

# FEAR OF CRIME, INCIVILITIES, AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY IN FOUR MIAMI NEIGHBORHOODS

## **Marc L. Swatt, Ph.D.**

Assistant Professor – School of Criminology and Criminal Justice  
University of Nebraska Omaha  
CPACS Building 218F  
6001 Dodge Street  
Omaha, NE 68182-0149  
Email: mswatt@unomaha.edu  
Ph: 402-554-4057

Marc L. Swatt is an Assistant Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. His recent publications have appeared in *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Crime and Delinquency*, and *Journal of Criminal Justice*. His current research interests include quantitative methods, criminological theory, neighborhoods and crime, and spatial crime analysis

## **Sean P. Varano, Ph.D.**

Assistant Professor – School of Justice Studies  
Roger Williams University  
CAS 145 - School of Justice Studies  
One Old Ferry Rd.  
Bristol, RI 02809  
Email: svarano@rwu.edu  
Ph: (401) 254-3738

Sean P. Varano is an Assistant Professor in the School of Justice Studies at Roger Williams University. His recent publications have appeared in *Crime and Delinquency* and the *Journal of Criminal Justice*. His research interests include policing, gangs, and the effectiveness of violence reduction strategies.

## **Craig D. Uchida, Ph.D.**

President, Justice & Security Strategies, Inc.  
PO Box 6188  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20916  
Email: cduchida@jssinc.org  
Ph: (301) 438 - 3132

Craig D. Uchida is President of Justice & Security Strategies, Inc., a consulting firm that specializes in criminal justice and public policy issues. He has written numerous monographs and edited two books. His publications have appeared in *Crime and Delinquency*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, and *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. His research interests include predictive policing, gangs, and violence.

## **Shellie E. Solomon, M.A.**

Chief Executive Officer, Justice & Security Strategies, Inc.  
1835 East Hallandale Beach Blvd # 387  
Hallandale Beach, FL 33009  
Email: SESolomon@jssinc.org  
Ph: (954) 458-6465

Shellie E. Solomon is the Chief Executive Office of Justice & Security Strategies, Inc. She has written numerous monographs, and government publications. Her research interests include children of inmates, gangs, mortgage fraud, and violence prevention.

With the assistance of: Christine Connor, Jonathan Mash, Corina Putt, W. Riley Waugh, and Robert Adams

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We gratefully acknowledge funding from the Children’s Trust of Miami–Dade to Justice & Security Strategies, Inc. for the “Mapping and Spatial Analysis to Study Youth Violence and Social Disorganization Project” (contract number 864-234) of which this is a part. The Trust is a dedicated source of revenue established by voter referendum to improve the lives of children and families in Miami-Dade County.

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Children's Trust.

# **FEAR OF CRIME, INCIVILITIES, AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY IN FOUR MIAMI NEIGHBORHOODS**

## **Abstract**

Extant literature indicates that individual perceptions of collective efficacy and incivilities are important in explaining fear of crime. Using field interviews with a sample of residents from four neighborhoods within Miami-Dade County, the current study examines the degree to which perceptions of incivilities mediates the relationship between collective efficacy and fear of crime. In the combined sample, results indicate that perceptions of collective efficacy perfectly mediates the relationship between collective efficacy and fear of crime. However, results from considering each neighborhood separately suggests substantial heterogeneity in the social processes that govern fear of crime. In one neighborhood, there is evidence for perfect mediation. In the second neighborhood there is evidence for partial mediation. In the third neighborhood, only perceptions of incivilities is an important predictor of fear of crime. Finally, in the fourth neighborhood, neither collective efficacy nor perceptions of incivilities predict fear of crime. These results suggest that ignoring the context within neighborhoods may lead to oversimplification of the processes at work. Implications for future research and policy are discussed.

**Keywords:** Collective Efficacy, Incivilities, Fear of Crime

## **INTRODUCTION**

There is a well-established connection between neighborhood conditions and well known deleterious conditions including serious violent crime (Bursik & Grasmik, 1993; Messner & Tardiff, 1986; Sampson & Groves, 1989), gang membership (Hill, Howell, Hawkins, & Battin-Pearson, 1999), school problems (Kirk, 2009; McCluskey, Patchin, & Bynum, 2004), and fear of crime (Wyant, 2008). Neighborhoods play important roles in lives of those that live, work, and socialize in their boundaries. They are one of several “zones” of influence that shape individuals’ sense the world beyond their immediate selves and family units. Neighborhoods create the physical and social context for interactions among neighborhood residents that help shape notions of “community” and individuals perceptions of their wider social space.

In order to identify the mechanisms that both inhibit the development of negative neighborhood conditions and promote healthier communities, considerable attention has been given to the concept of collective efficacy. For decades scholars have noted that communities differ in their capacity to create and enforce normative levels of pro-social behavior (see Kornhauser, 1978; Bursik, 1988; Warner, 2007). Networks of informal social control are central to establishing value systems that are reflective of prevailing social norms. Collective efficacy eventually emerged as the central process whereby community members create a sense of agency (see Sampson, et al. 1997) and assume ownership for the state of the community. It is one of several forms of formal and informal social control that predicts the overall functioning of a community (Warner, 2007). The purpose of this research is to understand the relationships among the perceptions of physical disorder (incivilities), collective efficacy, and fear of crime.

## **COLLECTIVE EFFICACY, INCIVILITIES, AND FEAR OF CRIME**

The concept of collective efficacy emerged out of the social disorganization literature. It represents the capacity of residents, organizations, and other groups to exert social control and thereby reduce crime and violence. Sampson argues that collective efficacy includes working trust among residents and the willingness to intervene to achieve social control. Neighborhood collective efficacy “captures the link between cohesion, especially working trust, and shared expectations for action...” The promise of collective efficacy theory is “that it reaffirms the importance of thinking about social ways to approach social problems” (Sampson, 2004).

Collective efficacy has important implications for how neighborhoods are informally managed by residents. Research shows that neighborhoods with higher levels of collective efficacy generally experience lower levels of violence (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). Within this model, social control is produced through modalities of intervention into problems by neighborhood occupants. In the most explicit sense, collective efficacy is expected to result in “direct” intervention to ameliorate problems. Warner (2007), for example, argues direct informal social control is when individuals take personal action to address an issue, and indirect informal social control is when third parties (e.g., governmental authorities) are mobilized by residents. More recent research suggests that collective efficacy works through other pathways, such as informal parenting styles, to create pro-social norms. Simons, Simons, Burt, Brody, and Cutrona (2005) suggest that increasing levels of collective efficacy in a neighborhood produces increases in authoritative parenting (see Baumrind, 1967). Both collective efficacy and authoritative parenting together in turn serve a deterrent function to discourage delinquent behavior in young people. Thus, the research suggests that features of neighborhoods, collective efficacy in particular, have important influences on neighborhood crime and disorder levels.

