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ABSTRACT

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF DRUG NEIGHBORHOODS: AN
ANALYSIS OF VISUAL CUES THAT CONTRIBUTE
TO STUDENTS' VIEWS OF WHAT IS OR IS NOT A DRUG NEIGHBORHOOD
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The University of Texas at Arlington, 2012

Supervising Professor: Robert Bing

Perceptions of crime has been an emerging criminological area of study for the past twenty years. Prior research has shown that visual cues of social disorganization are indicators of both general crime and narcotics crime. This research explores perceptions of narcotics crimes through the utilization of a cross-sectional quantitative research method. Data collected through this study was analyzed by a series of tests which confirm prior findings regarding the connection between visual cues of social disorganization and the perception of crime. This study further suggests that visual indicators of crime have the greatest impact on women, Asian or Pacific Islanders, people who are more familiar with the criminal justice system, or have an overall concern about crime.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Narcotics in America

The study of narcotics is not a new phenomenon in the United States. Since the War on Drugs began under President Reagan in the 1980’s, criminologists have extensively studied the impact of the use and distribution of drugs on the individual and collective lives of Americans (Dennis, 2009; Frabutt & Harvey, 2010; Garrison, 2011; Gaudio, 2010; Hartley, 2008; Lurigio & Davis, 1992; Payne & Gainey, 2007; Mauer, 2009; Popkin, Olson, Lurigio, Gwiasda, & Carter 1995; U.S. House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, 1993). The War on Drugs has intensified over the years, in the 1990’s President Bush held up a bag of seized crack cocaine during the State of the Union Address to announce that the drug problem had reached the steps of the White House. The debate continued after the turn of the century as California passed a law authorizing medicinal marijuana use and subsequently had “legal” marijuana shops raided by the Drug Enforcement Agency. In 2011, the evening news was dominated by accounts of raging drug wars along the United States and Mexican border as drug cartels battled for American’s insatiable appetite for recreational narcotics (“Mexican Drug Trafficking,” 2012).

As a result of these events, average citizens and policy makers seem well versed in the discipline of drug crimes and are able to hold a conversation regarding the many ills of the narcotics trade. This does not mean most Americans would be able to answer drug related questions based on empirical research or an exhaustive study of the history of narcotics. But, it could be argued that average citizens have a passing knowledge of current trends in drug use. The questions posed here are as follows: Why do Americans seem so well versed in all matters drugs? Why could you ask almost any college or high school student where to buy drugs and get an honest answer? Why do citizens know which neighborhoods in their city are likely to be infested with narcotics, even when those citizens have likely never been to these neighborhoods?
Why could most Americans quickly answer a variety of drug related questions, when more serious questions such as “how to prevent violent crime?” would only invite speculation. The simple answer is we as members of society hold perceptions, right or wrong, of drug crimes and where those crimes take place.

Criminologists have explained differences in perceptions of drug use between “high-end” and “low-end” users by focusing on: the differing narcotic characteristics of poor and rich drug users, differences in types of drugs, drug availability, drug preferences among different races, and the openness with which different narcotics are used (Beckett, Nyrop, & Pfingst, 2006). Although these are important factors in describing how various subgroups use drugs, it nonetheless does not explain fully why some neighborhoods cultivate a reputation for the drug trade and others do not. Narcotics seem to be a unifying characteristic among all socioeconomics, which is why this researcher is curious as to how some neighborhoods become identified as drug neighborhoods. This question has become increasingly important because society has begun to associate crime with particular cities, neighborhoods, and people, thereby failing to understand the totality of the crime problem. More specifically, citizens tend to view the infestation of drug crimes as a problem only associated with low socioeconomic and racially diverse neighborhoods. The point to be made here is that average citizens often wrongly assume there are only a few choice locations in any given city to buy or sell street drugs.

