores so comes a good area is not unkempt anymore.
me. In fact, this is half of this center, which often brings into a situation of its population. Significant physical and social forces can ensue that can result in a complex pattern of behavior. The process by which the residents of the stable group of residential units opposite have experienced the ecologic erosion of their behavior setting and the standing pattern of behavior. The interstices or "gaps" between viable behavior settings have expanded. The order on their own block, to which they have been accustomed, has faded within only a few months. The equilibrium between order and resident-perceived disorder has given way to the expansion of disorder.

And it is exactly this process of disequilibration that explains fear of crime. When residents in a particular locale perceive a shrinking of territorial control and an expansion of the interstitial opportunity areas for disorder, there is an increase in their community concern and apprehension about their own safety. The spatial extent of actual territorial control has shrunk to less than the expected extent, based on past experience. It is this discrepancy, and expanding of disorder beyond the interstices where its presence was accepted, that is stress-producing and induces concern. To put it more bluntly: It is not only what events and conditions occur that reflect disorder that is important—more crucial is where these instances are observed, how close it is to home, and how the locus has changed.

25.3.2. Implications Regarding Physical Environment

In the weavin of the preceding territorial behavior setting perspective on disorder, allusions to the pertinent roles of the physical environment have surfaced several times. In this subsection, I integrate and summarize these roles.

First, following Rapoport's (1982) suggestion that the physical environment carries nonverbal messages, elements in the physical environment such as territorial markers or traces from territorial behaviors can communicate information to insiders and outsiders (Altman & Chemers, 1978). To insiders,
messages of investment are sent to indicate that one is a good neighbor (Mazzu, 1954), that one is trustworthy and committed to the area. Other residents not only decode such messages but reciprocate as well. Messages of defense are also sent to outsiders or potential miscreants suggesting what kinds of behaviors will and will not be tolerated. If outsiders respect these signs or infringe on them only to find them backed up by the natural guardians (e.g., someone coming out the door as soon as a fence is jumped over), then the territorial control will persist. There will be no weakening of the behavior setting program. If, however, signs are ignored on and found not backed up, then territorial control will wane, and the behavior setting program may unravel somewhat. How these two processes, one involving insiders and one involving outsiders, might work over time is depicted in Figure 25.3.

The third way the physical environment is relevant to disorder occurs at a more macrolevel of analysis: Land use defines which areas are private or semiprivate property and which are public or open to the community (stores, churches, playgrounds, and so on). These land uses define where the "gaps" between the behavior settings will occur and thus where opportunity areas for disorderly conduct can be established. This is so for several reasons: (1) public spaces are less central to residents and thus of less concern; (2) public spaces by defitenience draw outsiders and strangers, thereby producing a confusing mix of users; this high quotient of strangers may make one less inclined to exercise territorial control and/or make the (3) these public.
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From the perspective of the potential miscreants, physical environment is relevant in two ways. First, locations around public amenities draw foot traffic ("action") and potential targets of crime. The locations represent opportunities for entertainment and for gain. Second, because the spaces are interstitial, activities there are likely not to be surveilled because residents are too distant or their visual access is blocked. Or if these marginal individuals are surveilled, they are less likely to be bothered by leaders or participants in the local setting program because of their location in a nonproximal, noncentral space.

25.3.3. Summary

To summarize the environmental psychological approach to disorder, I have presented the following points. Street blocks are behavior settings. Territorial functioning is one means by which the setting program is communicated and enforced. In spaces less central to a household or outside of the behavior setting, residents will be more tolerant of what they perceive as disorderly conduct. From the viewpoint of those labeled as miscreants by residents, these interstitial and peripheral locations provide opportunities for peer contact and "thrills." When this spatially sorted equilibrium between residents and those they view as troublesome is upset by larger social or ecological transitions or by local land use changes, the block setting program can be threatened and fear can develop.

25.4. PAST THEORY AND RESEARCH REVIEWED AND RECONSIDERED FROM AN ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY PERSPECTIVE

In the following sections, theory and research relevant to crime, delinquency, and fear of crime are reviewed, along with selected results from each. Work on where offenders and delinquents live is reviewed first, followed by work on where crime is committed and work on fear. No claim is made regarding exhaustive treatment. Each theory is presented, criticized when the flaws are relevant to the main thrust of the chapter, and empirically supported. Then I attempt to view each theory from the environmental psychological perspective that has already been developed. The purpose of this reexamination is not to see if these theories come up short but, rather, to see what the possibilities are for building even stronger theories that integrate and utilize an environmental psychological perspective. Some may label such an endeavor as gross miscegenation. I would prefer to view it as an attempt to forge more powerful, truly multidisciplinary models.

25.4.1. Offender and Delinquent Locations

Several sociological theories have centered around issues of offender and delinquent locations, or areas. The focus here has been on mapping, describing and explaining why some sections of urban areas "produce" a greater percentage of the offender or delinquent population.

Human Ecology

Human ecology is an attempt to understand urban life by applying the concepts of plant and animal biology (Park, 1915, p. 936; see also Michelson, 1970, Chapter 1). Humans are viewed as subgroups residing within ecological niches or communities that are "territorially organized" (Park, 1936, p. 4). The subgroup is tied to the area ("more or less completely rooted to the soil it occupies") with the individuals therein living in relationships of "mutual interdependence." There is constant competition between communities, resulting in a (rough) dominance ordering across areas, with dominance being indexed by land values (Park, 1936, p. 8).

The principle of dominance, operating within the limits posed by the terrain and other natural features of the locations, tends to determine the general ecological pattern of the city and the functional relation of each of the different areas of the city to all others.

Communities, or natural areas, however, go through change. These series of changes, set in motion by larger scale forces such as city growth or decay or population changes, mean that a particular area will experience a series of changes or developments labeled succession. Prior to each change, each natural area achieves a homeostasis that is then eroded and ultimately replaced by a new stage or order. Thus an area will experience different waves of immigrants, or ethnic neighborhoods will be cleared or abandoned and devolve into a transition zone area (Preston, 1966), ultimately to be engulfed by an expanding central business district.

Human ecology was the mainspring of the Chicago school of sociology and has proven one of
the most fruitful perspectives in that discipline (Hawley, 1981). At the same time, the perspective has been cogently criticized. Probably the most incisive critique has been offered by Alhan (1938). Among her criticisms are the following.

1. Human ecologists expand the concept of environment so dramatically that the boundary between organism and environment is hopelessly blurred. Environment includes physical, cultural, social, and institutional matters.

2. If environment includes social and technological aspects, as the human ecologists admit, the processes of competition must lose their ecological significance, and therefore the monistic emphasis on competition is not justified. The nature of human competition is radically different from competition in animal and plant communities.

3. Their use of terms such as dominance and succession is a distortion of the original ecological meanings.

4. There is a lack of regard for volitional factors. People are not so rooted that they cannot freely move into or out of areas.

5. There are discrepancies or gaps between the descriptive and the interpretive phases of the human ecologists' work; the data do not support the theory.

Much delinquency research has been ecological in nature, although only a portion of the ecological delinquency research has been theoretically tied to the human ecological school. The main contributions of this school are (1) that crime and delinquency persist at high levels in some areas of the city; (2) these consistently high levels persist in the same locations due to large-scale community-level forces and transactions; and (3) aberrant ecological change and increasing delinquency are linked. On this first point it has been established for some time that criminals and delinquents are concentrated more in some locations of the city than in others and that these areas where they reside are physically "poorer" than the conditions elsewhere in the city. Mayhew observed this in the mid-nineteenth century, Burt (1925) reaffirmed it in the early part of this century, and the evidence has mounted since.

Shaw (1929; Shaw & McKay, 1942/1969) observed it in Chicago for both delinquents and adult offenders. More than any other delinquency researcher, he has attempted to interpret his findings in the theoretical framework of human ecology. Shaw remarked (1929, pp. 119, 203) that the spatial distributions of delinquents and adult offenders were similar. Physically deteriorated places of juvenile residence were concentrated in the transition zone adjacent to the central business district and near industrial areas. In interpreting these results (pp. 204-205), he felt that physical deterioration was probably best interpreted as a symptom of an area undergoing transition, due to patterns of city growth, from residential to commercial or industrial land use.

These "natural" transition processes translate to actual people acting in the following manner. City growth often results in the expansion of the central business district (CBD) as increasing services and jobs accompany population growth. In residential areas proximate to the CBD, investors expect that the CBD expansion can be translated into profitable real estate transactions. Consequently speculators move into an area and do much buying and selling of real estate. Because properties are only held for a short period of time, they are not improved or even kept up. The housing deteriorates, and properties are subdivided into low-rent apartments and rooming houses. The areas, until transformed into commercial zones, house low-income and transient populations. These "disintegrative forces" undermine traditional norms and processes of social control, making delinquency more likely.

Sociological

Sociological, or sociogenic, theories look to factors beyond the person, and focus on how environment and culture influence behavior. Theories such as social disorganization and strain theory propose that areas are more likely to develop delinquency when there is a lack of social control. When the structure of society is unstable, individuals are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior to cope with stress. These theories are often used to explain why delinquency is more common in certain areas or among certain groups of people.

Axelrod, H. (1951) and structure close societal goals. This is not always the case. Differential a社, 1974) and a McKay, 1942) b
areas are difficult to interpret theoretically. Take the case of substandard housing, for example, leaving aside how it may be important in its own right as a factor contributing to delinquency, the condition could be interpreted as reflecting relative socioeconomic deprivation or as reflecting the social disorganization resulting from succession and ecological instability, as suggested by the human ecological school. Before discussing the ecological work that attempts to decide between these two explanations, sociogenetic theories of delinquency need to be described.

**Sociological, or Sociogenic, Theories**

Sociological, or as Gibbons (1976) calls them, sociogenic, theories of crime and delinquency causation look to forces, opportunities, and facts outside the person, and in his or her immediate social or cultural environment, in order to explain why delinquency and crime occur. Although most of the theories have been couched in terms of individual-level processes, some have also been used to explain why certain areas become or remain criminal or delinquent locations.7 (This is in contrast to the geographic and economic perspectives that focus on where delinquent or criminal acts have occurred as opposed to where delinquents or criminals live.) Most accept that offender and offense locations can be different because potential offenders will be drawn to targets of opportunity, and these targets are not necessarily close to where they live (Baldwin & Bottoms, 1976). There are those (e.g., Turner, 1969), however, who argue that they may be similar. The theories are as follows.