The role of collective efficacy in promoting safe, healthy community conditions is worth considering for several reasons. As Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush (2001: 519) noted, “Neighborhoods bereft of social capital (e.g., interlocking social networks) are less able to realize common values and maintain the informal social control that foster safety.” Collective efficacy is an important neighborhood-level process that functions as an intermediary between neighborhood conditions and disorder. For decades, scholars have attempted to understand the processes whereby some neighborhoods with high levels of economic disenfranchisement were able to somehow promote pro-social values and control disorderly behavior. That is, not all poor and impoverished communities suffered the same levels of crime and disorder. Wilson (1996) posited that many residents of poor communities were involved in tightly interconnected social networks that functioned as protective factors against crime and disorder. These social networks were argued to be critical in not only promoting pro-social values, but preventing serious violence. Research lends support for the conclusion that collective efficacy is a key social process in the production of violence. Neighborhoods with low collective efficacy, for example, experience significantly higher levels of crime, particularly serious violent crime such as homicide (Morenoff, et al, 2001). Thus, it is important to understand the sources of collective efficacy and the protective role it plays, particularly in at-risk communities.

One way that collective efficacy is linked to crime is through incivilities. Incivilities represent the presence of physical and/or social disorder that have a noxious effect on the condition of neighborhood environments. Incivilities such as unattended physical environments and the regular presence of groups of unruly and disruptive youth can escalate the deterioration of neighborhoods and leads to crime (see Kelling & Coles, 1996). The presence of incivilities has been shown to reduce individuals’ sense of satisfaction with their neighborhoods and also

increase fear of crime. Robinson, Lawton, Taylor, and Perkins (2003), for example, reported a lagged effect to perceived incivilities whereby perceived incivilities result in an increase in vulnerability, fear of crime, and decrease in overall levels of neighborhood satisfaction. Yet as Robinson et al. (2003) suggest, this relationship may very well be recursive where fear of crime also changes perceptions of incivilities. Regardless, this relationship appears consistently strong in urban areas. Reisig and Cancino (2004) also confirm the relationship exists in areas other than highly urbanized communities. Their research shows that even in relatively rural, nonmetropolitan areas, there is a significant negative relationship between perceived incivilities and collective efficacy. That is, net of other structural control variables, collective efficacy and incivilities were negatively associated. These relationships have been largely replicated by Wyant (2008) who found perceived incivilities to be a consistently significant and positive predictor of fear of crime. Wyant (2008) also found that while actual incivilities, measured through systematic social observations of social spaces, was also a significant predictor of fear, its impact all but disappeared when crime measures were included in the model. Thus, it is likely that perceptions of incivilities are a stronger predictor of fear of crime than actual incivilities.

There is a growing body of evidence that neighborhood conditions such as incivilities have both a direct and indirect effect on negative outcomes such as fear of crime. Using structural equation modeling, Gibson, Zhao, Lovrich, and Gaffney (2002) reported that perceived incivilities had both a direct, positive effect on fear of crime, but that the relationship was also mitigated to some degree through collective efficacy. Thus, the effects of incivilities can be reduced in communities with higher levels of informal social control. Gibson et al's (2002) findings were consistent across three different cities.

While the Gibson et al. (2002) study demonstrates the linkages between collective efficacy, incivilities, and fear of crime, the study did not consider whether these relationships vary within communities. As Oberwittler and Wikström (2009) suggest, there is substantial variability in collective efficacy in units of analysis smaller than a neighborhood. If there is additional within neighborhood variability, it is possible that the relationships between collective efficacy, perceptions of incivilities, and fear of crime differ between neighborhoods. The purpose of the current research is to add to the existing body of literature that considers the relationships between incivilities, collective efficacy and fear of crime. Specifically, this research uses surveys of a representative sample of neighborhood residents collected from four neighborhoods in Miami-Dade County, Florida to examine whether the relationships between collective efficacy, incivilities, and fear of crime differ between these neighborhoods.

## **METHODS**

### **Study Location**

The data used in this research comes from a larger study that examines the relationship between collective efficacy and crime in Miami-Dade County and is funded by the Children's Trust of Miami-Dade County in order to better understand the neighborhood dynamics, such as collective efficacy, that are associated with the development of crime. The current research uses resident survey data from the Brownsville, Bunche Park, Seminole Wayside Park, and East Little Havana neighborhoods, which were of particular interest to the funding agency.

Brownsville is an unincorporated neighborhood of mixed residential and commercial properties partly located in the core urban area of the City of Miami and partly within the north central corner of Miami-Dade County. The City of Miami and the Miami-Dade Police Department provide policing services in their respective jurisdictions. About 39,000 people live



in Brownsville and according to the 2000 census the racial distribution was 6% White, 91% African American, and 3% of other races. Hispanic or Latino of any race was a little over 8% of the population. Brownsville accounted for 120 homicides or approximately 11 percent of all homicides in Miami Dade County from 2004 to 2008 (Uchida, Solomon, Varano, Swatt, Putt, Connor, & Mash, 2011).

The Bunche Park area in Miami Gardens includes Bunche Park, Bunche Elementary School, and surrounding residential housing. Miami Gardens, incorporated in May 2003 is one of the newest cities in Miami-Dade County. With a population of over 105,457 and an area of approximately 20 square miles, it is the County's third largest city and is the largest predominately African American municipality in Florida. Located in the north end of Miami-Dade County, Miami Gardens is bordered by unincorporated Miami-Dade County to the west (an area known as Carol City) and the east (known as Ives Estates), Broward County to the north, and Opa-locka to the south. Medical Examiner data show that 72 homicides occurred in Miami Gardens from 2004 to 2008. This accounted for 6.4 percent of all homicides during the period within the county (Uchida et al., 2011).

Seminole Wayside Park lies in the southern part of Miami-Dade County, within Leisure City. This neighborhood is in the southern part of Leisure City and includes a small part of the northern boundary of Homestead and receives policing services from the Miami-Dade County Police Department. From January 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011, SWP experienced 141 burglaries, 80 larcenies, 76 vehicle burglaries, 44 aggravated assaults, 19 robberies and 2 homicides. Instances of robberies, narcotics crimes, and larcenies increased from 2009-2010, but instances of vehicle burglaries and motor vehicle thefts decreased (Uchida et al., 2011).

East Little Havana lies within the ethnic enclave, Little Havana, in the City of Miami, and is famous as a cultural and political capital of Cuban Americans. Little Havana is one of the most diverse neighborhoods in Miami-Dade County with a population estimated at 49,000 residents. The neighborhood predominately consists of immigrants from the Caribbean, Central America, and South America, and the predominant language is Spanish. Recently, Nicaraguan and Puerto Rican immigrants have also moved into the neighborhood. The northeastern corner of Little Havana is a predominately Hispanic, low socioeconomic status, high crime neighborhood. East Little Havana receives policing services from the City of Miami Police Department. From January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008, ELH experienced 59 calls for burglaries, 64 calls for larcenies, 34 calls for aggravated assaults, 40 calls for robberies, and 84 calls for larcenies to a motor vehicle. According to Miami-Dade Medical Examiner Data, in 2008-2010, four homicides occurred in this neighborhood (Uchida et al., 2011).

