

Columbia Law School

Scholarship Archive

Faculty Scholarship

Faculty Publications

1998

Crime in Public Housing: Clarifying Research Issues

Jeffrey A. Fagan

Columbia Law School, jfagan@law.columbia.edu

Tamara Dumanovsky

Columbia University School of Public Health

J. Phillip Thompson

Columbia University School of Political Science

Garth Davies

Simon Fraser University School of Criminology

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Housing Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jeffrey A. Fagan, Tamara Dumanovsky, J. Phillip Thompson & Garth Davies, *Crime in Public Housing: Clarifying Research Issues*, 235 NIJ J. 2 (1998).

Available at: https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship/3536

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Scholarship Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Scholarship Archive. For more information, please contact scholarshiparchive@law.columbia.edu, rwitt@law.columbia.edu.

CRIME *in* Public Housing:

Clarifying Research Issues

by Jeffrey Fagan, Tamara Dumanovsky, J. Phillip Thompson, and Garth Davies*

In recent years, crime and public housing have been closely linked in our political and popular cultures. Tragic episodes of violence have reinforced the notion that public housing is a milieu with rates of victimization and offending far greater than other locales.¹ However, these recent developments belie the complex social and political evolution of public housing from its origins in the 1930s, through urban renewal, and into the present.²

Stereotypes abound about public housing, its management, residents, and crime rates. In reality, variation is the norm, and it is these variations that affect crime. The study of crime in public housing is in its earliest phase, and there is much to learn. A few studies suggest that crime rates are higher in public housing complexes than in their immediate surroundings;³ other studies suggest quite the opposite.⁴ Still others suggest a process of diffusion and exchange of violent crimes between public housing and the surrounding neighborhood contexts.⁵

Predictably, most studies vary in several important ways, complicating comparisons of studies. Many focus on larger public housing authorities

(PHAs) in older cities, even though these communities are the exceptions among the more than 3,000 PHAs in the United States.⁶ Many studies rely on crime complaints to the police or housing authorities rather than on victimization studies. Conducting a victimization study or household survey in a public housing community is a difficult logistical enterprise, often characterized by undercounts of population and variation in telephone ownership.⁷ The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is currently supporting research to better understand the process of conducting victimization surveys in public housing.

Few studies give adequate attention to public housing's historical, socioeconomic, structural, and administrative contexts, despite the variability among and within public housing communities. Multimeasure studies of crime in public housing are rare, and efforts to assess the epidemiology and correlates of crime have been quite limited. Attention to the surrounding context has been uneven despite the likelihood that many crimes are committed by nonresidents.

Despite the challenges, there are lessons to be learned from previous research. This article summarizes some of these lessons, explores the variability among public housing communities, and suggests that research on communities, spatial analysis of crime locations and patterns, injury epidemiology, and victimization surveys provide important new directions for studying crime in public housing. (See "Methodology Challenges: Design, Measurement, and Data Collection Issues for Researchers" and "Collecting Data: Features and Possible Limitations.")

A brief history of public housing

Public housing's varied history is often intertwined with the social and political history of its home city. Public housing in New York City, for example, developed in response to historical needs as a job creation program (such as First Houses), as housing for wartime workers (such as Red Hook and Fort Greene), as veterans' housing, as filler between slums and urban renewal projects, as relocation

*Jeffrey Fagan is Director of the Center for Violence Research and Prevention in the School of Public Health at Columbia University, and Tamara Dumanovsky is Staff Associate at the Center. J. Phillip Thompson is an Associate Professor in the School of Political Science at Columbia University. Garth Davies is an Assistant Professor in the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University. This research is supported in part by generous grants from the National Consortium on Violence Research, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and the National Institute of Justice.

housing for people displaced by transportation and infrastructure projects, as a way to keep working-class whites from leaving the city, and, finally, as housing for poor minority people—especially in the 1960s.⁸

The bulk of public housing in the United States was built in the 1950s and 1960s as a vehicle for “slum clearance” in communities already characterized by structural disadvantage, such as poverty, long-term unemployment, and limited public services. Often the result was large-scale, highrise developments in socially isolated areas where little attention was paid to availability of or access to public or private services. A second wave of development in the 1970s and 1980s paid closer attention to the community context and resulted in lowrise developments intended to be integrated into the neighborhood and with better access to transportation, shopping areas, schools, and other social services.