Over the past two decades, criminology has seen the emergence of studies regarding perceptions of crime. Many researchers have observed that society perceives certain areas or types of people to be involved in criminal activity which allows for generalizations about where crimes occur, often in the absence of actual proof (Casten & Payne, 2008; Chiricos, 2004; Cops & Pleysier, 2011; Cossman & Rader, 2011; Crank, Giacomazzi, & Heck, 2003; Dansie & Fargo, 2009; Fagan, 1996; Frabutt & Harvey, 2010; King, 2009; Lurigio & Davis, 1992; McCord, Ratcliffe, Garcia, & Taylor, 2007; Nalls, Mullis, & Mullis, 2009; Payne & Gainey, 2007; Popkin, Olson, Lurigio, Gwiasda, & Carter, 1995; Powell & Wahidin, 2008; Sun & Triplett, 2008; Sutton, Robinson, & Farrall, 2011; and, Weisburd & Braga, 2006). Other studies (Gebotys & Roberts,
1988; Cheliotis, 2010) have implicated the media’s significant impact on society for encouraging these generalizations. Although the influence of the media on society’s perceptions of crime is a significant and important body of literature, do all citizens gain their crime data from media sources? Does society buy into everything the media portrays? If the answer is “no”, it is plausible other fundamental aspects of a community impact people’s perceptions of the criminal nature of neighborhoods.

It is not the intent of this study to present the varying drug habits based on socioeconomic status or the media’s portrayal of crime; but rather to discover which factors effect people’s generalizations about crime and their perceptions of drug neighborhoods. Individual’s observations of their city and neighborhood more meaningfully effect what they believe to be true than what someone conveys to them. The visual cues we connect to a specific crime problem are the cues we look for when visiting a new city or neighborhood in order to avoid these sources of crime. Ultimately, it is our own observations made in the moment that determines whether or not we believe we are in a drug neighborhood. The relatively few studies dedicated to understanding what visual cues of social disorganization effect perceptions of crime, allows this researcher to make a meaningful contribution to the existing body of knowledge.

1.2 Plan of Presentation

Chapter two provides an overview of the Criminological theories which explain how community structure effects perceptions of crime. Specifically, it will explore how social disorganization manifests into visual cues which are then perceived as being indicative of drug neighborhoods. The discussion of relevant theories will be followed by a brief review of how social decay takes place at the neighborhood level and what residents would observe as disorganization grips the community. A literature review will follow the discussion of criminological theories. Prior research will be reviewed in terms of criminological, sociological and economic contributions to the understanding of perceptions of crime. The literature review will provide the reader with a synopsis of current research as it pertains to the research
questions. These foundational sections will be followed by chapter three which will include a presentation of the research methodology employed by the current research study. Chapter four outlines the analysis of the data collected for this research project and analyzes that data through a series of T-Tests and Pearson’s R tests. The statistical presentation is followed by a conclusion of the findings in chapter five and discussion of these findings in terms of its benefit to the greater body of knowledge.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Relevant Theories on Perceptions of Drug Neighborhoods

Many criminological theories pertain to crime as a function of society. Specifically, Strain and Labeling theories have been well received within the criminological community as pillars of how crime serves as a function of society on an individual level. By contrast Social Disorganization Theory provides criminology with an understanding of how crime functions at the social level and provides the greatest relevance to the current research questions. Social Disorganization Theory was coined by sociological researchers Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay of the University of Chicago during the first half of the Twentieth Century. This theory was developed through extensive qualitative research by Shaw and McKay which lead them to conclude crime is a function of the breakdown of institutional and community-based controls within communities (Shoemaker, 2010). Social Disorganization theory was developed after multiple research projects that Shaw and McKay undertook in Chicago after the Industrial Revolution (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). The Chicago population boom taking place during this time period was characterized by rapid urbanization (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). This urbanization was due to an increase in foreign born immigrants relocating to large American communities, as well as, southern blacks immigrating to northern industrialized cities looking for a better life; specifically, an alternative to southern plantations (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009). This hyper-immigration resulted in the creation of many newly formed neighborhoods which initially pulled together, but then broke apart as cultural conflicts erupted. Sociologists at the University of Chicago became interested in studying the various social conditions of Chicago residents in terms of the structure of these emerging neighborhoods (Cullen & Agnew, 2006).

Shaw and McKay’s desire to research the social conditions in the Chicago area in the early Twentieth century was heavily influenced by the work of Robert E. Park and Ernest W.
Burgess (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009). Park and Burgess were professors at the University of Chicago and proponents of an idea termed “human ecology” which sought to explain the social and physical environment that citizens of a city find themselves. (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009). Human ecology was a term derived from “natural ecology,” which describes the primal competition found among plants and animals in the wild as they compete within their habitat. The foundations of natural ecology were then translated into human ecology in order to describe and understand the process by which humans interact with each other through compromise or conflict (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009). The belief was that in as much as plants and animals are constantly competing with each other on the forest floor for space and food, humans also compete with each other within a city environment for scarce resources.