### **Sampling Strategy**

Researchers selected a random sample of neighborhood residents from these four neighborhoods for participation in community surveys using a database of all active mailing addresses known to the United States Postal Service (USPS) for Miami-Dade County. The sampling frame was address-specific, not person-specific in the target areas. The data were secured from a USPS approved vendor and represents the most complete list of all known addresses to the USPS available. A random sample of addresses was selected from each neighborhood. A team of interview staff was selected and trained to administer the field surveys, walking from household to household and conducting in-person interviews. The list was resampled to account for unsuccessful for interviews. All interviews took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Five-hundred and seventy-eight completed surveys were collected from

May 2010 through August 2011. The combined sample consisted of the 524 respondents with complete information.<sup>1</sup>

## Measures

*Fear of Crime.* Fear of crime represents a central concept when examining neighborhood dynamics and as such, it represents the key dependent variable in the current analysis. Fear of crime was measured using five Likert items that asked respondents how much they fear being the victim of a burglary, having items stolen from outside their home, being the victim of a robbery, being the victim of an assault, or having people involve their family members in selling drugs. Response categories ranged from 1 = “Not worried” to 3 = “Very worried.” Results indicated that this measure had high internal consistency ( $\alpha = .905$ ) and principal axis factor analysis suggested a single factor solution. The final measure was created using the principal axis factor analysis solution and higher values indicated higher levels of fear.

*Perceptions of Incivilities.* As discussed in the literature review, there have been a number of studies which identified a link between neighborhood disorder/incivilities and fear of crime. Drawing from this research, resident perceptions of incivilities is one of variables of the most substantive interest in these analyses. Importantly, this measure is perceptual and it relied on the validity of respondent perceptions of disorder and incivilities in their neighborhood. - Studies suggest that these measures are valid (*see* Worrall, 2007; Armstrong and Katz, 2009). This measure was constructed from a series of fourteen Likert items that asked residents about

---

<sup>1</sup> For several respondents, there were missing data for one or several items in a scale variable. In these instances, the missing item values were replaced with the scale mean. As Schafer and Graham (2002) suggest, this method is unlikely to create difficulties in the analysis. Since the remaining missing data represented a small fraction of the overall valid cases (less than 10 percent) these cases were dropped from the analysis As Allison (2001) suggests, listwise deletion of missing data performs well when the fraction of missing data is small even if these data are MAR instead of MCAR.

neighborhood problems spanning a range from minor to serious problems.<sup>2</sup> Response categories ranged from 1 = “Not an issue/No problem” to 3 = “Big problem.” Again, results indicated that this measure had a high amount of internal consistency ( $\alpha = .831$ ) and principal axis factor analysis suggested a single factor solution. The final measure was created using the principal axis factor analysis solution and higher values indicated greater perceptions of incivilities.

*Collective Efficacy.* The final main variable used in these analyses is collective efficacy. As discussed in the literature review, collective efficacy has become a central concept in understanding neighborhood processes. The measure of collective efficacy is an extension of the measure used in the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods project (Sampson et al., 1997), which is commonly used in neighborhood studies. This extended measure included the original 10 items used by Sampson et al. (1997) as well as additional measures designed to assess the components of collective efficacy. In total, this measure consists of 29 Likert items across three dimensions: willingness to intervene (12 items), social cohesion (11 items), and the capacity of social control (six items).<sup>3</sup> Results indicated that our expanded

---

<sup>2</sup> The specific items used to measure *Perception of Incivilities* includes the following: 1) dirty/unkept buildings or lots, 2) vacant or abandoned lots, 3) neighbors making too much noise, 4) homeless loitering, 5) vandalism, 6) public drug or alcohol use, 7) theft or vandalism to vehicles, 8) graffiti, 9) drug dealing, 10) groups of young people hanging out/around, 11) physical assaults of people on the street, 12) gangs or similar criminal activities, 13) gun shots/gun violence, and 14) truancy.

<sup>3</sup> The measures of the three components of collective efficacy were as follows. *Willingness to Intervene*: 1) Someone trying to break in a house, 2) Illegally parking on the street, 3) suspicious people hanging around the neighborhood, 4) People having a loud argument in the street, 5) group of underage kids drinking, 6) children spray painting graffiti on a local building, 7) fight and someone was getting beaten or threatened, 8) child showing disrespect to an adult, 9) group of children skipping school and hanging out on the corner, 10) someone on the block playing loud music, 11) someone on the block firing a gun, 12) drugs being sold on the block. *Social Cohesion*: 1) neighborhood is a good area to raise children, 2) people who live in the neighborhood are generally friendly, 3) happy to live in the neighborhood, 4) people around here take care of each other, 5) people in the neighborhood can be trusted, 6) people around here willing to help neighbors, 7) this is a close-knit neighborhood, 8) people in the neighborhood generally don't get along (reverse coded), 9) people in the neighborhood don't share the same values (reverse coded), 10) regularly stop and talk with people in the neighborhood, 11) know the names of people in the neighborhood. *Capacity of Social Control*: 1) serious pothole that needed repairs, 2) people dumping large trash items in local park or alleyway, 3) vacant house being used for drug dealing, 4) city planning to cut funding for a local community center, 5) prostitutes soliciting clients, 6) city planning to close fire station closest to your home.

measure had high internal consistency ( $\alpha = .918$ ). While a principal axis factor analysis suggested a two factor solution, in order to remain consistent with Sampson et al. (1997), a single factor solution was retained. The final measure was created using the principal axis factor analysis solution and higher values indicate greater perceptions of collective efficacy.

*Control Variables.* A number of control variables were included in the analyses. Sex was a dichotomous variable with males as the reference category. As indicated in Table 1, females constitute 59.0 percent of the total sample. Due to the demographic composition of the neighborhoods under investigation, race/ethnicity was included as two mutually exclusive dichotomous variables: Hispanic and Black with the reference category of Other Race/Ethnicity. A total of 55.2% of respondents reported Hispanic ancestry and 37.2 percent indicated African-American/Black as their racial/ethnic designation. Employment status was included as a dichotomous indicator with the explicit category of currently employed full or part-time. In this sample, 51.0 percent of respondents reported being employed. Education was incorporated as a system of dichotomous variables with less than high school education being the reference category. In this sample, 36.3 percent reported receiving a high school diploma or GED equivalent as their highest education and 43.5 percent reported some college education or higher.

Additional control variables that are important in neighborhood studies were also included in the analyses. Social disorganization theory suggests that residential instability curtails the development of social networks that are critical to the capacity of neighborhood residents to exercise social control (Bursik and Grasmick, 1993). Residence length was operationalized as the number of months our respondents reported living at their current address. The mean residence length of our sample was 75.0 months. Home ownership was also included in the analysis as prior research suggests greater home owners experience greater permanence in

residence and a larger financial stake in the well-being of the neighborhood (Felson, 1998). Approximately 46.9 percent of respondents reported being homeowners with the remainder renters or individuals with other living situations. Social disorganization theory also suggests that economic disadvantage is associated with reduced capacity to exercise social control (Bursik & Grasmick, 1993). In the current study, economic disadvantage was operationalized as one or more members of a household participating in income assistance programs. This measure was a dichotomous indicator with the reference category of not participating in these programs. In the current sample, 40.5 percent of respondents reported that one or more members of their household participated in an income assistance program.