Historically, public housing has perpetuated segregation through “community preference” policies that gave priority to applicants already living in the neighborhood. Although these policies receive credit for maintaining social networks and organization within neighborhoods, they also had the effect of maintaining a neighborhood’s racial and ethnic homogeneity.⁹

The social context of today’s public housing varies widely, and much of it suffers from poor design, deteriorating structures, inadequate funding, a large concentration of poor people, isolation from social services, high crime rates, and cumbersome management.¹⁰

The history of public housing policy is significant for research in several respects. The structure and location of public housing sites necessarily and reciprocally affected the surrounding areas, and the extent and type of neighborhood change are important

factors in understanding contemporary variability in crime rates. Since many public housing sites were originally built in otherwise undeveloped areas, understanding the subsequent development of surrounding neighborhoods and patterns of neighborhood change should provide a more complete analysis of changes within public housing. In addition, a development’s socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, and family characteristics may affect crime rates.

The limited research on crime in public housing has looked only at structure-of-housing issues (for example, comparing crime rates between highrise and lowrise developments or looking at differences between larger and smaller public housing authorities). But structural variations may mask underlying differences in location, composition, social organization, and, most important, policy. (See “Variability Within Chicago’s Highrise Public Housing.”)

Variation in the administration of public housing

In addition to contextual and structural factors, several aspects of management and administration may affect crime rates in public housing.

Management of public housing. The administration of a public housing authority affects the characteristics of a housing development. The combinations of State and Federal supervision of PHAs, in addition to the idiosyn-

cratic policies of city governments, raise significant issues. Developments are increasingly being turned over to private management agencies; some PHAs are experimenting with resident management; other PHAs sponsor homeownership programs that encour-

age qualified residents to purchase apartments in rehabilitated buildings at bargain rates. Many of these programs are new and tend to apply to smaller, rehabilitated buildings. It may be too soon to measure the effects, if any, of the most recent management trends.

Admission and eviction policies. Criteria for admission and eviction vary across sites

and can change the composition, attitudes, and perceptions of both the residents and the wider neighborhood. Criminal history, drug-related offenses, family composition, and employment status have been used as criteria. Some PHAs are increasingly using employment status as a criterion for admission to increase the numbers of working-class families in developments. Others are converting highrise developments into housing for the elderly. Because such changes are intended to improve residents’ quality of life, equal attention should be paid to developments targeted and not targeted by such policies. One consequence may be increased segregation and isolation of the most disadvantaged residents in sites with these eviction and admission policies.

Police agencies. The amount and extent of police presence and response vary across and within PHAs and to a

Courtesy of the New York City Housing Authority Photo Archives



Riis Housing Project in New York City

METHODOLOGY CHALLENGES: DESIGN, MEASUREMENT, AND DATA COLLECTION ISSUES FOR RESEARCHERS

Criminological research on public housing is still relatively new. Its development can benefit from the methodological and conceptual influences from related disciplines, especially urban sociology, political economy, and crime prevention research, as well as geography, demography, and the sophisticated techniques available from spatial analysis, survey research, and qualitative methods.

The issues surrounding public housing research can be sorted into several domains: design considerations, measurement considerations, and data collection strategies.

Design considerations

Unit of analysis. Selecting the unit of analysis for research and an appropriate design often depends on a series of questions relating to the nature of the unit to be studied. For example, an intervention to prevent crimes at specific locations may differ from an intervention designed to reduce criminality among individuals, and an evaluation of the intervention would require very different theories and designs.¹

Comparison groups. The selection of the unit of analysis also affects other design considerations, such as the selection of comparison groups. Identifying valid and appropriate comparisons is a complex problem. Public housing residents are nested within buildings, and buildings are nested within developments. Researchers are increasingly concerned with the nested or hierarchical effects of neighborhood, school, or other contextual factors and their influence on outcomes.