Using the idea of human ecology, Park and Burgess outlined a concentric zone model of urbanization which reflected the constant “invasion, dominance, and succession” taking place between competing neighborhoods within a city (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009, p.83). Park and Burgess determined through their model that all cities can be broken down into five zones which began at the city center and moved outward to the suburbs. These zones were termed: 1) Central Business District, 2) Transitional Zone, 3) Working-Class Zone, 4) Residential Zone, and 5) Commuter Zone. Park and Burgess concentrated much of their efforts on the Transitional Zone because it was the first residential area of the city (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009). Zone 2 was under constant invasion from zone 1 as the city center grew through economic development and necessitated that the Central Business Center consumed land from the surrounding community (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). This process lead to disorganization within zone 2 as financially capable residents relocated to outer zones to escape the invasion by the city center. This resulted in only the most disadvantaged citizens being left behind in the Transitional Zone. Therefore, Park and Burgess characterized the visual cues of social disorganization within zone 2 as a mix of encroaching factories on residential neighborhoods, dilapidated housing from residents who were not financially capable of maintaining their property and low neighborhood stability from the exodus of financially capable citizens (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009). Future
sociologists would describe these visual cues of social disorganization as characteristic of neighborhoods with low levels of human and political capital (Short, 2002).

When considering Park and Burgess’ concentric zone model of urbanization, the Transitional Zone is where crime was most likely to occur (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009). This is primarily due to the transient nature of zone 2, characterized by continuous invasion from an expanding economic center combined with the escape of economically advantaged citizens. Because of cheap housing and the depressive nature of its neighborhoods, zone 2 also becomes a logical place for new immigrants to reside as they begin the task of building a new life. This view of urbanization suggests that immigrants are inherently depraved and socially disadvantaged people who are attracted to depressed areas with cheap housing. But when considering that so many people immigrated to Chicago, both nationally and internationally, in order to start over with little or no resources to do so, it becomes apparent why so many immigrants would begin their journey in the cheapest part of the city; which is precisely what Park and Burgess argued to be true.

As immigrants of numerous cultural backgrounds arrived in a common zone and were forced to contend with the ebbs and flows of urbanization, it created socially disconnected neighborhoods which had little cultural, racial or social homogeneity (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). Not only does the transient nature of zone 2 create disorganization among its residents, but diverse sets of socially disadvantaged people living together increases disorganization and creates neighborhoods in constant transition plagued by low community networking and depressed economic possibilities (Payne, 2006). High residential turnover had the negative consequence of impeding a community’s ability to organize and exert social control over its residents (Payne, 2006). Without organization and control, a community lacks the political power to guide its own progress. This reality defined the powerlessness of transitional zones within a city and serves as a cue to outsiders that the area is prone to crime. It is this powerlessness within the community, not the residents of the community themselves, that allows crime to flourish (Payne, 2006). Shaw and McKay were attempting to understand the social conditions which lead to this powerlessness.
as they began their research on the streets of Chicago. Consistent with the ideas of Park and Burgess’ urbanization effect, Shaw and McKay found that neighborhoods with high crime rates lacked: “1) solidarity…2) cohesion…and 3) integration.” (Kubrin, Stucky & Krohn, 2009, p.87). Taken together, these observations and conclusions became the foundation for explaining Social Disorganization Theory.

It is worth noting prior to Shaw and McKay’s research in Chicago, criminology was preoccupied with the psychological and physiological characteristics of criminals (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). Cesare Lombroso’s biological explanations of crime, which focused on the shape of a criminal’s body, were widely accepted by criminologists during the time when Shaw and McKay began their research (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). Anthropologist E.A. Hooton described the biological inferiority of criminals in a 1939 paper which was in keeping with the then contemporary criminological thought on crime (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). When researchers prior to the development of Social Disorganization Theory ventured to discuss these biological causes of crime within the larger context of society, they described neighborhood criminality in terms of clusters of like minded, and biologically equivalent residents living in the same residential community (Shoemaker, 2010). It was generally believed that certain geographical areas of a city with specific cultural or racial ethnicities were biologically inferior or had a general lack of morality; and therefore tended to congregate together so that they could continue to practice the basic criminal tenet of their lifestyle (Shoemaker, 2010). By relying on Park and Burgess’ urbanization model, Shaw and McKay began to suspect crime was a function of the social conditions of residents in specific neighborhoods, rather than the individual characteristics of residents themselves.