Satisfaction with the police is an important control variable in the current analyses as it is possible that the level of perceived incivilities by residents may be a function of the level of frustration toward the police to address serious neighborhood problems. For example, Varano, Schafer, Cancino and Swatt (2009) found that police were less responsive to crime, property crime particular, that occurred in higher poverty neighborhoods. Police satisfaction was measured using a single Likert item inquiring about the current level of satisfaction with the police. Responses ranged from 1 = "Very dissatisfied" to 5 = "Very satisfied." The level of police satisfaction in both neighborhoods was rather high, as the average of this item was 3.94. The analyses also included a variable that measures the extent to which respondents utilized particular neighborhood resources such as parks and community centers. While there is little prior research on this measure, it is anticipated that residents who frequent neighborhood establishments and more frequently utilize neighborhood resources will have a larger awareness space (e.g., Brantingham & Brantingham, 2004) and may be more apt to perceive neighborhood incivilities. In contrast, it is also possible that these individuals will also have an increased

likelihood of encountering other neighborhood residents, which should foster a larger and denser social network. Hence, these individuals may have higher perceptions of collective efficacy. A seven Likert item scale asked respondents how often they use specific facilities in the neighborhood (libraries, churches, parks, community centers, grocery stores, medical services, and public transportation). The response categories ranged from 1 = “Never” to 4 = “Often.” These items were averaged to provide a composite measure of the use of neighborhood resources, with an average of 2.35 across neighborhoods. Finally, seeing that there are likely other important unmeasured neighborhood dynamics that could lead to differences between the neighborhoods a series of control variables for neighborhood (Brownsville is left out as the reference category) were used in models that pooled subjects across neighborhoods.

### **Plan of Analysis**

Initial descriptive statistics were used to provide an initial description of the combined sample and to assess the distribution of key variables within each neighborhood. Bivariate correlations were also examined as a preliminary step to provide information regarding the relationship between key variables and controls.<sup>4</sup> The analysis strategy followed the procedures illustrated by Baron and Kenney (1986) for assessing the existence of mediating relationships. Since the dependent variables in these models were all produced using factor analysis and the skewness statistics for all variables were well within acceptable limits, they were treated as continuous variables and a series of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models were used to investigate potential mediating mechanisms. These regressions were conducted on first the combined sample and then on the sample for each neighborhood separately.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although some of the correlations appear high, multicollinearity does not appear to be a problem in these analyses, as the largest Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was 5.24 for the neighborhood control variable for East Little Havana. All other variables had VIFs less than 5.

## **RESULTS**

### **Descriptive Statistics**

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for each variable used in the analysis. Kruskal-Wallis and Chi-square tests demonstrated that there were significant differences between the neighborhoods on all variables except sex. As expected, there were significant racial/ethnic differences between the study neighborhoods. Brownsville and Bunche Park included a larger proportion of African Americans; East Little Havana and Seminole Wayside Park included a larger proportion of Hispanics. Finally, there were significant differences in residence length as the mean residence length in Brownsville was less than one year and was close to 15 years in Seminole Wayside Park. Residents in Bunche Park were the most likely to be employed (78.4%), but residents in East Little Havana were most likely to have at least some college education (60.0%). Home ownership was lowest in East Little Havana (11.0%) and using income assistance was highest (60.0%). Residents in Bunche Park were most satisfied with police services (4.16) and residents in Brownsville were least satisfied (3.50). Residents of East Little Havana reported the highest usage of neighborhood resources (2.54). Notably, the mean of fear of crime was lowest in Brownsville and highest in East Little Havana. Likewise, the mean of perceptions of incivilities was lowest in Brownsville and highest in East Little Havana. Finally, the mean of collective efficacy was highest in Brownsville and lowest in Bunche Park.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

### **Bivariate Correlations**

The results from the bivariate correlations are presented in Table 2. Consistent with theoretical expectations, we find that perception of incivilities carried a significant positive relationship with fear of crime ( $r = .325$ ). Similarly, collective efficacy demonstrated a



statistically significant positive correlation with fear of crime ( $r = -.169$ ). In addition to these two variables; both race/ethnicity variables, both education variables, home ownership, use of neighborhood resources, and income assistance demonstrated significant ( $p < .05$ ) relationships with fear of crime. Collective efficacy carried a statistically significant negative relationship with the perception of incivilities ( $r = -.349$ ). In addition, Hispanics and residents who used more community resources perceived higher levels of incivilities, while homeowners perceived lower levels of incivilities. In addition to fear of crime and perception of incivilities, the only variables with significant relationships with collective efficacy were home ownership, satisfaction with the police, and income assistance.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

### **Multiple Regression Models**

The first multivariate models examined the relationship between control variables and collective efficacy. The results for the full sample model are presented in Table 3. The full model was significant, but only explained 5.3 percent of the variance in collective efficacy. This suggests that a substantial amount of the variance in collective efficacy remained unexplained. Satisfaction with the police carried a significant relationship with collective efficacy, which suggests that residents who reported more satisfaction with police had higher perceptions of collective efficacy. Finally, the neighborhood control variable for Bunche Park was significant.

Interestingly, the within neighborhood models, presented in Table 3, suggested heterogeneity in these relationships between neighborhoods.<sup>5</sup> For Bunche Park and Seminole Wayside Park, the models were not significant, explained very little variance, and no variables

---

<sup>5</sup> In order to examine whether these coefficients were similar across groups, tests for the invariance of parameters across groups were used by specifying a structural equation model corresponding to the final regression models (see StataCorp, 2010). These tests indicate that the coefficients for employment and home ownership varied between neighborhoods.

were statistically significant. For Brownsville and Seminole Wayside Park, however, the models were significant and explained a larger percent of the variance in collective efficacy (22.3 and 18.8 percent respectively). Satisfaction with police had a statistically significant relationship in both models, and in both neighborhoods, higher satisfaction with the police was associated with higher collective efficacy. Additionally, home ownership and income assistance were both significant in the model for East Little Havana. Specifically, in East Little Havana, homeowners and respondents using income assistance reported lower levels of collective efficacy.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Table 4 presents the results of the OLS regressions of resident perception of incivilities on collective efficacy and the control variables. The results for the combined sample are presented in the first panel. This model explained 23.1 percent of the variance in our measure of perception of incivilities. Conforming to theoretical expectations, collective efficacy carried a statistically significant coefficient, indicating that for the combined sample, as collective efficacy increased, perceptions of incivilities decreased. In addition, the use of neighborhood resources variable was statistically significant. It appears that residents who more frequently used neighborhood resources reported higher reported perceptions of incivilities. The neighborhood control variables for Bunche Park and East Little Havana were also significant.