Accordingly, researchers cannot simply select random samples of individuals from the same buildings. Nor can they avoid the question of comparison groups by using predesigned and postdesigned. This would raise history, maturation, and other validity threats. One solution is to sample individuals from other comparable public housing developments within the same city. Other alternatives include using “bootstrapping”² or case control designs in which projects and individuals serve as their own controls. Research also can benefit from examining within-unit change over time, based on interactions with specific social and structural contexts.

Diffusion and displacement effects. The relationship of public housing to surrounding areas reflects another dimension of the nested status of public housing. Not only are individuals nested in buildings and developments, but developments are nested in neighborhoods, and the neighborhoods themselves exert both criminogenic and protective influences. Drug transactions often

involve persons from outside the housing development, and their movements in and out of the development create a large area where crimes may take place. Situational crime prevention efforts may displace crime to nearby neighborhoods or to neighborhoods some distance away.³

Some studies show higher rates of diffusion within public housing compared with the overall city rate, but such comparisons are invalid because of a lack of comparability of the areas. Other studies compared blocks within and outside public housing developments and found higher rates within the public housing blocks.⁴ One study of violence in and around public housing projects used weighted least-squares procedures to approximate diffusion effects.⁵ The researchers found evidence of outward diffusion for some violent crimes (robbery, homicide) and simultaneous diffusion only for assault.

Event locations. Some buildings within multibuilding housing developments have higher crime rates than other buildings. Moreover, crimes occur in a variety of locations inside and outside the development, and sampling may be required even though it poses its own methodological problems. Locations, too, are nested, and the effects of an intervention in a specific location may be mediated by events that occur in the surrounding area. Thus, for example, locating increased patrol in a specific hot spot may have artifactual effects if the patrol in the surrounding or control area is reduced (or increased) due to other, serendipitous factors.

Apportioning effects. Multiple interventions are common in a public housing project. Sorting and allocating their effects requires a highly complex and disaggregated design. Designs should anticipate multiple interventions, as well as interventions that span both developments and neighboring areas.

Measurement considerations

Although there may be adequate scales and methods to count *events*, other challenges emerge when attempting to standardize counts through computation of *rates*. Geocoded complaint and arrest records present strong advantages in dealing with spatial measurement concerns. However, geocoding cannot pinpoint floors in highrises or shared spaces in many public housing sites. Alternate data sources may be useful in estimating crime problems within specific boundaries of housing developments. Vital statistics and health data often contain address information and can be sampled and geocoded to estimate violence rates in and around public housing.

continued on page 5

continued from page 4

A related problem involves crimes that take place in shared spaces. For example, when drug selling occurs on streets adjacent to, but officially outside, housing developments and when it involves tenants, the assignment of these events to a housing project becomes conceptually difficult. Researchers need to develop rules for such occurrences, but the rules may exert a strong influence on crime rates and estimates of program effectiveness.

Data collection strategies

Surveys. Recent studies involving National Crime Victimization Surveys in public housing developments suggest that advances are forthcoming in measuring crime in public housing,⁶ but sampling concerns continue to arise from uneven patterns of telephone ownership. Additional sampling problems reflect the gap in official versus actual occupancy patterns; respondents are unlikely to provide data on victimization of unofficial occupants. Household surveys are also important tools in gathering observational and attitudinal data.

Conducting comparable surveys in surrounding neighborhoods creates additional problems, especially in counting households. A related theoretical and practical problem is the determination of the boundaries of surrounding neighborhoods. Few theories suggest the size of an ecological context for public housing—whether it is 1 block, 100 yards, or a larger social or administrative boundary. Practically, the distance in which displacement and design effects are likely to be salient is also difficult to determine.

Official records. Public housing authorities that have police departments may be able to supply arrest and complaint records for specific public housing communities, and data from the city's police department may be geocoded to determine which crimes occur in public

housing. In some cases, though, arrests or other data may be generated by special task forces (citywide drug or robbery details, for example) or by agencies from other jurisdictions, such as the State police or the Drug Enforcement Administration, but data from these additional sources are more difficult to obtain.