Just as Shaw and McKay introduced the idea that crime was a function of society, James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling were pioneers of the belief that crime could also be a function of society’s perceptions. Wilson and Kelling devised the Broken Windows Model of crime after their involvement with a 1970’s crime study in New Jersey called the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). This New Jersey study was designed to observe the impact of
police department foot patrols on local crime rates, compared to traditional motorized beats of police officers (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). Although many police departments were skeptical about the effectiveness of foot patrols, Newark, New Jersey took part in the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program at the request of the State of New Jersey in an effort to test the effectiveness of emerging community oriented policing principles (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). Ultimately, the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program concluded that high visibility foot patrols had no effect on neighborhood crime rates, when compared to those neighborhoods who continued to have motorized patrols only (Brandl & Barlow, 2004).

Consequently, researchers involved in the New Jersey experiment were able to make other important observations. In particular, researchers from this study collected data indicating that although crime rates had not fallen in foot-patrolled neighborhoods; the residents of those neighborhoods felt safer and perceived a lower crime rate (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). Kelling, in the same research concluded that although the New Jersey experiment was attempting to address questions regarding police officer’s effectiveness as crime-fighters, what was really occurring was foot-patrols allowed police officers to more effectively manage the police department’s other duty: order maintenance (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). Police officers on foot patrol serve in a high visibility capacity which allowed them to easily engage in conversations with residents regarding those residents’ concerns. The high visibility and high interactive nature of foot patrols gave residents the impression that the police department cared about the neighborhood, and more importantly, their local problems (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). Kelling further observed the presence of a visible police officer on the street discouraged crimes such as pan-handling and prostitution, as well as nuisances like rowdy teenagers or intoxicated vagrants (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). What Kelling hypothesized was that the lack of neighborhood nuisances and petty crimes made residents of that neighborhood less fearful within their daily activities and therefore those residents perceived less crime (Brandl and Barlow, 2004). By grasping the idea that fear of crime is as important as actual crime, Kelling was able to take a
crucial step forward in establishing the importance of perceptions of crime as a criminological factor.

In addition to the New Jersey experiment, Kelling and Wilson also reviewed research by Stanford psychologist Philip Zimbardo in order to formulate their ideas regarding public safety. In 1969, Zimbardo experimented with community perceptions of crime by arranging to leave an automobile with no license plates and the hood up in the Bronx, New York (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). It was found that within ten minutes, vandalism of the automobile began and within twenty-four hours nearly anything of value had been stripped from the vehicle (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). For additional data, Zimbardo also left a similar automobile in Palo Alto, California in a similar situation, but without the hood open. The automobile in Palo Alto was undisturbed for over one week until Zimbardo smashed part of it with a sledgehammer. Zimbardo reported that within a few hours of this action, “the car had been turned upside down and utterly destroyed.” (Brandl & Barlow, 2004, p.377). Philip Zimbardo concluded that unattended property, such as cars or buildings which give the impression “no one cares” through their outward physical appearance, become magnets for vandalism and crime (Brandl & Barlow, 2004). This research paved the way for a belief that society’s perceptions about a neighborhood, a building, or a person is fundamental to how we as a society react to that neighborhood, building, or person. Similarly, if we perceive a neighborhood or a person to be engaged in criminal behavior, then that perception is just as important as actual criminal conduct. By relying on observations gained from the New Jersey experiment and Zimbardo’s research, Wilson and Kelling were able to formulate conclusions about perceptions of crime in an article titled “Broken Windows”. Wilson and Kelling state:

Just as un-repaired broken windows can signal to people that nobody cares about a building and lead to more serious vandalism, untended disorderly behaviors can also signal that nobody cares about the community and lead to more serious disorder and crime. Such signals –
untended property, disorderly persons, drunks, obstreperous youth, etc. – both create fear in citizens and attract predators (Hagan, 2010, p.345).

In other words, foot-patrols of the New Jersey experiment were preventing these signals from taking place (or at least from worsening) as they engaged in order maintenance activities. By maintaining order, officers reduced residents’ fear based on a lower perception of crime.