Again, when examining the results for the individual neighborhoods, there is compelling evidence of heterogeneity between neighborhoods.<sup>6</sup> While the model only explained 7.8 percent of the variance in Seminole Wayside Park, it explained 43.8 percent of the variance in Brownsville. These results are surprising and the substantial differences between neighborhoods suggest that separate processes may be at work in each neighborhood. Concerning the individual

---

<sup>6</sup> Tests for the equality of coefficients across groups indicated that the coefficients for police satisfaction varied between the neighborhoods.

variables in each model, the effect of collective efficacy was statistically significant and fairly consistent across the neighborhoods, with the exception of Bunche Park. In Brownsville, Seminole Wayside Park, and East Little Havana, higher collective efficacy was associated with greater perceptions of incivilities. In Bunche Park, however, collective efficacy approached, but failed to reach statistical significance at the .05 level. Results that support the argument that social processes vary between neighborhoods were observed regarding satisfaction with the police. In East Little Havana police satisfaction had a significant negative relationship with perception of incivilities, which indicated that as police satisfaction increased, perceptions of incivilities decreased. Surprisingly in Brownsville and Bunche Park, police satisfaction carried a significant positive coefficient, which indicated that as police satisfaction increased, perceptions of incivilities also increased. Satisfaction with police was not significant in the model for Seminole Wayside Park. The different signs of these coefficients explain why this variable was not significant in the full model. Further, in Brownsville, use of neighborhood resources and employment were also significant.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Table 5 presents the final regression models with fear of crime regressed on collective efficacy, perceived incivilities, and the control variables. Model 1 presents regression models where perception of incivilities was excluded from the model, and Model 2 presents models where perception of incivilities was included.<sup>7</sup> In the full model, perceptions of incivilities perfectly mediated the relationship between collective efficacy and fear of crime, as the

---

<sup>7</sup> In results not presented, additional models examined whether perception of incivilities was mediated by collective efficacy, but found little evidence to support this relationship. These results can be provided upon request to the first author. While this would seem to contrast the results found by Gibson et al. (2002), it does not appear that alternative model specifications where incivilities mediates collective efficacy were considered in their results. Based on the relationships between their variables, this alternative specification of the model may be consistent with their results.

coefficient of collective efficacy was significant in Model 1 but was not significant in Model 2. The final model explained 43.2 percent of the variance in fear of crime. In addition to perceptions of incivilities, several additional variables carried statistically significant coefficients with fear of crime. Having a college education was associated with significantly greater fear of crime. Owning a home was associated with significantly lower fear of crime. Respondents who reported higher satisfaction with the police also reported significantly lower fear of crime. Residents using neighborhood resources more frequently also reported significantly greater fear of crime. Finally, each of the neighborhood control variables was statistically significant.

Again, however, it appears that the results from the combined sample masked important differences between the neighborhoods concerning the social processes at work.<sup>8</sup> In Brownsville there was evidence for a partially mediated effect for collective efficacy, since after perceptions of incivilities was added to the model, the coefficient of collective efficacy diminished but remained statistically significant. The final model performed well in this neighborhood as it explained 44.8 percent of the variance in fear of crime. In this model, African Americans appeared to have significantly lower amounts of fear of crime. Additionally, higher levels of satisfaction with the police were associated with lower levels of fear of crime.

A different picture emerged in Bunche Park. In this neighborhood, the relationship between collective efficacy and fear of crime was perfectly mediated by perceptions of incivilities. The final model explained a substantially lower percentage of the variance in fear of crime (24.8 percent). The only other statistically significant variable in the model for Bunche Park was home ownership. Homeowners reported lower fear of crime.

---

<sup>8</sup> Tests for the equality of coefficients across groups indicated that for the final model (Model 2), the coefficients for collective efficacy, Black, residence length, home ownership, and use of neighborhood resources were significantly different across neighborhoods.

The results from Seminole Wayside Park and East Little Havana contrast the results observed in the other neighborhoods. In Seminole Wayside Park, neither perceptions of incivilities nor collective efficacy reached statistical significance in the final model. This model explained a much smaller percentage of the variance (15.8 percent) compared to the results from the prior two neighborhoods. The only significant variable in this model was use of neighborhood resources, as residents who reported greater use of neighborhood resources also reported greater fear of crime. The results from East Little Havana contrast with the results from all previous neighborhoods. Interestingly, collective efficacy was not statistically significant even when perception of incivilities was not included in the model. In the final model, perception of incivilities was statistically significant. Homeowners reported significantly lower levels of fear of crime. Further, longer residence length was associated with lower fear of crime. Greater use of neighborhood resources was associated with significantly higher levels of fear of crime. This model explained 30.9 percent of the variance in fear of crime.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

## **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between collective efficacy, perceptions of incivilities, and fear of crime. Field surveys from a random sample of Miami-Dade residents in four neighborhoods, Liberty City/Brownsville, Bunche Park, Seminole Wayside Park, and East Little Havana were used to examine whether the effect of collective efficacy on fear of crime was mediated by perceptions of incivilities. The analyses examined results for the combined sample, as well as for each neighborhood individually. The findings suggested important heterogeneity in the social processes that govern fear of crime between neighborhoods. When only examining the results for the combined sample, this heterogeneity

would be missed. Only after considering models for each neighborhood separately, is it apparent that some variables were only significant in particular neighborhoods, the relationship between variables differs depending on the neighborhood under consideration, and there was substantial variability in the explanatory power of the models.

For the combined sample, results suggested that the relationship between collective efficacy and fear of crime was perfectly mediated by perceptions of incivilities. However, when considering each neighborhood individually, a more complex relationship between these variables emerged. In Brownsville, results supported a partially mediated relationship, as collective efficacy remained statistically significant, after perceptions of incivilities was added to the model. In contrast, for Bunche Park, the results indicated that perceptions of incivilities perfectly mediated the relationship between collective efficacy and fear of crime. In East Little Havana, collective efficacy was not significant even prior to adding perceptions of incivilities to the model. Perception of incivilities, however, remained an important variable for understanding the level of fear of crime. Finally, in Seminole Wayside Park, neither collective efficacy nor perceptions of incivilities were significant predictors of fear of crime. In sum, these findings suggested partial support for the mediating role of perceptions of incivilities in the relationship between collective efficacy and fear of crime. The extent of this support differed depending on the neighborhood that is under consideration. While some heterogeneity between neighborhoods was expected, the extent of this heterogeneity was surprising.

One possible explanation for this heterogeneity is that the relationship between collective efficacy, perceptions of incivilities, and fear of crime is that the relationships between these variables at the individual level depend on the aggregate influence of these variables at the neighborhood level. In a Hierarchical Linear Model (HLM) framework, this would imply that the

neighborhood-level mean for collective efficacy and perceptions of incivilities should be entered as a level 2 explanatory variable (see Wyatt, 2008). For example, perceptions of incivilities had the no influence in Seminole Wayside Park. It is possible that the variance in individual perceptions of incivilities is overwhelmed by the comparatively low amount of incivilities across the neighborhood. Likewise, collective efficacy was very important in Brownsville. It is possible that because Brownsville had comparatively high levels of collective efficacy, individual-level variation in the perceptions of collective efficacy become more important to understanding individual differences in fear of crime. Therefore, it seems plausible than that some of the differences between neighborhoods in Table 1 might explain these interactions. Unfortunately, the extent to which aggregate neighborhood-level impacts explain the differential relationships at the individual level would require a full HLM model to assess, which is not possible with the data at hand. Future researchers, however, should consider this possibility as it requires only a simple extension of HLM models that are commonly used.