Anomic theory, deriving from the works of Durkheim (1951) and Merton (1957), states that social structure closes off access (means) to accepted societal goals for certain social groups or classes. This results in a disjunction between societally accepted means (go to school, study hard, get a job, work hard) to achieving these ends (be successful, move up, get rich) and the socially structured or defined means accessible to particular social groups. Society tells people what to be but blocks access to the appropriate means. Consequently recognizing this, members of those groups experience anomic (literally normlessness) and turn to other means to achieve these goals. Crime and delinquency, for example, may bring material rewards (Black, 1970) or social status (Miller, 1958).

Differential association theory (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974) and cultural transmission theory (Shaw & McKay, 1942) both seek to explain the persistence of certain locales as delinquency and crime-breeding areas. Differential association theory says that in certain parts of the city a subculture of deviance has evolved and that persons residing in those areas have a much lower probability of coming into contact with law-abiding acts and attitudes. The deviant subcultural transmission approach suggests that unconventional acts and norms become accepted as the dominant norms by persons living in those areas and are transmitted from one generation to the next. Or in the words of Henry Mayhew (1862; cited in Morris, 1957, p. 61): “Thousands of our felons are trained from their infancy in the bosom of crime; a large proportion of them are born in the homes of habitual thieves and other persons of bad character, and are familiarized with vice from their earliest years.” These theories, however, do not seek to explain how or why these delinquency or criminality areas become established in the first place.

These two theoretical perspectives are integrated in Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) opportunity theory. They emphasize that persons in delinquent or criminal areas experience differential access to legitimate and illegitimate means of attaining societally accepted goals (e.g., money), with illegitimate means predominating. Or, to focus only on illegitimate modes of access, these means may be much more widely available in some areas, thus fostering the chances of delinquent and criminal behavior being successful (Cloward, 1959). Therefore, given blocked access to legal or conventional means of status attainment and the relative predominance of persons pursuing unconventional or delinquent means, criminals and delinquents result.

**Early Ecological Delinquency Area Research and Problems of Interpretation**

With these various theoretical perspectives in mind, we can now turn to the early ecological empirical work on delinquency areas, subsequent to Shaw and McKay's own work, and consider how these findings might fit a social disorganization, anomic, or relative socioeconomic deprivation type of model. (Although the previously described theories indicate that anomic is more likely to result from relative deprivation than social disorganization, a Durkheimian case can also be made that disorganization and the disruption of any remaining mechanical solidarity bonds (i.e., clan or family-based) would also lead to anomic if not replaced with adequate bonds of organic solidarity.) We will see that ecological factors are very
difficult to interpret theoretically in an unambiguous way. And there are other problems with the ecological research as well. In light of these questions, the utility of this research may be minimal.

Lander (1954) correlated census tract variables with delinquency rates based on court cases. Zero-order correlations between these rates and physical variables such as overcrowding and substandard housing were very high, around .7. But at the same time the rates correlated well, around .7 again, with sociodemographics such as percentage nonwhite population and percentage of rental occupancy. Lander interpreted these latter sociodemographics as indicative of social instability. The pattern of higher order partials and factor analyses led him to conclude that anomie, social instability, and lack of social control, rather than low SES and relative deprivation, were the “cause” of delinquency.

Bordua (1958–1959) in Detroit subsequently attempted and reported achieving replication of Lander’s results. Again, although the zero-order correlations between delinquency rates and a host of census tract variables (percentage owner-occupied, overcrowded households, substandard housing, percentage nonwhite) were very strong (.5–.6), the pattern of higher order partials led him to conclude that anomie, and to some extent overcrowding, were the responsible causal factors. In Indianapolis, Chilton (1964) failed to find that delinquency was more closely tied to anomie than to SES factors. He concluded, again based on higher order partials because many of the zero-order correlations were strong, that substandard housing, rental (i.e., transient) households, and to some extent low SES were the responsible causal agents.

Chilton also reanalyzed the Lander and Bordua data subjecting it to different analyses. This reexamination called into question the anomie construct and clearly pointed to a higher order (i.e., net of other variables) association between overcrowded housing units and delinquency. Still, the early studies later came in for heavy criticism. Rosen and Turner (1967) critiqued them on the grounds that multiple regression was inappropriate for the analysis of ecological data because nonadditivity (interaction effects) probably existed in the data. They suggested that predictive attributes analysis, which seeks such conditional effects, was more appropriate. Their analysis of Philadelphia ecological data supported their assertion.

Perhaps more widely known are Gordon’s (1967) criticisms of these works. He criticized higher order partialling carried out when there is no theoretical context to specify relevant control variables. Such procedures commit what he called the partialling fallacy. He also argued that such a procedure made no sense when “valid covariation” was parcelled out. He questioned the construct validity of variables reflective of anomie. He concluded that SES was the major covariate of delinquency.

Taking into account these criticisms, Chilton and Dussich (1974) reanalyzed their original Indianapolis data. They did new factor analyses and carried out predictive attributes analysis, a social area analysis (cf. Shevky & Bell, 1955), and analysis of covariance. They concluded that low SES and delinquency were linked. Perhaps more importantly (p. 81), they said that “delinquency referrals are related to the racial composition and living arrangements of these areas, but that the importance of these factors is not independent of the economic situation.” In other words, substandard or overcrowded housing is more of a potential causative factor for those segments of the population that are already at risk due to other factors, for example, being nonwhite, than it is for other segments. Environmental insults may therefore be more deleterious for some groups than for others.

Morris (1957) analyzed delinquency areas in Croydon and also found very strong ties between poor housing (i.e., overcrowding) and delinquency rates. Much more valuable though was his suggestion regarding the processes underlying this descriptive relationship.

The efficiency of the family as an effective agency of social control must inevitably be impaired when relationships within it are subjected to stress. These factors may arise from... factors which are predominately economic. Undoubtedly among the most important of these is housing. (p. 168).

Thus:

\[
\text{low SES} \rightarrow \text{overcrowded housing} \rightarrow \text{stress: impairment of family members as agents of social control} \rightarrow \text{delinquency}
\]

Although Morris’ data provide only hints that the preceding sequence may be operating, supporting evidence is available from other studies. Loring (1956) found that controlling for social class, households were more likely to be referred to public agencies (courts, welfare agencies, and so on), if role density within the household was higher. (Role density means an increasingly diverse array of kin or relatives.) And Mitchell (1971) discovered in his Hong Kong study that clients sent their offspring more frequently and with a location of the child by Morris to explain delinquency. Most useful factors in part was that these studies went on to empirically verify the theory.
Kong study that as apartment density increased, parents sent their children out of the apartment more frequently and were less likely to know the outside location of the children. Thus the process proposed by Morris to explain the crowded/substandard housing-delinquency link appears worthwhile. Perhaps its most useful feature is that it admits that sociological facts in part determine physical conditions but then goes on to emphasize that the physical conditions have their own consequences.

**Subsequent Ecological Work**

Studies subsequent to the aforementioned, although more careful in their treatment of aggregate data, or melding aggregate data with case study information, continue to find links between areas that produce high rates of delinquencies or offenders and substandard housing. Herbert (1977b) discovered this for delinquents in Cardiff, Cartwright and Howard (1966) with gang delinquents in Chicago, and Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) found this for adult offenders in Sheffield. Because a poor social as well as physical environment continues to characterize these areas, the question still remains as to which is relatively more important. (For a discussion of other problems with work in this area see Baldwin (1975, 1979).)

As Thrasher (1927) found years ago, delinquent locations are “bad” areas of town, which are interstitial in character—that is, they have a mixed ambience, being neither residential nor industrial, and often lie “between” the boundaries of more stable communities. Shannon (1982), in his analysis of several cohorts of delinquents in Racine (Wisconsin), has noted that this continues to be the case. He also discovered some slight evidence that changes in areas (e.g., increasing mixed land use) was later followed by increasing delinquency. [Kobrin & Schuerman (1982) in Los Angeles found that land use changes also eventuated in more juvenile offenses.] One reason for the delinquency-producing qualities of these mixed areas is the number of potential targets they contain and lack of guardians.

**Conclusions: Problems and Possibilities in Delinquency and Crime Location Theory and Research**

Given the foregoing, what can we conclude? First, it is abundantly clear that there are serious conceptual and methodological problems with ecological delinquency research. This research tells us nothing about individual-level relationships unless we want to commit the ecological fallacy (Robinson, 1950; Thorndike, 1939) and impute areal-level relations to individuals. Because various aspects of the environment intercorrelate more strongly at higher levels of analysis, it is exceedingly difficult to untangle this covariation and isolate particular variables as uniquely linked to delinquency or offender rates. Constructing links between areal physical and sociodemographic parameters (e.g., percentage substandard housing, percentage rental population) and social facts such as anomie or social disorganization is a tenuous artistic enterprise at best, and misleading at worst. It may well be impossible to adequately operationalize these social facts that are produced by larger scale metropolitan and intercommunity dynamics by relying solely on ecological data.

But second, despite these limits, problems, and vagaries, two general points are clear from the research. A delinquency or offender area, once established, appears to have considerable “staying power,” retaining those qualities over a span of time from one to four decades. Numerous reasons have been proposed to explain such persistence. These explanations have variously focused on internal dynamics (proximity to opportunities, interstitial or transition zone qualities, physical isolation), external social forces (such as labeling by other residents or housing officials), or external pressures due to growth. With regard to the labeling hypothesis, Savelberg (1982) has reviewed several studies and has suggested that spatially identifiable groups through labeling and discriminatory practices become “objectively disadvantaged” in terms of access to employment, education, and services, thereby setting the conditions for crime and delinquency. Danner (1974) has also used a labeling perspective to explain how areas get and maintain a “bad” reputation. We therefore have indications of how such an area forms in the first place and why it persists. Herbert (1977a; see also 1980) has also proposed a “cycle of disadvantage” model that explains delinquency area persistence through several aspects of disadvantage, all of which work together and reinforce one another in several ways.

Areas that produce higher rates of delinquency or offenders also contain a greater prevalence of substandard or dilapidated housing. And this link may be stronger for some groups than for others. As Morris has suggested (1957), and much research has indicated (Baum & Paulus, Chapter 14, this volume), overcrowded conditions may cause stress and interfere with effective interpersonal functioning, dampening the efficiency of parents or other adults as agents of social control. Or it may drive children out of and away from the home in attempts to gain privacy or at
least distance from other family members. As we will clarify later, there are several possible ways an environmental psychological perspective could be used to clarify these links.