A second complication involves the distinctions between location event, offender residence, and victim residence. Rarely do crime data record all three pieces of information. The importance of this triangulation for public housing rivals, if not exceeds, its importance in understanding victim-offender interactions and the contextual factors that shape these interactions.

Observations. The advantages of direct observation are self-evident, but such activity is labor intensive, expensive, and requires experienced observers. Coding and reliability questions also need to be addressed. Nevertheless, observation can overcome many of the limitations of other data sources, and time and place sampling can streamline these efforts.

A related strategy is key informant interviews. Key informant strategies have been used extensively in several notable studies of urban life,⁷ including data collection in public housing.⁸ This method involves identifying persons whose knowledge of neighborhood life is extensive and who are capable and accurate reporters of the dynamic exchanges among people within social networks and spaces. Repeated interviews with key informants over time can establish a longitudinal database of events and dynamics within the area of interest. Data can be either structured, quantifiable responses to a protocol or open-ended qualitative narratives that result from a structured conversation between researcher and informant.

Notes

1. Ekblom, P., and K. Pease, "Evaluating Crime Prevention," in *Building a Safer Society*, vol. 19, ed. M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995:585-662.
2. Bootstrapping, which capitalizes on natural variation within a sample, involves asking different types of questions to subsets within a sample. A theory can then be constructed based on the answers.
3. Barnes, G.C., "Defining and Optimizing Displacement," in *Crime and Place*, ed. J.E. Eck and D.L. Weisburd, Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 1995:95-113; Ekblom and Pease, "Evaluating Crime Prevention"; and Clarke, R.V., "Situational Crime Prevention," in *Building a Safer Society*, vol. 19, ed. M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995: 91-150.
4. Roncek, D.W., R. Bell, and J.M.A. Francik, "Housing Projects and Crime," *Social Problems* 29(2)(1981):151-166. See also Harrell, A., and C. Gouvis, *Predicting Neighborhood Risk of Crime*, Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1994.
5. Fagan, J., and G. Davies, "Crime in Public Housing: Two-Way Diffusion Effects in Surrounding Neighborhoods," presented at the Workshop on Spatial Analysis of Criminal Justice Data, New York: City University of New York, Graduate Center, 1997.
6. Holzman, H., and L. Piper, "Measuring Crime in Public Housing: Methodological Issues and Research Strategies," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Boston, Massachusetts, November 1995; and Holzman, H., "Criminological Research on Public Housing: Toward a Better Understanding of People, Places, and Spaces," *Crime and Delinquency* 42(3)(1996):361-378.
7. Engle, S.M., *Urban Danger*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981; and Fischer, C.S., *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
8. Sullivan, M., *Getting Paid*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989.

COLLECTING DATA: FEATURES AND POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS

Public housing authorities

Features:

Larger PHAs may collect and report crime data, including records of crime-related complaints by tenants or tenant organizations. Organized tenant patrols may maintain victimization records.

Limitations:

Data on locations of events may be missing; such data are needed to assess hot spots and evaluate safety measures. Official crime statistics may undercount actual crime rates.

Police department records

Features:

Police records may include identifiers for public housing (that is, the data may indicate that the incident occurred within public housing boundaries). The records may also indicate the residence of the victims, offenders, or both. Complaint and arrest reports may be available. National Incident-Based Reporting System data also will contain event information.

Limitations:

Data may not be specific to units and locations in public housing. Official crime statistics may undercount actual crime rates.

Injury surveillance data

Features:

Mortality and morbidity data for intentional injuries may include the event's location as well as residential data about the injured or deceased person. Geocoded data for residential and event locations would allow analyses of violent crime in public housing and surrounding neighborhoods.

Limitations:

Data often do not contain information about an offender's residence.

Tenant/resident surveys

Features:

Annual tenant surveys can measure crime rates, residents' fear of crime, victimization rates of residents, and crime hot spots.

Limitations:

Data may undercount public housing residents, and telephone interviews can result in sample bias.

certain degree depend on the relationship between the local PHA and the police department. Some larger PHAs have their own police agencies that patrol public housing sites.¹¹ Larger public housing projects without housing authority police agencies often require special police attention and relationships with the city's police department, especially if the development is isolated from its surrounding neighborhoods.