A more theoretically enticing and equally possible explanation for these results is that there are unmeasured neighborhood-level factors that condition the relationships between collective efficacy, perceptions of incivilities, and fear of crime. Obviously, with only four neighborhoods under consideration, it is not possible to assess this hypothesis. It may be helpful, however, to speculate about which variables might be worth consideration. One of the first important variables to consider is crime. As discussed previously, these neighborhoods differed substantially in the amount and severity of crime. It is possible, that the mitigating effect of collective efficacy on fear of crime is only particularly salient in high crime neighborhoods. A second possible variable that could explain the observed differences is average housing value. It is possible that as average housing value increases, the importance of collective efficacy

decreases. In wealthy neighborhoods, collective efficacy may be irrelevant as residents are paying for additional measures of social control (i.e., gated entrances, fences to restrict access, private security) or for additional insulation from potentially criminogenic features of the environment (increased distance from urban center, increased distance from crime attractors/generators) as part of the cost of housing. A third variable worth considering is average length of residence. Increased average stability within a neighborhood implies a greater permanence of network affiliations. While individual perceptions of collective efficacy may vary, this variance may be unimportant in neighborhoods with high average length of residence as stable social networks already function to mitigate fear of crime. These potential variables are not meant to represent an exhaustive list of possible explanations for the between neighborhood differences, but merely represents suggestions for further inquiry.

Of course, this study is limited in a number of respects. The results of this study may not be generalizable to other settings. Miami is one of the most demographically and culturally diverse cities in the country and it may be the case that this diversity complicates comparisons in to other cities. Further, this study only examined four neighborhoods within Miami-Dade County, and it is possible that these findings are particular to the neighborhoods under consideration. Another potential criticism of this study is the use of perceptual measures of incivilities as opposed to objective measures of incivilities (e.g., Sampson et al. 1997). As previously discussed, it is likely that perceptual measures of incivilities have more salience when examining fear of crime. However, the use of triangulated measures would offer a substantial addition to this research. Finally, this analysis did not attempt to disentangle the relationship between collective efficacy, perceptions of incivilities, and fear of crime over time. Additional



data where neighborhood residents were administered a series of follow-up interviews over time would be necessary for a more thorough understanding of the dynamic social processes at work.

Despite these limitations, this study offers important insights to policy and future research. For policy, the most important observation is that these findings clearly indicate that context is critical when designing interventions to combat fear of crime. Strategies that may be effective in one neighborhood may not be effective in others. For example, a strategy that relies on strengthening collective efficacy will likely be ineffective in East Little Havana. Likewise, a strategy that focuses on addressing incivilities will have little effect in Seminole Wayside Park. For this reason, it is recommended that policy-makers engage in an assessment of the social processes linked with fear of crime within the areas of interest prior to designing an intervention.

In regards to future research, the most pressing concern is to replicate these findings in other neighborhoods in other cities to determine whether these results are particular to these neighborhoods in Miami-Dade County. These four neighborhoods consisted of two low socioeconomic status, predominately African-American communities, one low socioeconomic status, predominately Hispanic community, and one working class, predominately Hispanic community. Future research should seek to examine neighborhoods with a greater range of racial/ethnic compositions and economic conditions. When possible, future research should also consider examining a sufficient cross-section of neighborhoods to allow for between-neighborhood comparisons. These comparisons would enable examinations of neighborhood-level variables that may explain the differences observed between neighborhoods.

## **REFERENCES**

Allison, P.D. (2001). *Missing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Armstrong, T. & Katz, C. (2009). Further evidence on the discriminant validity of perceptual incivilities measures. *Justice Quarterly*, 27, 280-304.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75, 43-88.
- Brantingham, P. J., & Brantingham, P. L. (1999). A theoretical model of crime hot spot generation. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention*, 1, 7-26.
- Bursik, R.J. (1988). Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: Problems and prospects. *Criminology*, 26, 519-551.
- Bursik R.J. & Grasmick, H.G. (1993). *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Felson, M. (1998). *Crime and Everyday Life*, 2nd Edition. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gibson, C. L., Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., & Gaffney, M. J. (2002). Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(3), 537.
- Hill, K. G., Howell, J. C., Hawkins, J. D., & Battin-Pearson, S. R. (1999). Childhood risk factors for adolescent gang membership: results from the Seattle Social Development Project. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36(3), 300-322.
- Kelling, G. L., & Coles, C. M. (1996). *Fixing broken windows : restoring order and reducing crime in our communities*. New York: Martin Kessler Books.
- Kirk, D. S. (2009). Unraveling the contextual effects on student suspension and juvenile arrest: The independent and interdependent influences of school, neighborhood, and family social controls. *Criminology*, 47(2), 479-520.
- Kornhauser, R. (1978). *Social sources of delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCluskey, C. P., Patchin, J. W., & Bynum, T. S. (2004). Reducing chronic absenteeism: an assessment of an early truancy initiative. *Crime & Delinquency*, 50(2), 214-234.
- Messner, S. F., and Kenneth Tardiff. (1986). Economic inequality and levels of homicide: An analysis of urban neighborhoods. *Criminology*, 24(2), 297-315.
- Morenoff, J., Sampson, R.J. & Raudenbush, S. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology*, 39, 517-560.

- Oberwittler, D. & Wikström, P.O. (2009). Why small is better: Advancing the study of the role of behavioral contexts in crime causation. Pp 35-59 in Weisburd, D., Bernasco, W. & Bruinsma, G.J.N. (Eds.) *Putting Crime in its Place: Units of Analysis in Geographic Criminology*. New York: Springer.
- Reisig, M. D., & Cancino, J. M. (2004). Incivilities in nonmetropolitan communities: The effects of structural constraints, social conditions, and crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 15-29.)
- Robinson, J. B., Lawton, B. A., Taylor, R. B., & Perkins, D. D. (2003). Multilevel longitudinal impacts of incivilities: Fear of crime, expected safety, and block satisfaction. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19(3), 237-274.
- Sampson, R.J. & W.B. Groves. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 94, 774-802.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S.W. & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-24.
- Schafer, J. L. & Graham, J. W. (2002). Missing data: Our view of the state of the art. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 147-177
- Simons, R. L., Simons, L. G., Burt, C. H., Brody, G. H., & Cutrona, C. (2005). Collective efficacy, authoritative parenting and delinquency: a longitudinal test of model integrating community-and family-level processes. *Criminology*, 43, 989-1030.
- StataCorp. (2011). *Stata Structural Equation Modeling Reference Manual Release 12*. Statistical Software. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
- Uchida, C.D., Solomon, S.E., Varano, S., Swatt, M., Putt, C., Connor, C., & Mash, J. (2011). Crime, collective efficacy, and Miami-Dade neighborhoods. Report delivered to the Children's Trust of Miami-Dade.
- Varano, S. P., Schafer, J. A., Cancino, J. M., & Swatt, M. L. (2009). Constructing crime: Neighborhood characteristics and police recording behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(6), 553-563.
- Warner, B.D. (2007). Directly intervene or call the authorities? A study of forms of neighborhood social control within a social disorganization framework. *Criminology*, 45, 99-129.
- Wilson, W.J. (1996). When work disappears. *Political Science Quarterly*, 111, 567-595.
- Worrall, J.L. (2007). The discriminant validity of perceptual incivilities measures. *Justice Quarterly*, 23, 360-383