Returning, then, to the environmental psychological perspective mapped out earlier, how might this be integrated with the extant theory and research on delinquency and offender location?

We can start our theoretical integration with the general recognition that changes happening in a neighborhood or a community, perhaps as the result of larger scale urban processes (growth, succession, decline, and so on), will "filter down" to impact territorial dynamics at the block level. These impacts may be several. First, if the area is in the process of change, or even if it is a socially unstable area with a high rate of turnover, this factor impedes effective territorial functioning in outdoor spaces in several ways.

1. Given a high rate of turnover, it is very difficult for any one particular stable resident to keep track of who belongs or who does not belong in an area. Basic distinctions between "insiders" and "outsiders" become blurred. Territorial access control hinges on the ability to make exactly these kinds of discriminations. Imagine two residents who may be sitting out on their front steps. Two doors down three older men may also be sitting but are loud and carrying on. The first resident suggests they go over and tell the rowdies to move on, but the second resident says she thinks two of the three are new renters who have recently moved in. Given that a typical street block (at least in Baltimore) may contain 30 to 60 addresses and that each address in a rental area may include two to six households, even if we only assume an average household size of four, this is 240 to 1440 people of which one must keep track. And if a large portion of the population is constantly moving in and moving out, the exercise of territorial control will be crippled, due to the difficulties in achieving a rudimentary categorization of other people as either belonging or not belonging in the setting. Support for this proposal has been gained from an investigation of the links between neighborhood context and territorial functioning (Taylor et al., 1981).

2. In light of this instability and illegibility of the social context, residents may restrict their domain of territorial concern. Instead of worrying about what is happening on the entire block, they may restrict their attention and vigilance to a smaller area and perhaps worry only about events up to a couple of doors away. This results then, at the block level, in an overall weakening of the texture of territorial control. For any particular patch of outdoor space there are fewer available "eyes" (Jacobs, 1961). Taylor et al. (1981) also provided supportive evidence for this suggestion. In increasingly unstable neighborhoods, attitudes of territorial responsibility extended a shorter distance from the home.

3. Increasing instability means that it will be more difficult for a clearly defined, widely adhered-to standing pattern of behavior to become established. With people constantly coming and going, the program itself is strained, and people become less familiar with it. Thus there may be less respect for what is agreed on as appropriate behavior, and those actual agreements may devolve over time. The process is analogous to successively putting complete new crews on a ship, but never giving them enough time to learn in detail about the ship's operation; their only teachers are the crew that preceded them. Eventually, after a few turnovers, the ship would not be running too well; a similar situation might obtain for the setting program on blocks in unstable areas.

Or to state the point differently, there will be increasing divergence from the original setting program. Because deviation-countering and vetoing mechanisms are crippled due to social overload, illegibility of social context, and the construction of territorial functioning, the divergence is not readdressed. Consequently the norms progressively degrade or become more diffuse. If we assume that residents recognize these developments, it is easy also to understand how fear of crime develops.

The same processes may also deleteriously influence the development of stable corner gangs. With constant turnover, the group structure (cf. Whyte, 1943) may be less well defined, resulting in a diminution of peer pressure and leadership authority. Whether this then results in more or less delinquent acts is difficult to say, but it undoubtedly provides a less meaningful gang context.

4. Instability means that it is more difficult to establish local social ties. Deutschberger (1946) found that in changing as compared to stable areas, local social networks shrank because losses from the network were not replaced. And these local ties are an important supporter of territorial functioning (Newman & Franck, 1965; Taylor et al., 1981). The lack of social supports further detracts from the possibilities of effective territorial functioning.

The preceding points illustrate how social instability may cripple territorial functioning and the setting program. To tie these processes in to the "production" of delinquents (and later criminals), we need only invoke learning processes. In these more unstable areas, residents will be less likely to intervene if they witness a delinquent act (Hackler, Ho, & Ur-
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quhart-Ross, 1974; Maccoby, Johnson, & Church, 1958). The youth learns that he can get away with it. In Miller’s (1958) language, he can get his “thrills” and not get in “trouble.” Given reinforcement and no punishment, the behaviors are repeated.

Second, in addition to social instability, the ecological delinquency research has clearly indicated deteriorated or substandard housing as a covariate of delinquency-producing areas. It is worthwhile to consider how these also might influence territorial functioning at the block level.

1. Lower quality housing is likely to be rental housing, and the lower quality it is the more likely it is to be subdivided into progressively smaller and increasingly inadequate units. Given such a housing condition, residents are not likely to engage in significant territorial marking. They do not identify with nor do they want others to identify them with such conditions. Consequently, at the block level, there is a paucity of upkeep, beautification, embellishments, and territorial markers. The signs that can carry potential messages from the insiders to the outsiders—that say “we care about where we live and you had better behave”—are missing. The physical cues to the setting program (cf. Wicker, 1979, Chapter 4) are missing, resulting in even less adherence to the standing pattern of behavior.

2. When people see the low housing quality that others are living in and the environmental problems that accompany dilapidated housing, they may be likely to conclude that they are living in the midst of moral outcasts (Rainwater, 1966). This attribution will further deepen co-resident distrust and suspicion. (This theme is explained more fully in the section on fear.) Co-resident ties, which can support individual territorial functioning and underpin effective collective territorial action, become even more difficult to establish. So again, territorial functioning is crippled. People are not visibly invested in their environment (and they would probably add, rightly so), and they perceive that their fellow residents are not either. Given such lack of commitment, and potential threat from others, it is not surprising that the local program devolves. Getting involved in local events raises the possibility of retaliation from unpredictable others and cooperating with “unknowns.” (The latter may also have negative consequences.)

In sum, an environmental psychological perspective, grounded in territorial and behavior-setting theories, could be very well integrated with insights from research on delinquent and offender areas. Such integration provides a description of multilevel processes, linking areal dynamics with events at the small-group and individual level. Such integration may therefore provide a much more powerful analysis of the where and why of delinquency and offender areas.

25.4.2. Understanding Where Crimes Occur

Once a delinquent or offender has been “raised,” he or she must go somewhere to commit a crime. An important question is where these criminal or delinquent acts occur. Theory and research in this area, to which economists and geographers as well as sociologists have contributed, is substantial, and three levels of inquiry, of increasing sophistication, can be discerned. At the simplest level, the question is: Where do crimes occur? In what kinds of areas, or what kinds of specific locations? At a somewhat more complex level the question is: If going to commit a crime is like going to work, what does the journey to crime look like? How far do people go? Do they go farther depending on the type of crime they want to commit? And last, the most complex level of inquiry is concerned with the relationship between offender locations and offense locations. How is where the offender lives different from where he or she goes to commit a crime? This last level of inquiry represents the most wholistic approach to the question of crime location.

Opportunity and Cost Approaches

Crime needs a target. In the case of property offenses—residential and commercial burglary, larceny—the location of the targets is fixed geographically by land use. Thus the expectation has been, and data have supported the commonsensical notion, that certain types of crimes happen where there are more opportunities or targets for those types of activities. White (1932), who examined both offender and offense areas, found that high offense areas had much of their land devoted to business use. “The point to be made, in view of these facts, is that crime is associated with business and is found in the center of cities because that is where the greatest concentration of business is found” (p. 502). Percentage of business land use explained 31% of the variation in felonies.

Schmid (1960a, 1960b), in an exhaustive Seattle study noted links between robbery and presence of commercial and business establishments.

O’Donnell and Lydgate (1980) carried out a census of all types of land uses in Honolulu and correlated land uses with crime. Resource factors such as
TOWARD AN ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY OF DISORDER

retailing, restaurants, and entertainment were associated with robbery and larceny. Fraud was associated with tourist business. Perhaps what is more interesting and less expected was the association of physical resources with potentially violent person-to-person crimes such as robbery, assault, and disorderly conduct.

The role of opportunities in relation to crime has led some to suggest that opportunities rather than population factors should be used as the denominator for developing crime rates. Boggs (1965) examined 12 crimes in St. Louis and proposed an opportunity denominator for each (e.g., square footage of land in streets for street robbery, pairs of persons for homicide and assault, the business-residential land-use ratio for business robbery, commercial burglary, and grand larceny). These crime-specific occurrence rates were distributed very differently over the city than standard crime rates and for several rates showed low or modestly negative associations with standard crime rates at the census tract level. Using physical opportunities therefore provides a very different spatial "portrait" of crime.

Subsequent studies reviewed by Harries (1981) have also used opportunity denominators, revealing different spatial distributions of crimes. Two problems noted by Harries (1981) with opportunity rates are (1) the difficulty and/or cost of obtaining valid geographic data for very small areas (e.g., police reporting areas) and (2) if opportunities are used as the denominator for a crime rate, it is not clear how one can control for population characteristics in developing these rates.

Harries (1978, 1981) explored the advantages gained by using alternative denominators in Oklahoma City and Tulsa. Opportunity-based rates showed a much more dispersed crime pattern than did standard crime rates. Harries also determined that opportunity denominators were capturing new information not contained in standard population denominators. He suggested, however, that opportunity-based denominators should only be used for specific subclasses of offenses (e.g., commercial burglary), not broad crime categories.

The link between crime and opportunities is solid (e.g., Dunn, 1980, p. 12) but not perfect. This has led to the consideration of factors (i.e., costs) that would make available opportunities less attractive. One such potential cost is the possibility of police action. Rengert (1980) tested a model that incorporated opportunities and potential costs. Areas with a higher potential cost to the offender were those where police had a higher clearance rate. The percentage of cleared cases was used as the measure of police efficiency. Using abandoned homes (opportunities) and police efficiency (costs), Rengert was able to predict 58% of the variation in crimes of arson and vandalism in 22 Philadelphia police districts.

Costs as well as opportunity factors were considered by Fabrikant (1979) in his analysis of Los Angeles data. Using data from juvenile cases, he found that comparative police efficiency (relative clearance rates) influenced crimes, but the strength of the deterrent impact varied across crimes, being stronger for "outside" crimes such as robbery, which is street-oriented. The implication, then, is that changes in relative efficiency across police areas will result in a change in the distribution of robberies. Robbers will redistribute themselves to avoid areas of high police surveillance or high police efficiency. Such redistribution, however, may not occur as much as Fabrikant suggests. The time involved in travel to and from a crime is also a cost and something offenders seek to minimize.