Assessments of crime need to take into account differences in types of crime control programs in a public housing site. (See "NIJ and HUD Collaborate on Research and Evaluation.") These programs vary considerably both between and within cities, and

the various strategies—ranging from drug sweeps to curfews—may conflate crime trends with enforcement trends. A sharp increase in arrest rates in public housing may indicate an increase in police presence, not necessarily an increase in crime.

Tenant organizations and perceptions. Some PHAs have formal and institutionalized tenant organizations that often act as a bridge between residents and the PHAs and may form ties with local police departments, social service agencies, and community organizations. The presence of an active tenant organization may indicate a level of community stability and cohesion that has a significant impact on crime rates. Since public safety is

most likely to be one of the more important issues for such organizations, comparing the degree of tenant organizing and its effectiveness between public housing developments may be an important component of studying crime (and fear of crime) in public housing. (See "Variation in the Types of Residents in Public Housing Communities.")

Residents' own perceptions of public housing may be influenced by the history of its development. The composition of the housing, the length of residents' tenancy, and their connections to the larger community all affect residents' attitudes about public housing. The general reputation of public housing in surrounding neigh-

neighborhoods and in the city will affect how people behave and, in turn, may affect crime and fear of crime.

Variations in physical structure and neighborhood

Many public housing projects are large-scale, multiple-building, highrise developments covering several square

city blocks. Research has shown that the relationship between building size and crime rates varies by type of crime.¹² For example, highrise buildings have lower burglary rates than lowrise developments. However, there can be significant differences between similarly structured public housing developments. More attention should be paid to studying variability in types and rates of crime between similar housing developments to learn about

factors other than structure that might explain variability in crime rates.¹³

Given their size and structural design, it is easy to argue that large public housing developments are “spatial” neighborhoods. What needs to be established is whether they are also “social” neighborhoods.¹⁴ Most do not contain within their boundaries, and often not on their immediate periphery, facilities and institutions (schools,

VARIABILITY WITHIN CHICAGO'S HIGHRISE PUBLIC HOUSING



An NIJ-sponsored study of the effectiveness of the Chicago Housing Authority's (CHA's) comprehensive antidrug initiative illustrates the difficulty of implementing programs and conducting research in public housing settings.

The research tracked CHA's antidrug efforts for 3 years within three developments—Rockwell Gardens, Henry Horner Homes, and Harold Ickes Homes—and conducted a more limited assessment of an experiment with intensive police patrols in the Robert Taylor Homes.¹

Researchers found that reduction in crime and fear of crime varied significantly not only between similar developments but also within the same development. Despite several key similarities (structural, programmatic, and targeted crime type), other more powerful differences exerted greater influence on crime. For example, the program was implemented inconsistently within a single development because of variability in levels of disorder and social cohesion, management practices, residents' perceptions toward the police and one another, and the occurrence of such external events as visits by leading political figures and lawsuits against the housing authority.

The CHA model antidrug program to control violent crime was both comprehensive and collaborative, and CHA policies were well defined. Yet onsite management practices varied considerably, making implementation uneven. The program was also affected by the unique nature of each development and, in some cases, the individual differences between buildings in the same development.

Strong resident leadership in one building in Rockwell Gardens, for example, brought about tremendous changes that never extended to other Rockwell buildings.

In addition to the buildings' variability, external developments affected the researchers' ability to take accurate measurements. A class-action lawsuit against CHA, settled during the evaluation period, resulted in a massive redevelopment effort at Horner that clearly had a much larger impact than any of the antidrug interventions.

In all four developments, gangs dominated daily life and wielded more influence over the level of drug trafficking and violence than either the police or housing authority management. However, the nature of gang control varied both across the four sites and within individual sites. In Rockwell and Horner, for example, multiple gangs fought over control of buildings, turning them into virtual war zones. The gang warfare was so extreme at Horner that the residents in one building formed a pact with the gang members as a means of protection. Ickes, on the other hand, was spared the turf battles because a single gang controlled the development.