Proponents of the Broken Windows Model argue the theory is able to capture the complex nature of crime and explain it in terms of a general social condition (Weisburd & Braga, 2006). By this, Broken Windows is able to offer an explanation of public order as it correlates to crime. Proponents, as well as Wilson and Kelling themselves, also argue this model acknowledges the public order function of policing as a legitimate goal of law enforcement in lieu of the ever eclipsing crime-fighting ideals of contemporary law enforcement administrators (Weisburd & Braga, 2006). Finally, supporters of the Broken Windows Model argue this theory gives policy makers an additional perspective of how to address crime efficiently with ever shrinking state budgets (Weisburd & Braga, 2006). Broken Windows is a theory that, when put into practice, will likely receive support from the community, will likely reduce citizen fear of crime, and may also reduce actual street crimes (Weisburd & Braga, 2006). But the legitimacy of the Broken Windows Model is still being debated among criminologists with research projects testing its validity as a criminological model still in development. In order to understand how these social conditions develop in the real world, the following section discusses social decay in a practical manner.

2.2 Practical Explanation of Social Decay

Theories enable researchers to form a basis for assumptions of observations, but observations take place in the real word and not within the pages of written text. The Broken Windows Model discussed in the previous section would imply that a window must first be broken before decay begins. Some key elements of the Broken Windows Model (as described by Sousa
and Kelling) include: disorder, fear of crime, negotiated street rules, breakdown of community relationships, disorderly individuals, and “a lack of capacity to manage disorders” (Sousa & Kelling, 2006, p.79). In this short list of criminal elements, the term disorder appears with considerable frequency. Civil unrest, unemployment, lack of community involvement or lack of community resources can all be initial elements of disorder. These elements of disorder are the beginnings of the Broken Windows Model whereby a particular neighborhood begins to understand that nobody cares and the problems of that neighborhood are not the problems of the community at large. Disorders may materialize when a city council will not approve funding to improve roads in disadvantaged neighborhoods or build new schools for overcrowded classrooms. Many of these initial disorders are immediately noticeable to residents of the community, who may begin to resent policy makers for their lack of interest in local problems. Once a fear begins to grow that no one cares about a neighborhood, these disorders will become more prominent and pertinent to the overall dysfunction of the community. Restated, as the initial signs that no one cares about the community become more noticeable, it becomes easier to accept that view and proceed to other elements of the Broken Windows Model. The acceptance that nobody cares about a community becomes observable through the visual cues of poorly paved roads, overcrowding, or disrepair of neighborhood buildings.

It is interesting that Sousa and Kelling also include in their discussion of the Broken Windows Model a breakdown of secondary controls such as negotiated street rules and community relationships. Sousa and Kelling (2006) describe negotiated street rules as “those rules, which differ from neighborhood to neighborhood, whereby residences are taught how to act in and around each other through the course of growing up in those neighborhoods” (pp.79-80). If a person lives in a tight knit neighborhood, they probably live in a community where the police are rarely called. Community cohesion becomes very important in deterring crime, but the most important factor is each resident cares about what is going on in their neighborhood. These secondary controls are the types of community relationships which Sousa and Kelling, as well as Shaw and McKay, felt had to break down in order for crime to precede. Unemployment and lack
of community resources are external factors which residents have little or no control over. But community involvement and civil unrest can be controlled through these secondary controls. In order for disorder to proliferate, communities must be shown by outside forces that their neighborhood has no value, but then residents themselves must fail to prevent further decay in what Sousa and Kelling (2006) describe as a “lack [of] capacity to manage their disorders” (p.79). This lack of capacity is a combination of both the larger society failing to care about a particular neighborhood, as well as the residences themselves not caring about the neighborhood. At this point crime can flourish and a neighborhood can become infested with crime.