A markedly different approach to opportunities has been taken by Carter and Hill (1978, 1979). They have argued that if differences in opportunities exist, criminals are "aware" of this and build up images of these areas based on these differences. Thus images should covary with crime. Graphically one may illustrate this as follows:

\[ \text{Opportunities} \rightarrow \text{Image Costs \rightarrow \text{Area Crime rate}} \]
\[ \text{Other factors} \rightarrow \text{area} \]

Carter and Hill used a modified semantic differential technique with convicted property offenders (n = 83) and a noncriminal sample. Three perceptual dimensions emerged (high status, high vs. easy mark, and familiarity). Criminals' images based on these three factors explained over 70% of the variation in crime rates. An important next step in this research would be the linking of image with actual physical and social characteristics.

Focusing on behavioral instead of physical factors, Cohen and Felson (1979) have suggested that the opportunity/cost ratio for crime may be higher in areas that lack natural guardians, for example, a neighborhood of young professionals where in most households husband and wife both work and thus are both away from the home guardian perils even re-making property in an area.

Thus predominate opportunities and types of land use favor formal (i.e., resident-based responses are influenced by occupational patterns) are aware of opportunity it is hard to know, varying motivation extent to which they value ratio.
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Areal Patterns of Offense–Offender Links
Felons live some place and commit crimes elsewhere. This simple fact has led to interest in the “trip to crime,” or the spatial dynamics of offender travel behavior.

DISTANCE
Early work in this area was concerned with the distance between offender residence and offense site. Since White’s (1932) early work, it has been confirmed that felons do not travel that far—anywhere from less than half a mile to a mile and a half or two miles depending on the type of offense and the age of the offender. Violent, as compared to property, offenses are more likely to occur closer to home (McDermott, 1981; Rhodes & Conly, 1981), and juveniles travel less far than older offenders (Turner, 1969; Baldwin & Bottoms, 1976). Crimes that require less readily available targets (e.g., armed robberies require a store) are associated with longer trip distances (Capone & Nichols, 1976).

RELATIVIZED OPPORTUNITY
Concern about the relations between offender residences and offense sites has given rise to the concept of relativized opportunities structures. That is, in relative terms, how much more attractive or available are opportunities at the crime site as compared to where the offender lives. Rengert (1981), however, criticizes the opportunities model because it does not consider “opportunities for whom.” For an opportunity to count, there must be felons nearby whose working radius the crime site is within, and they must, through their daily activity patterns and so on, become aware of this. Thus Rengert suggested actual or effective [to use Gans’ (1968) distinction between potential and effective environment] opportunities were a function of the existence of nearby felons, ease of access, and existence of targets. Using well-known regional science “density potential” models, he tested his thesis on burglaries in different areas of Philadelphia. Areas attracted more burglars if they had more residential units and had higher housing values. Outlying areas of the city were particularly attractive to burglars—due in part to wealthier homes. Katzman (1981), also using a density potential model in Dallas, found that higher neighborhood housing values attracted more property crime. The presence of adjacent poorer populations also contributed to an area’s crime rate. Thus this approach confirms the utility of examining opportunities in relation to the distribution of offenders. A crime opportunity is meaningless unless there are nearby offenders to take advantage of it.

Perhaps more interesting has been the question of whether where offenders live is different in terms of areal characteristics, from where they commit their crimes. Rhodes and Conly (1981) addressed this question in a Washington, DC, study that innovatively merged lot-level, physical, land use information, available citywide with offender files. They found that offense areas were more transitional, and heavily used for business purposes, as compared to DC land use in general, and as compared to areas where the offenders lived. Thus offenders were moving out of their immediate environment to take advantage of nearby crime sites that were more attractive due to their land use pattern and (presumably) accompanying street activity pattern. This agrees with Suttles’ (1968) description of dangerous no-man’s-lands in Chicago such as around construction sites or large institutions or factories. Offenders appeared to avoid heavily residential areas fitting Greenberg, Rohe, and Williams’ (1983) findings. There was also less movement into small business areas, supporting Jacob’s (1961) suggestions about the positive values of such areas.

In sum, then, offenders seek out areas with which they are somewhat familiar in terms of the local ecology, which afford opportunities, and which due to land use and accompanying anonymity and activity patterns lack local or “built-in” guardians.

Specific Locational Factors
Complementing the work on areal factors associated with crime opportunities has been a smaller body of
work concerned with specific features associated with crime incidence. There is a host of soft, rather impressionistic evidence that crimes are more likely to happen on streets with certain types of characteristics. For example, Morris (1957, p. 124) reported in his analysis of Croydon data that the streets “which were poorly lit, shaded by trees or with few passers-by... were commonly the scene of indecent exposures and assaults.” Harder evidence is also available. Bevis and Nutter (1977), for example, observed that the type of street layout (closed vs. through) was associated with burglary rates. Thus some types of streets tend to be more crime-prone than others.

With regard to commercial establishments, McPherson and Silway (1980) found that bars and adult entertainment establishments “generated” nearby street crime but only for certain types of bars and certain types of entertainment establishments. And when they examined crime in single commercial centers, they found that the types of businesses present had a strong impact on the crime rate (McPherson, Silway, & Frey, 1993).

Physical environment features associated with armed robbery of convenience stores were examined by Duffa (1976), using data from Tallahassee. He assumed that armed robbers would be fairly rational in their choice of targets because they do travel farther than unarmed robbers to do a job and thus would be more responsive to various environmental features. He found that the more frequently, as compared to less frequently, robbed stores were located on lightly traveled streets, with fewer surrounding commercial activities, and thus by implication, fewer surrounding eyes on the street. Although businesses represent opportunities, how many of these opportunities actually become crime targets depends on the type of business, type of clientele, and surrounding activity patterns.

These studies confirm that commercial areas afford viable crime opportunities and shed new light on how these opportunities may work. The commercial area’s vulnerability is determined in part by surrounding land use and traffic patterns and its own orderly or disorderly appearance as well as by the nature of the surrounding population. Further, these areas “generate” street crime. In the case of bars, the problem may be between customers. In the case of other establishments, the area may serve as a “lair” due to its anonymity and/or lack of caring by tenants or nearby residents, where unwitting passers-through can be accosted. Links between commercial areas, processes of neighborhood stability and change, and attitudes of proprietors and customers toward the areas need to be examined. Some possible links along these lines will be discussed later.

**Conclusions, Problems, and Possibilities**

The work in this area has suggested several points regarding the geography of crime. Offenders are drawn to opportunities as crime loci, but opportunities must be proximate to a large population of potential offenders who can take “advantage” of the opportunities because, on average, offenders do not travel far. The environmental “image” offenders have of an area is associated with the extent to which the area is victimized. Further, crime or offense areas appear to be different from areas where offenders live. Moving to a more specific level of analysis (Branningham, Dyrenson, & Branningham, 1976), specific types of nonresidential land uses appear to “generate” crime, as a function of the kind of clientele they attract, who can subsequently play the role of either potential offender or potential victim. Thus at a subarea as well as the area level we can also speak of areas of relative opportunity.

Although these general relationships are promising, several significant gaps in this literature remain. Generally speaking, the process by which offenders get “linked up” to particular opportunities or opportunity areas is yet unclarified. Carter and Hill’s (1978, 1979) notion of an area developing an “image” is particularly interesting in this regard. How does this image develop? Is it the case that offenders initially “case” an area, using a set of cues, and then try out their luck, and, if successful, pass the word on to fellow offenders? In interviews with actual offenders (Bennett & Wright, 1984; David, 1974; Letkemann, 1973; Reppetto, 1974), it is suggested that offenders do make such assessments of areas and particular sites and that there is communication between felons involved in similar endeavors. If this is the case, it would be invaluable to know more about the cues offenders use when assessing an area. Two sets of factors may be relevant: features pertinent to the potential opportunity (amount of benefits possible) and features pertinent to potential costs such as surveillability of location, police coverage, presence of safety devices, and perhaps territorial cues indicating investment or vigilance on the part of residents. Offenders may be alert to “clues” in these two areas. The Rhodes and Conly (1981) study particularly underscores this latter point—that offenders committing street assault move into areas where ongoing construction and large-scale nonresidential land uses decrease the likelihood of retribution. Finally, the actual residence (and the offender see major, heavily trafficked part of the entire area thoroughly.
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decrease the likelihood that other passersby, who could act as witnesses or interveners, would be around. Finally the question also arises regarding the actual route taken between origin (offense residence) and destination (crime location). Will the offender seek to route himself or herself along major, heavily trafficked thoroughfares where he or she is likely to be anonymous? This is another aspect of the entire process that needs to be examined thoroughly.

Given the preceding sequence, we can turn to our central inquiry and ask how might this process be folded into and illuminated by an environmental psychological perspective such as the territorial one we have described.

Basically our environmental psychological perspective serves to clarify the types of physical elements in the environment, in addition to location and types of opportunities, to which the potential offender might be attuned. These physical elements would be the signs of upkeep, beautification, and maintenance that reflect strong territorial functioning and high levels of attachment to place (Shumaker & Taylor, 1983). From these the potential offender would infer populations who are vigilant, care about their locale, and are ready and able to confront or do something about intruders or suspicious persons. To the extent that the potential offender infers strong territorial functioning, or high levels of attachment, he or she may anticipate a greater possibility of being detected or apprehended should he or she decide to attempt an offense. Thus the physical observables reflecting territorial functioning or attachment would reduce the anticipated benefit–cost ratio and thereby make the area a less attractive locale to operate in.

Other relevant physical factors may include features such as lighting and volume of traffic on the street, which would lower the salience of the potential offender, and ease of access to a main road for speedy egress. Some of these may also influence resident territorial functioning. With regard to street traffic, Appleyard (1981) indicated that its volume may reduce the time residents spend out front, or the extent to which they are involved with events on the front. With regard to pedestrian traffic, Baum, Davis, and Aiello (1978) found that high levels of foot traffic were associated with residents using their front yards less and less informal chatting between neighbors out front. By implication, then, the pedestrian traffic would also dampen territorial functioning. Thus other factors, above and beyond the resident-generated physical territorial elements, some of which may impact territorial functioning, will shift anticipated benefit–cost ratios. In other words, in addition to physical factors, the computation of the anticipated benefit–cost ratio is probably also influenced by behavioral factors.