The Chicago public housing experience points out the complexities of and challenges to understanding crime issues in public housing. It also illustrates that researchers need to consider the broad and subtle differences that exist within an individual housing community, recognizing that the same policy and program can have widely varying results.

1. Popkin, Susan J., Victoria E. Gwiasda, Jean M. Amendolia, Andrea A. Anderson, Gordon Hanson, Wendell A. Johnson, Elise Martel, Lynn M. Olson, and Dennis P. Rosenbaum, "The Hidden War: The Battle to Control Crime in Chicago's Public Housing," final report submitted in fulfillment of NIJ grant numbers 93-IJ-CX-0037 and 95-IJ-CX-0011. The research examined the impact of the antidrug efforts through the eyes of the residents. Researchers conducted four waves of door-to-door surveys, six rounds of in-depth interviews with a small group of residents, two rounds of interviews with key staff involved in implementing the antidrug initiative, and ethnographic observations of each of the developments. In addition, official crime statistics from 1988 through 1995 were examined to assess the effect of CHA's efforts on residents' demand for police service.

CRIME IN PUBLIC HOUSING

NIJ AND HUD COLLABORATE ON RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) have become partners in an effort to build safer public housing communities.

By combining NIJ's expertise in research and evaluation with HUD's expertise in providing housing authorities with resources, the two agencies are collaborating to understand the implementation and effectiveness of HUD's Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP). HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing and NIJ have signed an interagency agreement through which HUD has transferred \$1.3 million to NIJ for a two-part effort to conduct joint research and evaluation.

In the first part of the effort, NIJ and HUD have embarked on plans to provide housing authorities with the resources to implement locally based research partnerships. The researcher-housing authority partnerships are designed to provide feedback on PHDEP initiatives at both the local and national level. These partnerships build on a similar NIJ initiative that has created dozens of successful re-

searcher-criminal justice agency teams that are cooperatively designing and implementing local research projects and evaluations across the Nation.

The researcher-housing authority partnerships can take one of two forms: (1) those that focus on developing and implementing technically sound strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of programs, with feedback so that course corrections can occur throughout the life of the program, and (2) those that focus on identifying problems, designing and implementing testable solutions, and evaluating the impact of the solution.

The second part of the effort will develop a standard national reporting and information system for PHDEP, a comprehensive effort to reduce and eliminate drug-related crime that has supported \$1.2 billion worth of activities over the last 8 years. NIJ will assess current PHDEP reporting requirements and develop a standard semiannual reporting form that grantee housing authorities can use to measure crime reduction more tangibly than current methods.

VARIATION IN THE TYPES OF RESIDENTS IN PUBLIC HOUSING COMMUNITIES

Based on ongoing field research in New York City's public housing, J. Phillip Thompson and Susan Saegert have categorized PHA families into at least four types, who are usually found in the same buildings.¹ The list is not exhaustive or necessarily representative of most PHAs; it simply suggests the variety among public housing residents and some of the complexities and sensitivities presented in gathering data from public housing families and individuals.

• **Long-term residents.** These are middle-aged or older residents who have typically lived in the same development for 25 years or more. They often anchor the local tenant association, conduct social events for the residents, help residents find jobs, and transmit local history, among other functions. They are usually women with extended families in the building.

• **Distressed families.** These are families facing multiple and serious physical, financial, and mental problems.

• **Working-class loners.** These families are usually headed by a working adult. They typically keep to themselves, fearing crime and social disorder within their development. They are trying to leave public housing.

• **Coping but isolated.** These residents are typically new to the community and are socially isolated (they therefore may feel vulnerable to violent assault). They try to keep their kids in the house and out of trouble and are trying to adjust to their environment.

1. Thompson, J.P., and S. Saegert, "Social Capital in Public Housing," forthcoming, Center for Urban Studies, Columbia University, 1998.

shopping centers, places of worship) that are commonly associated with a “neighborhood.” Social dimensions of neighborhoods are dependent on interaction patterns and social networks. Although in some cases spatial location determines social interactions, such as school districts, spatial proximity is not a guarantee of social interaction. The extent of informal interactions between tenants, their level of familiarity and recognition, and the use of common spaces may all be measures of social neighborhoods within public housing. It could be argued that the spatial isolation of some public housing projects makes them more like traditional neighborhoods than other areas where individuals tend to have more interactions with people outside their neighborhoods.