Jeffrey Fagan (1996) discusses the later changes which take place in neighborhoods in the article, “Gangs, Drugs and Neighborhood Change.” Gangs and drug dealing followed in the wake of deindustrialization, loss of jobs, inequality and economic disinvestment during the 1970’s (Fagan, 1996). The point is made that gang formation was most evident in low-income and politically disadvantaged neighborhoods when compared against the wealthier communities with political resources (Fagan, 1996). Fagan (1996) echoes points made by Sousa and Kelling when he states, “These factors are part of the political economy of a community because they reflect dimensions of community life that are shaped by forces that lie beyond the control of communities…the social controls and social organizations that form in communities are the result of the interactions of individuals with the structural features of the community” (p.55). Once again, neighborhood decay and the creation of criminal cultures are caused by both the greater decline of social resources and a breakdown of secondary controls. Fagan (1996) argues that changes in labor markets since the 1970’s have caused neighborhoods to lack the capacity to regain control after an initial decay. In particular, Fagan (1996) states many blue-collar jobs have been replaced by what he calls “pink-collar” jobs which are essentially the same manufacturing jobs that were available before 1970 which now require higher skill levels, education, or degrees in order to be hired. This results in entry level workers seeking alternative means to make a living, which are often criminally based (Fagan, 1996).
Today drug dealing has become institutionalized. The institutionalization of the drug market begins by first expanding into local economies (Fagan, 1996). For example, dealers set up their trade behind the counter of the convenience store where they work or at local “crack houses”. Fagan (1996) notes once drug dealing becomes routine in neighborhoods, its legality becomes blurred as dealers refer to dealing as “going to work…and as getting paid” (, p.64). In effect, drug dealers create a new social and economic system in order to pull their neighborhood out of decay. In order to do this, drug dealers create new street rules which are governed predominantly by violence (Fagan, 1996). For instance, many people believe an increase in violence in a particular neighborhood would be a sign of further social decay. But it may be easier to think of it in terms of a civil war. Drug dealers are attempting to create a life for themselves but lack the secondary controls to enforce their lifestyle. Violence is a tool by which dealers could then create new secondary controls so that their drug activities can continue.

Whereas at one point your neighbor would call the police when he/she found out you robbed the local gas station, now no report is made because your neighbor is afraid of what may happen if he/she disrupts the new local economy. Violence and the presence of street level drug trafficking become indicative of criminal neighborhoods and serve to notify outsiders of the criminal element of the community.

Accordingly, the interest a community places upon their drug epidemic captures the interest of residents and non-residents alike. Many times, the visual cues of narcotics trafficking, and crime in general, are how neighborhoods become known as being involved in the drug trade. McCord, et al. for example, describe the effect of what is called “crime generators.” The term denotes businesses, institutions, and facilities that bring in large numbers of people from surrounding areas to a specific location (McCord, et al., 2007, par.20). Included with crime generators, McCord, et al. also describes “crime attractors” as pawn shops, drug-treatment facilities, halfway houses, night clubs, liquor stores, etc, which specifically attract criminal elements to certain areas of a city (2007, par. 21). McCord, et al. (2007) reports that drug markets have been known to cluster around crime attractors because they provide a ready supply
of customers for their product. Ironically decaying neighborhoods begin enticing other crime attractors because they have a reputation as being socially, economically, and politically disadvantaged. Due to these disadvantages, neighborhoods not only lack the ability to control residents through secondary controls, but they also lack the ability to adequately control potential crime generating or crime attracting businesses from coming or going within the community. If the neighborhood is politically disadvantaged as well, then it will not have the clout necessary to offer incentives to businesses who can create legitimate jobs in their area. Further, if the neighborhood is economically disadvantaged they are likely to allow any business to come into their community, even if that business is a crime attractor. After all, it is better to have a pawn shop or a liquor store down the street that can employ at least a few residents rather than having yet another empty building. Economic disadvantages lead to social disadvantages which encourage outsiders to frequent a neighborhood for illegitimate purposes or criminal inclinations.

McCord, et al. (2007) report that illegitimate uses of land in a community often lead to greater fear and perception of crime. Fear of crime and perception of crime are similar problems which tend to “feed off” of each other and cause crime rates to be based on something other than reality. In those locations where local crime rates are perceived as greater than they are, these heightened perceptions produce the same crime rate identified by the public (McCord, et al., 2007). McCord, et al. (2007) offers the following explanation when discussing the impact of crime attractors, “They shape the quality of life for residents and contribute to local reputations, house market values, and, of course, local crime rates” (par.2). Decay of neighborhoods takes years to occur and the rebuilding of those neighborhoods may take even longer. As a result, these neighborhoods develop reputations as places to find drug houses, pawn shops, bars, and homeless shelters. These neighborhoods no longer become desirable places to live, but rather, as places to locate deviance and drugs. McCord, et al. (2007) found that people who lived closer to crime generators and attractors had greater neighborhood disorder and a higher perception of crime. These findings are reported to be independent of the racial composition or economic prosperity of the neighborhood (McCord, et al., 2007).
In all, the marginalization of a community is the first of many steps that begins, and ultimately continues the disorganization of a neighborhood. The theoretical and practical explanations of drug neighborhoods outlined above serve as the basis for understanding how and why a drug neighborhood develops. What follows is a comprehensive review of the current research studies available on perceptions of crime as it relates to neighborhood disorganization and the visual cues which signal to onlookers that they are in a criminal neighborhood.