Wyant, B. R. (2008). Multilevel impacts of perceived incivilities and perceptions of crime risk on fear of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45(1), 39-64.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Dependent and Independent Variables

Variable	Full Sample ( <i>N</i> = 524)		Brownsville ( <i>N</i> = 103)		Bunche Park ( <i>N</i> = 111)		Seminole Wayside Park ( <i>N</i> = 155)		East Little Havana ( <i>N</i> = 155)		Kruskal-Wallis
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Fear of Crime	0.030	1.013	-0.766	0.492	-0.358	0.565	0.082	0.888	0.785	1.096	181.601*
Perception of Incivilities	-0.006	0.971	-0.409	0.694	0.272	1.037	-0.257	0.700	0.314	1.137	63.828*
Collective Efficacy	0.042	0.990	0.197	0.950	-0.100	0.950	0.150	0.897	-0.068	1.108	9.376*
Hispanic <sup>1</sup>	0.552	0.498	0.097	0.298	0.099	0.300	0.755	0.432	0.974	0.159	315.709*
Black <sup>1</sup>	0.372	0.484	0.845	0.364	0.838	0.370	0.084	0.278	0.013	0.113	342.193*
Sex <sup>1</sup>	0.590	0.492	0.534	0.501	0.631	0.485	0.535	0.500	0.652	0.478	6.489
Residence Length	74.973	395.316	14.485	14.415	17.180	13.268	177.247	714.815	54.282	60.730	127.176*
Employment <sup>1</sup>	0.510	0.500	0.447	0.500	0.748	0.436	0.452	0.499	0.439	0.498	32.029*
HS Diploma/GED <sup>1</sup>	0.363	0.481	0.621	0.487	0.477	0.501	0.374	0.485	0.097	0.267	83.658*
Some College <sup>1</sup>	0.435	0.496	0.272	0.447	0.414	0.495	0.394	0.490	0.600	0.491	29.599*
Home Ownership <sup>1</sup>	0.469	0.500	0.631	0.485	0.658	0.477	0.587	0.494	0.110	0.314	115.753*
Satisfaction with Police	3.935	0.874	3.495	0.999	4.162	0.987	3.974	0.738	4.026	0.720	42.746*
Use of Neighborhood Resources	2.345	0.560	2.397	0.449	2.040	0.512	2.331	0.552	2.542	0.577	46.956*
Income Assistance <sup>1</sup>	0.405	0.491	0.369	0.485	0.171	0.378	0.400	0.491	0.600	0.491	50.232*

\*  $p < .05$

<sup>1</sup> Dichotomous Variable - Pearson Chi-square reported

Table 2. Bivariate Correlations between Dependent and Independent Variables ( $N = 524$ )

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Fear of Crime	--												
2. Perception of Incivilities	.325*	--											
3. Collective Efficacy	-.169*	-.349*	--										
4. Hispanic	.450*	.109*	.005	--									
5. Black	-.432*	-.073	.015	-.854*	--								
6. Sex	.027	.005	-.015	.012	.008	--							
7. Residence Length	.055	-.024	-.000	-.000	-.100*	.023	--						
8. Employment	-.003	.044	-.042	.148*	.131*	-.050	.014	--					
9. HS Diploma/GED	-.214*	-.064	-.002	-.278*	.273*	.024	-.050	-.030	--				
10. Some College	.165*	.007	.023	.103*	-.118*	-.004	-.036	.091*	-.662*	--			
11. Home Ownership	-.315*	-.127*	.091*	-.244*	.249*	-.063	.014	.097*	.126*	-.047	--		
12. Satisfaction with Police	-.021	.072	.098*	.091*	-.110*	.018	.065	-.025	-.003	-.014	-.057	--	
13. Use of Neighborhood Resources	.300*	.128*	-.041	.113*	-.098*	.110*	.091	-.067	-.071	.082	-.153*	-.053	--
14. Income Assistance	.157*	.027	-.090*	.196*	-.152*	.119*	.040	-.296*	-.056	-.025	-.324*	-.099*	.163*

\*  $p < .05$

Table 3. OLS Regressions of Collective Efficacy on Control Variables<sup>1</sup>

Variable	Full Sample	Brownsville	Bunche Park	Seminole Wayside Park	East Little Havana
Neighborhood (BP)	-0.450* (0.145)	--	--	--	--
Neighborhood (SWP)	-0.058 (0.174)	--	--	--	--
Neighborhood (ELH)	-0.236 (0.204)	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0.217 (0.177)	0.390 (0.484)	0.137 (0.507)	0.268 (0.206)	-0.117 (0.746)
Black	0.273 (0.195)	0.212 (0.387)	0.388 (0.392)	0.209 (0.323)	0.200 (1.050)
Sex	0.025 (0.089)	-0.172 (0.192)	-0.078 (0.192)	-0.052 (0.154)	0.274 (0.188)
Residence Length	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.007)	-0.004 (0.008)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.001 (0.001)
Employment	-0.086 (0.092)	-0.244 (0.192)	0.395° (0.227)	0.023 (0.166)	-0.318° (0.179)
HS Diploma/GED	-0.014 (0.127)	0.270 (0.309)	0.057 (0.321)	-0.008 (0.198)	-0.015 (0.323)
Some College	0.103 (0.117)	0.556° (0.323)	0.148 (0.356)	0.092 (0.202)	-0.329° (0.191)
Home Ownership	0.122 (0.100)	0.244 (0.261)	0.376 (0.228)	0.147 (0.159)	-1.039* (0.278)
Satisfaction with Police	0.146* (0.051)	0.234* (0.101)	0.031 (0.102)	0.027 (0.104)	0.251* (0.119)
Use of Neighborhood Resources	-0.083 (0.082)	-0.059 (0.215)	0.192 (0.190)	-0.000 (0.152)	-0.103 (0.157)
Income Assistance	-0.166° (0.099)	-0.219 (0.244)	-0.037 (0.250)	-0.088 (0.177)	-0.501* (0.189)
Constant	-0.375 (0.358)	-0.885 (0.808)	-1.462° (0.805)	-0.238 (0.571)	-0.180 (1.048)
Model Statistics					
<i>N</i>	524	103	111	155	155
<i>F</i>	2.03*	2.37*	0.96	0.38	3.02*
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.053	0.223	0.096	0.028	0.188

°  $p < .10$ ; \*  $p < .05$ <sup>1</sup> Unstandardized regression coefficients listed in columns with standard errors listed in parentheses underneath the coefficient

Table 4. OLS Regressions of Perception of Incivilities on Control Variables and Collective Efficacy<sup>1</sup>