More specifically, I would suggest that the potential offender is somewhat attuned to the scope and coherence of block behavior settings in a neighborhood. He or she is aware, albeit perhaps in some what fuzzy fashion, of the bounds of accepted behavior in various locales and has an idea of what will be "noticed" by residents as opposed to what will not stick out. He or she can gauge the extent to which clear, mutually agreed-on demarcations between insiders and outsiders are made by residents, based on the mix of people he or she observes and the observed responses of residents themselves.

In short, potential offenders may be aware of and sensitive to the extent to which residents in a neighborhood or on a block function as natural guardians. The social and physical evidence he or she uses to make this determination are the reflections of residents' territorial functioning. This input influences the anticipated benefit–cost ratios of committing an offense such as aggravated assault or burglary, by leading the potential offender to estimate that it is more or less likely that he or she will be detected, pursued, or apprehended. Consequently this information influences the images that are formed of particular areas and the desirability of various alternative sites (particular blocks, particular households) within an area. In short, the territorial behavior setting focus allows us to pinpoint specific possible factors that link an offender to a particular target area.

Another way the territorial perspective is helpful is in clarifying why crime target areas may be especially vulnerable. If we focus simply on street crime such as assaults or purse snatching, we know some of the reasons why they happen around nonresiden-
tial or commercial land uses. People are attracted to these locations; they go there to shop or drink or be entertained or eat. Consequently these commercial areas act as nodes, drawing pedestrian traffic, resulting in a higher rate of potential targets per time unit. But in addition to the target rate, other factors may be relevant as well. Because small commercial areas are by definition open to the public, no group of "insiders" can establish behavior-setting programs of acceptable behavior. There are some legal remedies that can be invoked such as no loitering within 50 ft of a building, but these are by and large of minimal help. In short, it is difficult if not impossible to establish a delineated setting program when there is a large fraction of commercial land use. Or to state the
point differently, commercial areas are not within the territorial purview of a particular group. Residents abutting small commercial areas recognize this (McPherson et al., 1983) and have minimal expectations of control or jurisdiction over such locations. The predominantly commercial areas are by definition interstitial in a territorial sense, falling between zones of resident-based territorial functioning. This point is not only pertinent for understanding street crime around commercial areas, but it also helps us understand why street crimes occur in no-man's-land, the "transitional areas" described by Rhodes and Conly (1981) where, due to type of land use (institutional, temporary housing) or changes in land use (construction or demolition areas), the natural guardians are lacking, and we have "holes" in the fabric of territorial functioning.

The territorial-behavior setting perspective clarifies linkages between offenders and offense areas, delineating a specific set of cues and processes shaping these linkages.

25.4.3. Crime as an Influence on the Physical Environment

Once an offender or delinquent has been "produced" by an area and once that delinquent or offender has chosen and traveled to a particular locale to commit an offense, several consequences ensue. One that will be taken up in the following section is elevated fear of crime, or perceived risk on the part of residents, or heightened levels of behavioral protection. In this section, however, we focus on how the environment itself may be a "victim" of crime. The environment may be a victim of crime in the following way. Crime may be thought of as one element that, along with many others, may "add up" to result in some overall particular quality of life. Crime counts as a negative factor, or disamenity. Or alternatively, we can think of public safety as an amenity or public good, which crime reduces in size. Other amenities include good versus bad schools, large, adequate housing versus smaller or substandard housing, adequate versus inadequate public services such as refuse collection, and so on. All else being equal, a neighborhood with more crime is a less desirable place to live, and a neighborhood with less crime (more safety) is a more desirable place to live. Thus we might expect that as crime goes up in an area, fewer people want to live there. In economic terms, this is a "softening" of the market as the supply-demand ratio increases. Consequently we would expect house prices to fall. And indeed, several studies indicate that crime does serve to depress house values.

Dubin and Goodman (1982; see also Goodman, in press) examined house sales price for 1,755 house sales in Baltimore City and Baltimore County. Controlling for characteristics of the house sold and for racial composition, crime had a significant dampening impact on house prices. In the city sample, three independent crime dimensions (nonviolent crime to property, violent crime, and "shopping center" crime) all had substantial and significant impacts. A one (standard) unit change on all three of the crime dimensions implied a house value loss of over $7,000. In the county sample, crime impacts were less sizable but still significant for one dimension (violent crime).

Gray and Joeson (1979) examined links between crime and house values and rents in Minneapolis, at the census tract level. Controlling for other neighborhood characteristics, they found that burglary and vandalism depressed house prices. Dollar costs (lost house values) of burglary varied from an average of $336 to $3,090 across the various tracts. Vandalism costs varied from an average of $117 to $2,200. Crime also depressed mean rents. Hellman and Haroff (1979), in a census tract analysis in Boston, also found a price-depressing effect for crime. These studies move us closer to understanding the role of crime in neighborhood deterioration. They suggest that safety (a relatively crime-free environment) is part of assessed (Miller, 1981) and actual value.

This relationship suggests several short-term and long-term consequences. In the short term, by deterring from the economic viability and desirability of an area, higher crime may "push" people out. People may reconsider buying into a higher crime area or may be more desirous of leaving such an area. Unfortunately the "push" hypothesis has not borne up. Rather than being "pushed" out of high crime areas, it appears that people are "pulled" or drawn toward relatively safe environments. Katzman (1980), for example, found that low as compared to high property crime neighborhoods in Dallas were more attractive to mobile families, particularly if those families had children or were from a higher income bracket. "Crime appears as less important an influence on the likelihood of out-movement than on the likelihood of in-movement" (p. 288). Other studies with individuals (Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, Chapter 4), areas (Guterbock, 1976), and Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) (Frey, 1979) have come to the same conclusion. Thus it is not the case that increasing crime drives people out of an area but rather that increasing crime rates reduce the relative attractiveness of a location, thereby increasing the relative attractiveness of safer areas, making the latter more desirable as destination points.
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A long-term consequence of crime as a disamenity might be that crime, by "softening" the housing market in an area, makes the housing in that area "filter down" faster, that is, makes it likely that current owners will be replaced more quickly by lower-income groups. Results from longitudinal assessments, however, have suggested that the causal process is somewhat different than this. Kobrin and Schuerman (1982), in a longitudinal study of areas in Los Angeles using census data from several decades, found that changes in land use later led to changes in areas' populations, and this in turn was followed by an increase in crime. In other words, after land use and population changes occurred, then crime increased.

Thus even though crime is clearly a disamenity, resulting in decreased house prices, what one might expect to be the short- and long-term consequences of this victimization of environment are not supported by research. Crime does not appear to be something that residents flee from, nor does it, by itself, in the long run, appear to speed up processes of neighborhood dissolution. It is clear, then, that more attention is needed to sort out what these consequences are.

How might this research be integrated into the environmental psychological perspective proposed? Crime may be a disamenity in the following fashion. As crime increases in an area, the system of territorial markers and behavior is bound to disintegrate (cf. Jacobs, 1961). People will be out less, watching less, and, if their markers are increasingly disregarded as crime increases in the area, the markers (flowers, decorations, etc.) will no longer be put out. The territorial system will be ignored and overridden, unless residents mount a concerted collective effort, will progressively be withdrawn. So it may not be the case, dependent on the realistic alternatives that people have available to them, that crime makes people more desirable of leaving, but it may be the case that crime leads to further physical deterioration and increased fear, and progressively less clear block setting programs, as the resident-generated territorial system weakens.

25.4.4. Fear of Crime and the Physical Environment

Theory

Fear of crime has been discussed for some time as part of a reaction or response to crime (DuBow, McCabe, & Kaplan, 1979). Other reactions to crime include behavioral restriction and community crime prevention. Explicit in this terminology is the assumption that crime brings about these fear reactions; crime is the stimulus, fear the response.

Unfortunately, this logic has founseered on the fact that fear of crime is much more widespread than crime itself, which, fortunately, is still a relatively rare event. Consequently, researchers have sought other factors that could diminish this slippage. This has basically given rise to a search for a crime "multiplier." Two theories have taken this approach. (For a comparison of various theories, see Taylor and Hale (in press).)

The indirect victimization theory suggests that local interpersonal channels of communication create "indirect" victims of crime. A person is victimized, others hear about it, and they are indirectly victimized because the information increases their fear, anxiety, and concern levels. This theory has received some empirical support (Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Tyler, 1980), suggesting that local channels of communication do serve to spread bad news. The results of these investigations, although they bring crime and fear levels into a greater degree of correspondence, do not completely eliminate the slippage.

Another theory that attempts to bring these matters into line focuses on the local physical as well as social environment. Drawing on a symbolic interactionist perspective, Hunter (1978) argues that residents desire to observe others producing behavior in public places that is supportive of the public norms. These norms may vary from area to area, but each community has its own set of shared subcultural norms (Fischer, 1975). Further, Hunter suggests that these norms are not totally subject to local whim or preference but rather are circumscribed by concepts of "citizenship," which link residents to each other and to the state. These citizen-state obligations and the power of the state to define rights and duties circumscribe the range of acceptable norms. Thus people expect public order from each other, and this is related to and embedded within the individual-state connections of citizenship. (The similarities between this line of reasoning and Wilson's, 1975, are several. He suggested that what bothered people most about crime was the implication that people could no longer be counted on to observe accepted norms of behavior in public spaces.)

Social signs of civility include matters such as people not being noisy, politeness in public space encounters, and assistance in times of need. Social signs of incivility include individuals or groups drinking or getting drunk or dealing drugs in public places, "street" or "hey, honey" hassles, rowdy children out of their parents' control, and arguments or disputes between neighbors. Physical signs of civility include
well-trimmed lawns and bushes and yards, clean steps and sidewalks and alleys, well-painted houses, clean windows, and unliitered, maintained public facilities or playgrounds. Physical signs of incivility include vacant or abandoned houses, poorly maintained housing, vacant lots that are overgrown or littered with trash and junk, autos in disrepair, littered alleys, scattered bulk trash such as refrigerators or stoves, and so on.