In his study of Section 8 public housing construction in Chicago, Robert Bursik found that public housing construction was followed by high rates of neighborhood instability which, in turn, was related to higher rates of delinquency.¹⁵ The Bursik study demonstrates the impact of policy decisions on neighborhood change and shows that neighborhood instability, independent of compositional changes, has a significant impact on delinquency rates. It suggests that other studies could measure patterns of stability in and around public housing, apart from compositional changes, to see if stable public housing developments tend to be located in stable neighborhoods and to determine the effects of varying rates of stability on crime rates.

Notes

1. See, for example, Kotlowitz, A., *There Are No Children Here*, New York: Doubleday, 1991; and Lemann, N., *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*, New York: Knopf, 1991.

2. Marcuse, P., “Interpreting ‘Public Housing’ History,” *Journal of Architecture and Planning Research* 12(3)(1995):241–258.

3. Roncek, D.W., R. Bell, and J.M.A. Francik, “Housing Projects and Crime,” *Social Problems* 29(2)(1981):151–166; and Dunworth, T., and A. Saiger, *Drugs and Crime in Public Housing: A Three-City Analysis*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1994.

4. Farley, J.E., “Has Public Housing Gotten a Bum Rap? The Incidence of Crime in St. Louis Public Housing Developments,” *Environment and Behavior* 14(4)(1982):443–477; and Harrell, A., and C. Gouvis, *Predicting Neighborhood Risk of Crime*, Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1994.

5. Fagan, J., and G. Davies, “Crime in Public Housing: Two-Way Diffusion Effects in Surrounding Neighborhoods,” presented at the Workshop on Spatial Analysis of Criminal Justice Data, New York: City University of New York, Graduate Center, 1997.

6. Holzman, H., “Criminological Research on Public Housing: Toward a Better Understanding of People, Places, and Spaces,” *Crime and Delinquency* 42(3)(1996):361–378.

7. Holzman, H.R., T.R. Kudrick, and K.P. Voytek, “Revisiting the Relationship Between Crime and Architectural Design: An Analysis of Data from HUD’s 1994 Survey of Public Housing Residents,” *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 2 (1996):107–126.

8. Marcuse, Peter, “Public Housing in New York City: History of a Program,” unpublished manuscript, 1997.

9. Saegert, Susan, and G. Winkel, “Social Capital Formation in Low-Income Housing,” New York: City University of

New York, Graduate School and University Center, unpublished paper, 1997.

10. Public housing in several cities, including Detroit, Newark, Chicago, and New Orleans, is considered “troubled.” HUD considers housing authorities troubled if they score less than 60 out of 100 points against HUD’s “PHMAP” (Public Housing Management Assessment Program) indicators. See, for example, House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, “Public Housing: Status of HUD’s Takeover of the Chicago Housing Authority,” testimony before the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, September 5, 1995.

11. In 1995, New York City consolidated the housing and transit police departments with the New York Police Department. It may be too soon to study the effects of this consolidation.

12. Holzman, Kudrick, and Voytek, “Revisiting the Relationship Between Crime and Architectural Design,” 107–126.

13. Popkin, Susan J., Victoria E. Gwiasda, Jean M. Amendolia, Andrea A. Anderson, Gordon Hanson, Wendell A. Johnson, Elise Martel, Lynn M. Olson, and Dennis P. Rosenbaum, “The Hidden War: The Battle to Control Crime in Chicago’s Public Housing,” unpublished report in fulfillment of NIJ grant numbers 93–IJ–CX–0037 and 95–IJ–CX–0011.

14. Tienda, Marta, “Poor People and Poor Places: Deciphering Neighborhood Effects on Behavioral Outcomes,” in *Macro-Micro Linkages in Sociology*, ed. Joan Huber, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1991.

15. Bursik, Robert J., “Social Disorganization and Theories of Crime and Delinquency: Problems and Prospects,” *Criminology* 26 (1988):519–551.