Variable	Full Sample	Brownsville	Bunche Park	Seminole Wayside Park	East Little Havana
Neighborhood (BP)	0.655* (-0.016)	--	--	--	--
Neighborhood (SWP)	-0.016 (0.154)	--	--	--	--
Neighborhood (ELH)	0.378* (0.181)	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0.257 (0.157)	-0.012 (0.304)	-0.013 (0.496)	0.226 (0.158)	0.160 (0.734)
Black	0.018 (0.173)	-0.102 (0.242)	-0.036 (0.386)	-0.009 (0.247)	-0.504 (1.034)
Sex	-0.093 (0.078)	-0.014 (0.120)	-0.120 (0.188)	-0.016 (0.117)	-0.203 (0.186)
Residence Length	-0.000 (0.000)	0.004 (0.004)	0.000 (0.008)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.002 (0.001)
Employment	0.011 (0.081)	0.296* (0.121)	-0.023 (0.225)	-0.004 (0.126)	-0.165 (0.178)
HS Diploma/GED	-0.068 (0.112)	-0.222 (0.194)	0.066 (0.314)	-0.198 (0.151)	-0.180 (0.318)
Some College	-0.134 (0.104)	-0.365° (0.205)	-0.310 (0.349)	0.012 (0.154)	0.016 (0.190)
Home Ownership	-0.041 (0.089)	-0.256 (0.164)	-0.104 (0.226)	0.096 (0.122)	0.460 (0.287)
Satisfaction with Police	0.054 0.046	0.156* (0.065)	0.352* (0.099)	-0.015 (0.079)	-0.263* (0.119)
Use of Neighborhood Resources	0.264* (0.073)	0.313* (0.134)	0.202 (0.187)	0.113 (0.116)	0.254 (0.154)
Income Assistance	-0.051 (0.088)	0.186 (0.153)	-0.379 (0.244)	-0.047 (0.135)	0.165 (0.190)
Collective Efficacy	-0.307* (0.039)	-0.319* (0.065)	-0.194° (0.098)	-0.137* (0.064)	-0.337* (0.082)
Constant	-1.045 (0.317)	-1.415* (0.508)	-1.275 (0.800)	-0.563 (0.435)	0.721 (1.031)
Model Statistics					
<i>N</i>	524	103	111	155	155
<i>F</i>	10.16*	5.84*	3.21*	0.99	4.14*
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.231	0.438	0.282	0.078	0.259

°  $p < .10$ ; \*  $p < .05$ <sup>1</sup> Unstandardized regression coefficients listed in columns with standard errors listed in parentheses underneath the coefficient



Table 5. OLS Regressions of Fear of Crime on Control Variables, Perception of Incivilities, and Collective Efficacy<sup>1</sup>

Variable	Full Sample		Brownsville		Bunche Park		Seminole Wayside Park		East Little Havana	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Neighborhood (BP)	0.562* (0.119)	0.433* (0.119)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neighborhood (SWP)	0.665* (0.141)	0.668* (0.138)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neighborhood (ELH)	1.129* (0.166)	1.055* (0.163)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0.286* (0.144)	0.235° (0.141)	-0.375° (0.213)	-0.373° (0.208)	0.098 (0.284)	0.099 (0.278)	0.235 (0.193)	0.194 (0.193)	1.316° (0.704)	1.280° (0.686)
Black	-0.089 (0.158)	-0.092 (0.155)	-0.350* (0.170)	-0.333* (0.166)	0.048 (0.221)	0.053 (0.216)	-0.218 (0.302)	-0.216 (0.300)	-0.680 (0.991)	-0.565 (0.967)
Sex	-0.064 (0.072)	-0.046 (0.070)	-0.005 (0.084)	-0.002 (0.083)	-0.051 (0.108)	-0.036 (0.106)	-0.209 (0.144)	-0.206 (0.143)	-0.060 (0.179)	-0.014 (0.175)
Residence Length	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.005 (0.003)	-0.006° (0.003)	0.004 (0.005)	0.004 (0.005)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.003* (0.001)	-0.003* (0.001)
Employment	0.084 (0.075)	0.082 (0.073)	0.064 (0.085)	0.015 (0.086)	0.043 (0.129)	0.046 (0.126)	0.043 (0.155)	0.043 (0.154)	0.120 (0.170)	0.157 (0.167)
HS Diploma/GED	0.140 (0.103)	0.153 (0.101)	0.166 (0.136)	0.203 (0.134)	-0.232 (0.179)	-0.240 (0.176)	-0.001 (0.185)	0.035 (0.184)	0.242 (0.305)	0.282 (0.297)
Some College	0.157° (0.095)	0.183* (0.093)	0.116 (0.144)	0.176 (0.143)	-0.222 (0.199)	-0.182 (0.196)	0.195 (0.189)	0.193 (0.187)	0.194 (0.182)	0.191 (0.178)
Home Ownership	-0.204* (0.082)	-0.197* (0.080)	0.057 (0.115)	0.099 (0.114)	-0.406* (0.129)	-0.392* (0.127)	-0.092 (0.149)	-0.109 (0.149)	-0.479° (0.275)	-0.583* (0.271)
Satisfaction with Police	-0.110* (0.042)	-0.121* (0.041)	-0.086° (0.046)	-0.112* (0.046)	0.011 (0.057)	-0.035 (0.059)	-0.162° (0.097)	-0.160° (0.096)	-0.200° (0.114)	-0.141 (0.113)
Use of Neighborhood Resources	0.386* (0.067)	0.334* (0.066)	-0.061 (0.094)	-0.112 (0.095)	0.077 (0.107)	0.051 (0.105)	0.508* (0.142)	0.488* (0.141)	0.710* (0.148)	0.652* (0.146)
Income Assistance	-0.034 (0.081)	-0.024 (0.079)	-0.018 (0.107)	-0.048 (0.106)	0.028 (0.140)	0.077 (0.139)	-0.085 (0.165)	-0.076 (0.164)	0.100 (0.182)	0.062 (0.178)
Collective Efficacy	-0.114* (0.036)	-0.053 (0.037)	-0.289* (0.046)	-0.237* (0.051)	-0.113* (0.056)	-0.088 (0.056)	-0.037 (0.078)	-0.013 (0.079)	-0.061 (0.079)	0.016 (0.0813)
Perceptions of Incivilities	--	0.197* (0.040)	--	0.164* (0.072)	--	0.128* (0.057)	--	0.179° (0.102)	--	0.227* (0.078)
Constant	-1.228* (0.291)	-1.022* (0.288)	-0.048 (0.357)	0.184 (0.364)	-0.231 (0.458)	-0.067 (0.454)	-0.519 (0.534)	-0.418 (0.533)	-1.470 (0.988)	-1.633° (0.965)
Model Statistics										
<i>N</i>	524	524	103	103	111	111	155	155	155	155
<i>F</i>	23.03*	24.12*	6.08*	6.26*	2.15*	2.46*	2.09*	2.04*	4.34*	4.86*
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.405	0.432	0.448	0.478	0.208	0.248	0.138	0.158	0.268	0.309

°  $p < .10$ ; \*  $p < .05$

<sup>1</sup> Unstandardized regression coefficients listed in columns with standard errors listed in parentheses underneath the coefficient