Physical and social signs of incivility are expected at the territorial boundaries between different segments of the social order (Suttles, 1965), that is, between different racial or ethnic or class-based territorial groupings. But when communities experience decline or drastic change (succession in Park's terminology), the physical and social incivilities will become more prevalent, spreading beyond the boundaries. And it is this awareness of social and physical incivilities, decoded as clues to holes or gaps in the social order, that inspires fear. Graphically Hunter (1978) portrays his model as follows (double arrows indicate dominant causal pathways):

Because physical and social incivilities are more ubiquitous and more frequently experienced than crime, this explains why fear levels are higher than crime rates warrant and why across areas and persons fear and crime are only modestly associated. Further, Hunter suggests that the continued existence and spread of social and physical incivilities serves to further undermine residents' belief in the legitimacy or potency of the state. These signs are "living testimony" to the inadequacy of policing, housing enforcement, sanitation crews, and so on. Perhaps what is more important is a significant assumption in Hunter's incivilities thesis. For fear to be aroused, residents must make an inference from the general to the particular. They must deduce that because the area as a whole is becoming progressively disorderly, they themselves are personally at risk; that some harm could come to them. Finally the major "driver" in Hunter's thesis is social disorganization, as brought about by human ecological processes. By invoking this large-scale concept, Hunter harks back to the much earlier work of Shaw and McKay. And an important question is whether or not these processes can be adequately measured.12

Wilson and Kelling (1982) have used a related line of reasoning to argue strongly that police should be more involved in maintaining the public order that is desired by community residents. They suggest that foot patrols can and do do this effectively in many instances. An experiment in Newark suggested that foot patrols reduce fear levels and result in more effective police-citizen interactions because officers are more familiar with the locale and with whom they are dealing. [For a more thorough discussion of the relevant theoretical and empirical work, see Greene and Taylor (1986).]

Wilson and Kelling's (1982, p. 32) causal reasoning about the links between physical and social incivilities and crime is slightly different from the logic proposed by Hunter. These authors suggest that the growing incivilities lead to behavioral restriction and withdrawal on the part of residents and a reluctance to "get involved" or to attempt to regulate others' behaviors. At that point "such an area is vulnerable to criminal invasion." To depict it graphically:

This model is different from Hunter's thesis in that fear, by reducing informal social control, leads to increased crime. Thus (1) crime and incivilities are indirectly instead of directly linked, and (2) fear may cause more crime as well as things working the other way around.

The incivilities hypothesis, in either guise, is appealing. It focuses on contextual characteristics that, potentially, provide very powerful explanations of the fear-crime link. And in contrast to earlier models, it expands still further the scope of potential causal factors.

Research
Empirical work to date has purportedly supported the incivilities thesis. Lewis and Maxfield (1986), in a study of 12 neighborhoods, found that high fear levels were most promi
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were most prominent in areas with high crime levels and high levels of perceived social and physical incivilities. Skogan and Maxfield (1981), using data from the same study, reported a strong positive neighborhood-level correlation between perceived social and physical incivilities and fear levels. These data are limited, however, in that perceived as opposed to objectively assessed incivilities were measured.

When objective measures are used, the results are much less supportive of the thesis in a secondary analysis of the Greenberg, Rohe, and Williams (1982) Atlanta data set, Taylor and Hale (in press) used measures of on-block physical incivilities, such as vacant houses, to predict individual fear levels. The physical features had few significant impacts. In a Baltimore study of 66 neighborhoods (Taylor, Gottfredson, & Shumaker, 1984; Taylor, Shumaker & Gottfredson, 1985), residents in each locale were interviewed, and 20% of all street blocks were reliably coded by teams of raters. Although the assessments provided a very clear-cut social and physical incivility factor, this feature, after controlling for socioeconomic characteristics, had minimal impact on fear. The authors, however, hypothesized and found that incivilities did have an impact on fear in moderate income neighborhoods. So although linked to perceived social and physical problems, fear of crime is not linked to objective characteristics across the board, although it may be linked in some kinds of neighborhoods.

The implications of this are several. First, the link of fear with perceived social and physical problems supports Garofalo and Laub's (1978) suggestion that "fear of crime" is more than "fear" of "crime." It suggests that community concern, an awareness of community deterioration, is bound up in this as well. Second, and perhaps what is more important for an environmental psychologist, it appears that the link between perceived and actual incivilities is by no means straightforward. Rather it appears to be a complex and perhaps Brunswikian probabilistic relationship (cf. Cnien & Appleyard, 1980). Some people may be more sensitive to the implications of a deteriorating environment (e.g., those in moderate income neighborhoods that have uncertain futures) than others. In short, the implications of the deterioration of the physical environment for fear levels are not yet clear.

Possibilities
If we turn to the proposed environmental psychological perspective, I would suggest that there are several ways it can help us clarify links between physical environment and fear. First, fear of crime is a reflection of the loss of territorial control, of the breakdown of an orderly setting program. In fact, at the block level, fear of crime and territorial cognitions reflecting a lack of territorial control correlate better than .7 (Taylor et al., 1984).

Second, the impact of physical incivilities depends on how perceivers explain their causes. In the case of vacant houses or lots or units that are not kept up, residents may infer that either local residents are the cause or that forces external to local groupings such as the city bureaucracy or slumlords are to blame. If the latter attribution is made, it may have a negative impact on self-perceptions, as Rainwater (1966) has suggested, or it may not. People may feel that they are being discriminated against, rather than deciding that they are moral outcasts. So if an attribution to extraneighborhood factors is made, the physical deterioration may not be fear-inspiring. I would suspect that this kind of attribution would be made in lower income, predominantly rental areas, where vacancies and dilapidation may be the most widespread.

If, on the other hand, residents attribute an internal cause (within-neighborhood cause) to the physical deterioration, then this is a different matter altogether. If they decide that physical deterioration is coming about because people care less about where they live and the area is going downhill, this would be fear-inspiring. It would indicate that territorial functioning, and concomitantly the setting program, are disintegrating. As territorial markers reassuring residents of each other's mutual trustworthiness are replaced by signs of decay, mistrust will increase. Internal attributions such as these are most likely to be made in neighborhoods that have at least a modicum of homeownership (e.g., at least 30 to 40% owner-occupied housing units). In such areas, physical incivilities are likely to be less prevalent than in the lowest income areas but are likely to have more of an impact. What this adds up to then is a nonlinear relationship between physical incivilities and fear; the impact of the physical degeneration depends on how it is interpreted. If viewed as a breakdown in resident-generated territorial control, it will cause concern. This conditional relationship has been empirically supported (see Taylor, Shumaker, & Gottfredson, 1985).

A third point from a territorial perspective concerns the spatial relationship between the physical incivilities and the person whose fear may be increased. Focusing for the moment on one respondent, whether or not physical deterioration such as a
vacant boarded-up house increases his or her fear levels depends upon how close that house is. If it is next door, the person may be extremely concerned due to the possibility of rats attracted by the garbage thrown in or the possibility of a fire being set. The proximity translates into a direct threat to the perceiver’s own household and well-being. If the vacant house is located further away but still on the same street block, it is less of a cause for worry, but it is still troublesome. The perceiver must pass by it in his or her daily rounds, and it constitutes an eyesore and a reminder of the lack of viability of the respondent’s own neighborhood. If the vacant house is still further away, it may be only of minimal concern. If it is far enough away so that it can be avoided in the daily round of activities, the perceiver can convince himself or herself that what goes on “over there” cannot happen on his or her block. The spatial dynamics, therefore, may also influence impacts on fear.

These considerations all add up to a highly conditional relationship between physical decline and fear of crime. The decline must be interpreted as a reflection of decreased concern, investment, or commitment on the part of residents themselves, and it must be proximate, in order to result in a sense of decreased territorial control, which is reflected in more fear. Thus the environmental psychological perspective we have developed allows the specification of how and when this physical environment–fear linkage may hold.

25.4.5. Summary

In the foregoing sections we have examined theory and research pertinent to several aspects of disorder. We have considered where offenders and delinquents are likely to reside, what kind of target areas they pick and why, and what the impacts of crimes actually committed are. In each area, we have suggested that extant theories can be considerably enhanced by an integration with an environmental psychological perspective. The integration results in a clearer statement of the micro-level causal processes suggested by these theories. The integration also, in some cases, results in an expansion to multilevel models. Consequently the question of whether or not environmental psychology has anything unique to contribute to these areas of inquiry can, on the basis of these considerations, be answered resounding in the affirmative. The following section drives this point home more strongly by considering work already done that has used an environmental psychological approach.

25.5. WORK REFLECTING THE BEGINNING OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY OF DISORDER

In this section, theoretical and empirical work that explicitly draws on concepts from environmental psychology to determine where crime occurs and where fear or problem levels are lower is considered. The most recent work receives the most attention. Work is reviewed according to the level of analysis, moving from the site level to work at the street-block level, and subsequently to the neighborhood level.

In a theoretical sense, much of this latter work stands in the shadow of (and some might say, on the shoulders of) Newman’s (1972) work on defensible space. Although there are several excellent reviews of theory and research in the area (Mayhew, 1979; Merry 1981a, 1981b; Taylor, Gottfredson, & Brower, 1980) some prefatory remarks regarding the theory and research are warranted.

The theory as originally formulated was a strong reaction against the design and planning practices of public housing projects in the 1950s and 1960s. High-rise buildings with hundreds of units were situated in “superblocks,” surrounded by undifferentiated landscaping, and far from public streets. Newman (1972) suggested that these very design practices that were praised by architects contributed to crime levels. The large number of people in a building, the large, undifferentiated outdoor areas, and the lack of surveillance, for example, made it difficult for people to exercise their “natural policing function.” Newman felt that if exterior spaces could be segmented and redesigned in such a way as to unleash natural territorial instincts, then residents themselves would begin to take care of things more, and crime would decrease. Graphically his original theory was:

\[
\text{Stronger Design} \rightarrow \text{territorial} \rightarrow \text{Less crime functioning}
\]

He maintained that his research in New York City housing projects linking certain design features with lower crime rates supported his notion. It is worthwhile to consider just a couple of limits of this early theory and research. (For more, see Taylor, Gottfredson, & Brower, 1980, or the other reviews.) First, Newman’s view of human territorial functioning is very global, nonpro
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very global, nonplace specific, and oversimplified. Second, his early research failed to measure the cruci
al hypothesized mediating variable—territorial functioning. Both of these limitations were addressed in
subsequent work. These flaws notwithstanding, the pioneering nature of this early work cannot be dis-

missed.