2.3 Current Literature on Perceptions of Drug Neighborhoods

In the article, “Broken Windows: Why-and How-We Should Take Them Seriously”, W.G. Skogan (2008) reviews the minutes of multiple police-citizen neighborhood meetings in the Chicago area that were regularly scheduled by the police department with specific neighborhoods in order to give community residents the opportunity to voice any concern they had about their neighborhood to the police department (Skogan, 2008). What Skogan (2008) found was that thirty-six percent of the time, residents discussed problems involving social disorder. Some of these problems included: “loitering, street prostitution, public drinking, and fears about teenage misconduct”, as well as various other nuisances (Skogan, 2008, p.198). It was further found that during these police-citizen meetings, street drug markets were discussed twenty-four percent of the time and physical decay of the neighborhood twelve percent of the time (Skogan, 2008). Ironically, only an average of nine percent of the meeting discussions were devoted to issues involving actual crimes, such as robberies or burglaries (Skogan, 2008). The Skogan study concludes that not only are residents’ perceptions of social disorder the most influential factor in perceptions of crime, but if the police fail to address social disorder, they will loose residential cooperation in their crime-fighting function. Skogan reports that since Wilson and Kelling first described the Broken Window’s model, the social disorders contained within that model have been greatly expanded to include a wide variety of conduct (2008). Many of the conducts included in the contemporary view of the Broken Window’s model, which were not necessarily included by Wilson and Kelling, are: “truant high-schoolers, squeegee men, dumpster divers,
street preachers, [homeless camps],...sexually oriented establishments, street harassment,...open gambling, threatening phone calls [and] recreational violence in pubs and clubs” (Skogan, 2008, p.195).

Skogan’s (2008) article represents a contemporary review of where the Broken Window’s model of crime has arrived and the general police and political approach that is necessary to reduce residential fears of crime. Interestingly, Skogan (2008) dedicates much of his article to the primary issue discussed during the observed police-citizen meetings in Chicago: social disorder as observed through neighborhood nuisances. What is not discussed by Skogan (2008), are the other seemingly important issues which take up a large majority of these meetings. In particular, Skogan reports that drug markets are discussed twenty-four percent of the time (second most common subject), yet no further observations or discussion is provided in his article (2008). Skogan (2008) does not discuss these underlining issues presumably because his article is not meant to target perceptions of drug markets, but rather attitudes residents have about general nuisances and what these nuisances mean to neighborhood perceptions of crime. As “perceptions of crime” continues to emerge as a criminological area of study, discrepancies remain in understanding what citizens actually perceive when they discuss issues of social disorganization.

Elizabeth J. Dansie and Jamison D. Fargo were two such researchers who were concerned that previous studies regarding community perceptions of crime were actually measuring community perceptions about police practices. This concern was addressed by Dansie and Fargo (2009) through a secondary analysis of the Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety in 12 Cities (1998) study. The original study was conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice: Bureau of Justice Statistics as a random telephonic survey of eight-hundred residents from twelve different U.S. cities. The cities selected by the Bureau of Justice Statistics for this study were in varying phases of the community-policing strategy (Dansie and Fargo, 2009). Although the Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety in 12 Cities (1998) study was meant to target community perceptions of crime, Dansie and Fargo
(2009) argue what was actually measured by this research was citizens’ observations of various community-policing strategies. Therefore, Dansie and Fargo (2009) completed a secondary analysis of the 1998 research data, in order to focus specifically on citizens’ understanding of perceptions of crime as it relates to residents’ fear of being victimized in their own neighborhood.