25.5.1. Site Level

At the level of the individual site or household, it appears that offenders and residents alike may perceive
and be responsive to territorial markers and behavioral traces. Brown (Brown & Altman, 1983) com-
pared burglarized and nonburglarized households in suburban settings and observed that nonvictimized
sites displayed more territorial markers and signs of activities. She has suggested, based in part on this
evidence, that as the burglar approaches a particular household he or she must penetrate through a series
of increasingly “strong” territories, and whether or not he or she chooses to do that depends on the ob-
servable territorial cues (Brown & Altman, 1978, 1981). Although actual burglar perceptions have not
yet been measured, it makes sense to suggest that burglars would take physical features into account.

What is more clearly established is that residents are aware of and “decode” territorial cues as influ-
encting potential intruders and shaping resident responses to incursions. A study using abstract pic-
tures found that fences, and to a lesser extent flow-
er, would deter intrusions (Brower, Dockett, &
Taylor, 1983). Also flowers were an indication of a
safer, better quality block. Respondents felt that if a
fence was present, a resident would respond more
vigorously to an intruder because an incursion would
be harder to justify. Comparing residents in low ver-
sus high problem areas, in the latter case redundant
territorial cues were viewed as necessary to deter in-
vasions (confirming Brower, 1980). Thus residents
and perhaps burglars understand the role of on-site
territorial markers. More work needs to be done
with offenders to clarify the exact cues that are re-

cvant, and how they are weighed in the decision-
making process.

25.5.2. Street-Block Level

At the street-block or group level, territorial function-
ing can have a deterrent impact on crime and fear. Such functioning can be supported by local social cli-

mate and by physical factors. A study of 63 street

blocks in Baltimore found that blocks with more ex-
tensive real and symbolic barriers and where resi-
dents knew one another better and where residents
felt more responsible for what happened on the sid-
ewalk and in the alley had less street crime and
less fear (Taylor, Gottfredson, & Brower, 1984). Fur-
ther it appeared that social ties undergirded ter-
ritorial functioning. A similar result was obtained in
a study of 60+ public housing sites across the coun-
try. Newman and Franck (1980, 1982) found that de-
sign features such as fewer households per doorway
encouraged informal outdoor socializing and control
over adjoining outdoor spaces, which in turn was as-
associated with less crime and fear. Therefore, at
the block or project level, in a broad range of residential
environments, territorial functioning, supported by
physical factors and group dynamics, serves to dampen
incidents of and negative reactions to disorder.

25.5.3. Neighborhood Level

At the neighborhood level, several studies suggest
that links between design and disorder are indirect
and are dependent on other contextual factors.
Merry (1981a, 1981b) has highlighted the role of cul-
tural factors. In her study of a multiethnic public
housing area, she found that many potentially defen-
sable areas were left undefended because Chinese
members of the community perceived that they were
dominated or outnumbered by members of other
ethnic groups, even though they were not. In a dem-
stration project in Hartford (Fowler & Mangione,
1979), entrances to and traffic through a neigh-
borhood were altered so as to make the streets less
anonymous and “turn them back” to the residents
themselves. When coupled with a local organizing ini-
tiative, these steps appeared effective in reducing
crime and fear. When local organizing efforts faded,
crime appeared to creep back up (Fowler & Man-
gione, 1981). So again, as at the block level, physical
factors alone are not sufficient to guarantee order;
but if coupled with other social or cultural dynamics,
they can be effective.

Potentially relevant also to the maintenance of
neighborhood order is attachment to place
(Shumaker & Taylor, 1983). In a study of 66 Bal-
timore neighborhoods Taylor et al. (1984) found that
fear was lower in neighborhoods where attachment
to locale was stronger. Person-place bonds, net of
actual crime or physical deterioration levels, influ-
enced perceptions of disorder. The more general
implication of this linkage is that impacts of events
indictive of disorder are conditioned by overall sentiments regarding locale.

25.5.4. Summary

This recent work indicates that concepts of human territoriality and related processes such as attachment to place are helpful in understanding links between physical environment, social environment, crime, and fear. In just a short period of time, relatively sophisticated and powerful models have been developed. These models have been applied to issues of disorder at the site, block, and neighborhood levels and should continue to be useful. The utility of these models confirms that environmental psychological models have a significant place to occupy in the armamentarium of conceptual tools applied to problems of disorder.

25.6. A CAUTIONARY NOTE

The tone throughout has been largely exhortatory and upbeat, suggesting in several ways how a particular environmental psychological perspective could be conjoined with other theoretical areas to provide more powerful, truly multidisciplinary perspectives on various issues of disorder. It is necessary, so that we will not be accused of a Panglossian stance, to trundle out some of the particular difficulties that confront researchers in this area. These problems are already familiar to criminal justice and criminology researchers.

First of all, there is a dearth of large-scale, easily available data bases with which to work. For crime, there are the Uniform Crime Reports, issued yearly, but these only report results at the city level. This means that to obtain specific, localized crime data, one must develop a good working relationship with the local police department. Crime data themselves, however, are in many ways problematic (Skogan, 1981, but cf. Hindelang, 1974). Reported crime, for example, is less than true crime. Incidences of true crime may be better approximated using victimization survey data such as is contained in the National Crime Survey (NCS). But in the NCS, no specific geographic codes are available. Thus one cannot transfer NCS victimization reports, for example, onto a census of a city. One might decide to go out and do one's own victimization survey. Several problems crop up here, however, due to the rarity of crime. Many people must be surveyed in order to develop a stable victimization rate (Skogan, 1981). Depending on the type of crime of interest, anywhere from several hundred to several thousand persons must be interviewed before it will be possible to have a good estimate of the rate. Further because rates are low and thus unstable, they have large standard errors. Consequently it may be difficult to ascertain whether or not two areas have significantly different victimization rates. The smaller the areas compared (e.g., blocks vs. neighborhoods), the more difficult it is to make these discriminations. These difficulties do not surround fear data because everyone has some fear level. Thus there are real problems in developing good crime or victimization measures and relating them to specific environmental factors.

Another problem with crime statistics, and with official delinquency statistics, is that they may be biased, reporting a greater proportion of the incidence of each in the lower social classes. Although in the area of crime several studies have supported their nonbiased nature (e.g., Black, 1970; Hindelang, 1978), the question is by no means settled.

In the area of delinquency reporting, research results suggest that for some purposes, official delinquency data may be biased (Hindelang et al., 1981, p. 207).

Over the last decade the delinquency research community has been increasingly polarized between those who felt official data were adequate and self-report inadequate and those who felt the reverse. This split was deepened, in part, by the fact that the two different groups kept finding different "predictors" of delinquency. For example, the "official" group claimed that the links between low social class and high delinquency rates were strong, whereas self-report studies failed to find this. (It turned out as discussed earlier that part of this problem was the ecological approach of the former and the individual-level approach of the latter.) Hindelang et al. (1981) found, in a large-scale study, that the self-report method was by and large valid. People were likely to report crimes known to officials, as well as those not known.

The validity of the measure, however, was differential across subgroups of the population and was lowest for black males—the group with the highest official delinquency rate. But self-report data from black males, although invalid for some purposes (e.g., black-white comparisons), may be valid for other purposes (e.g., understanding the etiology of delinquency in black males; Hindelang et al., 1981, pp. 213-224). The validity of the data, either based on official statistics or self-report, depends on the uses to which it is put.

A conceptual problem that requires very special attention is that labeling on different block boundaries may be quite different. Living in different neighborhoods may alter the caregivers' and the average citizen's perception of a situation (see Gibb's [1972] results).

In crime, the cause of the range (FBI has definitive definitions). Typically, on one of these scales or divide into the general categories. There are as many as there are types of crimes.

Second, people naive regarding the order. What I mean is that one may not know what he has a "need" for. Possible interpretations can be interpretable; as suggested by Taylor, 1977; Taylor, Wal and viewed as a con values (Müller, 1977). The commitment to success only to ill
A conceptual and statistical problem in this area that requires very careful attention is the aggregation problem (Cronbach, 1976; Hannan, 1971; Taylor, 1982, pp. 307–310). Residents living on the same block may be more like one another, in their attitudes toward the immediate environment, than people living on different blocks. Residents living in one neighborhood may be more like one another than residents living in different neighborhoods. Consequently, these similarities must be taken into account by decomposing the data (centering by appropriate means). Otherwise, misleading correlations may result.

A couple of final theoretical issues deserve to be highlighted. First, crime and delinquency are both labels applied to an extraordinary range of behaviors. In the case of delinquency, for example, Gibbons (1976, pp. 97–98) has remarked that “there must be something radically different about gang delinquents, sex offenders, petty ‘hidden’ offenders, juvenile arsonists, hyper-aggressive delinquents, and other lawbreakers who are lumped together under the term ‘delinquent.’” It is not surprising therefore that numerous attempts have been made to develop typologies of delinquents and delinquent behavior. (For a discussion of these approaches, and their pros and cons, see Gibbons, 1976, pp. 99–100, especially Footnote 72.)

In crime, the problem is somewhat simpler because the range of behaviors is more restricted. The FBI has definitions for eight “serious” or Part I offenses. Typically, an ecological researcher will focus on one of these or add them all up to make a “crime” scale or divide them into “property crimes” and “personal crimes.” The main point for the theorist and the researcher is to carefully state, in conceptual terms, why predictors will be linked to particular types of crimes, or particular types of delinquencies.

Second, researchers cannot be sociologically naive regarding the causes and consequences of disorder. What I mean by this is that the existing social order may “cause” disorder and at the same time have a “need” for disorder to exist. There are many possible interpretations of the causes of disorder. It can be interpreted in the Marxist context of conflict, class struggle, and resistance to domination (Sumner, 1977; Taylor, Walton, & Young, 1973). Or it could be viewed as a commitment to an autonomous set of values (Miller, 1958), or a subdominant value orientation (Kluckholn & Strodtebeck, 1961), or as a result of commitment to dominant societal goals but with access only to illegitimate means (Coward, 1959). Other interpretations are possible as well. The main point of these different views, whether we subscribe to a Marxist perspective or some other orientation, is that it is possible that the very structure of society and its inequities somehow cause disorder.

At the same time, society may have a need to observe disorder. Durkheim (1960) has suggested that by defining certain people as delinquent or criminal, society is indicating what the norms of acceptable behavior are. People who pass those bounds deserve to be rejected because they are deviant (statistically speaking), and this rejection clearly keeps a reminder of what is and what is not tolerated before society. The situation only becomes problematic when those who are rejected constitute too large a portion of the society. If such a situation developed, Durkheim suggested, society will redefine the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable behaviors, in favor of increased leniency. Society needs to label some people and behaviors as disorderly, so that its own order is clarified by juxtaposition.

Translating these considerations into spatial terms suggests several interesting thoughts. If society is causing and/or needs to define certain segments of the population as deviant, delinquent, or criminal, these individuals are going to be connected to particular locations. At the neighborhood level, this means that individuals from outside of a particular area, including those connected with public service such as housing officials or police will be labeling locations within an area as crime- or delinquent-infested (Damer, 1974). These sociotypes (Triandis, 1977) justify reduced levels of service delivery to these areas. The concentration as opposed to dispersion of such labeled individuals and areas “serves” the public at large because (1) they can avoid such locations, and (2) such locations enhance, by comparison, the quality of upper scale areas.

At a more microscale level, this line of reasoning suggests that if certain people are to be labeled as delinquent or otherwise marginal members of society, they will need, claim, and be granted locations where they can carry on. In other words, suppose society is, in effect, allocating intersitial areas to those groups and individuals whose behavior has been defined as out of bounds. This process of societal allocation and individual or group claiming could be reciprocal, complementary, and systemlike. The out-group is relegated to intersitial areas where, to some extent they are out of sight, and where they are less likely to disturb the most central, close-to-home spaces in the residential environ-
ment. And at the same time, these groups claim these spaces with graffiti, litter, and broken bottles, indicating that they have been there and could well return, thereby discouraging others belonging to main-line society from mingling. The fear of dangerous places then serves to maintain a separation between members of society and those who are defined as beyond the bounds. This concentration of outsiders in interstitial areas better serves the local society than deconcentration of outsiders could. In the former case the security of close-to-home territories can be more easily maintained. The gathering of outsiders in interstitial areas only becomes problematic when these spaces are very close to central territories.

The implications of this line of reasoning for issues of territorial control are several. First, it suggests that the interstitial areas are functional. Lapses in territorial control such as occur between block behavior settings help to more clearly define those settings and to protect them from potential deviant pressures. If loud radios and drinking are going on in the park, they will be less likely to happen in front of one's door. Second, attempts to close gaps in territorial functioning, to fill in the interstices, may be bound to fail. The outsiders may simply gather somewhere else—a place where control is minimal—and go through the process of claiming that. In short, attempts to expand the block behavior setting may result only in displacement. (Although this would be a gain for the persons living closest to the first location, it is neither a gain nor a loss from the perspective of the larger area.)

These comments should not be interpreted as either a defense of current levels of disorder extant in residential neighborhoods, nor should they be viewed as disparagement of attempts to reduce levels of disorder. The main point being made is that, sociologically, the topography of territorial control cuts more than one way and that the perspective of the orderly should not automatically take precedent over potential perspectives from the viewpoint of the disorderly, or over the perspective of the society as a whole. Future theoretical refinements should not lose sight of a pluralistic approach. Although this commitment may make conceptual clarification more cumbersome, it may result, ultimately, in theory that has more external validity.

25.7. RESEARCH FUTURES

Where will the environmental psychology of disorder lead? What theoretical avenues will be pursued? Throughout we have described various possible theoretical integrations that can be achieved, working with the theories of human territoriality and behavior settings. In this section, we will indicate some further clarifications that are needed regarding territorial functioning in block settings and then move on to consider some more abstract issues deserving of attention.

An important issue will be to develop more complete descriptions of how territorial functioning operates in block settings. These processes are potentially rich in texture. If observations are carried out in systematically related locations, for example, in urban versus suburban areas, in stable versus changing neighborhoods, the links between extrasetting context and setting functioning can be more carefully delineated. These observations will also be useful in more closely delineating where territorial processes leave off and where other processes such as attachment or stress responses come into play. There is a very real danger of expanding the concept of territorial functioning so much that it becomes useless. This danger can and should be avoided by bounding, or indicating the limits, of these processes.

Such in-depth descriptive work can be more useful if it is longitudinal. An investigation over time (e.g., Bechel, 1977) would help to delineate more carefully how particular individuals play various roles in the block program and perhaps even give clues to the various motivations underlying participation (or penetration) in the setting at a particular locale. Once this background leads to particular hypotheses about individuals in settings, then they could possibly be tested using cross-sectional study designs. Examinations over time may also provide clues about uncoiling the causal chain involving fear, informal control, and crime, and determining how they feed into one another. Thus descriptive work, over time in a range of settings, may be most useful in further fleshing out the environmental psychological perspective proposed in this chapter.

There may also be a place for experimentation. In fact, field experiments may be the most straightforward way of further elucidating the spatial distribution of territorial behaviors. For example, certain contaminants can be placed at various points in or adjoining a setting, and residents' responses observed. Worthel and Lollis's (1982) technique of depositing small bags of litter may be one useful approach, although others certainly should be tried. It is important to know the topography across synomorphs inside the behavior setting, and outside the behavior setting, of territorial behaviors.
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A pressing question deserving attention is the perspective of the delinquent or the potential offender. Carter and Hill's (1979) work in this regard is a very promising start, and consideration of criminals' image of an area needs to be explored at the finer levels of block and site. Many of the methods of environmental cognition could be applied to such an inquiry. Further light must be shed on these processes if we are to understand the etiology of disorder.

Although the preceding points are by no means an exhaustive listing of the needed amplifications for a more complete theory of territorial block settings and disorder, they at least indicate some of the more important loose ends of the theoretical perspective that need to be resolved.

Turning to more abstract matters, there are several aspects of the issue of disorder that deserve pursuing. The discussion in this chapter has turned on fear of crime, delinquency, and crime as indexes of disorder. This is a very limited set of indexes, to be sure. These indexes could be expanded in several dimensions. For example, how are collective disorders such as looting, burning, and so on, ecologically patterned? Are the patterns similar to crime? Georges' (1975) finding that buildings burnt in Newark during collective disorders tended to be along main thoroughfares and Crescen's (1983) suggestion that looting targets during the 1979 Baltimore snowstorm tended to be on neighborhood boundaries would suggest there may be similarities between collective disorders and incidents perpetuated by individuals. The same kinds of locations may be susceptible to both types of violence. As yet there has been minimal attention paid to possible links between the geography of collective disorders and the geography of crime. If the disorder continuum is to gain validity, a broader set of indexes will be needed, and for these different indexes researchers will have to demonstrate similar types of causes.

A second issue deserving attention is multilevel processes. How are neighborhood dynamics linked to block dynamics, and how are block dynamics in tum linked to individual or household processes? Research to date has tended to stay focused at one particular level. But in actuality, larger scale processes influence lower scale processes and vice versa.

A sketchy example may clarify these connections. Consider an inner-city neighborhood, which was once stable lower middle-class ethnic, which has recently changed to being racially mixed. With increasing demand for affordable starter houses and only more expensive housing elsewhere, the neighborhood may suddenly experience an influx of gentrifying "yuppies" (young urban professionals). This may make the area a more desirable target for offenders because there is more to steal. Thus the neighborhood may experience an increase in property crime.

At the block level these market processes, in one case, may have resulted in a more heterogeneous population, with resentment between longer term, blue-collar Catholic residents, lower middle-class blacks, and gentrifiers. Some new gentrifiers, more used to advocating for themselves and expecting a higher quality environment given their background, may try to mobilize people around a community crime prevention effort. But due to diversity, the effort may fail. The recently increased diversity may also increase co-resident distrust, further dampening territorial functioning. Individual perceptions of, and responses to, these dynamics may depend upon one's confidence in the neighborhood and particular group membership.

The example begins to convey the kind of complex but significant causal connections that can occur across levels. These links need to be drawn into a more wholistic picture of disorder.
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NOTES


2. A street block refers to the spaces encompassed by the houses on two sides of a street, bounded at the ends by two cross streets.

3. Several years ago some student fieldworkers involved in a research project were working in a low-income neighborhood. At a stoplight, local youths were trying to gain entrance to stopped trucks, via rear doors. The assessor informed the driver who pursued the youths. Later the youths came back and asked the students. "What right do you have messing with our fan? We do this every day."

4. One might argue that places providing opportunity for disorder can be eliminated by policies such as age-segre-
gated housing policies. Newman (1979) has proposed an idea somewhat along these lines. The problem remains, however, that even if miscreant individuals or youth were "zoned" out of an area, they would still be likely to migrate to another area in search of purse-snatch or robbery targets.

5. The expansion of the opportunity areas for disorders assumes that there is an available and waiting "supply" of disorderly youth who will move in and make use of the space, for which there is a "demand." The correctness of this assumption varies from neighborhood to neighborhood but may be more correct in neighborhoods that have, or are surrounded by, more sizable youth or lower income populations.

6. Murray (1982) also found some "new" delinquency areas that had not shown up in 1940; these were in the northwest section of the city where, from 1960 to 1970 black populations had largely replaced the prior Jewish population.

7. For the labels applied to some of the theories here, I follow Schmid (1960b).

8. As one person described by Liebow (1967) in his study of inner-city black men said, "A hard working dishwasher just becomes a hard working dishwasher."

9. The problem of changing relations at varying levels of analysis is illustrated in the debate on the low SES–delinquency debate. Gordon has concluded that "the association between delinquency and socioeconomic status is quite unambiguously very strong" (Gordon, 1967, p. 927; see also Gordon, 1976). But as Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis (1981, p. 184) point out, almost all of the research that has found the SES–delinquency link has been ecological, and "the consistency and strength of the ecological SES–delinquency relationships are beyond dispute." But the error has crept in in that "the dominance of ecological research on the SES–delinquency relation has resulted in the findings of this research being relied upon as evidence about the individual-level relationship, despite its obvious tangential relevance to this question."

10. Density potential models ask, for each of a range of points in a geographic space, what is the potential of that point given surrounding conditions. Contributions from other points to a point's potential are weighted by proximity. Thus one might ask for various potential commercial sites for an expensive store in the city, what is the potential market, as defined by households in adjacent areas with incomes of over $30,000. Or, in our case, for the subpopulations of small stores ("stop and rob") in various locales, what is each locale's potential "market" of offenders living nearby?

11. Transitional areas had temporary lodgings or construction or demolition.

12. The incivilities thesis, although little about it has been published, has been extraordinarily influential in research and policymaker circles in the area of criminal justice and crime prevention.
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