The secondary analysis was completed by reorganizing the survey data from the 1998 study into six criminological factors and then measuring the validity of these factors as predictors of fear of crime. Dansie and Fargo (2009) categorized the questions from the original survey data under a neighborhood’s physical environment if those questions had to do with the research subject’s knowledge of: abandoned cars or buildings, rundown or neglected buildings, trash, empty lots, public drinking or drug use, public drug sales, vandalism or graffiti, prostitution, panhandling, loitering, homeless sleeping on the streets or poor lighting. The types of crime taking place in a neighborhood were then categorized by any research question having to do with a participant’s knowledge of: auto theft, theft of personal property, breaking and entering, people openly selling drugs, people openly using drugs, violent physical attacks, crimes committed with guns, sexual assaults, or murder (Dansie & Fargo, 2009). The inclusion of drug related activities, as factors in social disorganization, is important to the understanding of perceptions of neighborhood crime by offering that an increased presence of drug users and drug dealers in a specific neighborhood would have just as much of an impact on residents’ perceptions of crime as other, more serious, crimes. Dansie and Fargo (2009) concluded from their secondary analysis that perceptions of crime were greatly influenced by a neighborhood’s physical environment and the types of crime taking place in that neighborhood. Dansie and Fargo were able to capture the importance of people’s perceptions of crime as those perceptions relate to observed social dysfunctions within a neighborhood and not as it related to police initiatives. Their research concludes, “knowledge of negative characteristics of the neighborhood environment and neighborhood crime were related to increased fear” (Dansie & Fargo, 2009, p.1).
In order to determine the practical usefulness of Social Disorganization Theory and the Broken Window’s Model researchers have evaluated multiple policing initiatives that have relied upon these theories to address crime problems. In one such study, Frabutt and Harvey (2010) discuss the importance of police initiatives that target drug markets because of these markets’ impact on community “traffic congestion, noise…, disorderly conduct, begging, loitering, vandalism, drug use and littering…,criminal damage to property, prostitution, [and] robbery…” (Frabutt & Harvey, 2010, p.453). Both authors make the observation that these social disorders affect quality of life for neighborhood residents and attract police action (Frabutt & Harvey, 2010). The strategy which was analyzed by Frabutt and Harvey (2010) involved the police department in North Carolina collaborating with other law enforcement and social service agencies to identifying residents who were intimately involved in the local drug trade. Once major contributors in local drug markets were identified, these agencies collaborated in building criminal cases against the perpetrators (Frabutt & Harvey, 2010). But once strong criminal cases were developed, the District Attorney’s Office did not prosecute these individuals, but instead, confronted the key players with the evidence to give them the option of changing their lives in lieu of prosecution (Frabutt & Harvey, 2010).

Frabutt and Harvey (2010) conducted their analysis of this North Carolina police initiative through semi-structured interviews of thirteen primary law enforcement stakeholders involved in the implementation of the drug elimination strategy. It was the researcher’s intent to determine the effectiveness of the collaborative strategy and to lay out the process of establishing similar initiatives in other cities and police departments. Frabutt and Harvey (2010) ultimately establish that in order for these types of police initiatives to work, the first step in identifying drug markets is to use statistical crime mapping programs to identify high crime areas so that the police department can justify their reasons for targeting one neighborhood, or drug dealer, over another. This point was reiterated by the researchers several times due to the need to base police initiatives on statistically verifiable areas of a city which are known to be current drug markets, rather than those areas which are perceived to be drug markets. Frabutt and Harvey (2010)
report that during implementation of the North Carolina initiative, the High Point and Winston-Salem Police Department stake-holders received resistance from patrol officers who felt some of the identified neighborhoods for this initiative were not worth the police department’s time, such as neighborhoods which were not viewed by officers as being riddled with drug dealers.

Additionally, police officers involved in this initiative also feared that other target areas that were characterized by high crime rates posed too great of a problem to be solved through a social services approach to policing, and were once again, not worth the investment of this initiative (Frabutt & Harvey, 2010). In this manner, the researchers establish the importance of dispelling biases and implementing police initiatives based upon justifiable facts, rather than perceptions. Further, it becomes apparent that society’s perception of a neighborhood appears to influence our commitment to addressing crimes in that neighborhood.

In an earlier study, Arthur Lurigio and Robert Davis (1992) analyzed the effectiveness of four citizen anti-drug programs which were being employed by local residents in four major metropolitan cities. The researchers argue that neighborhood anti-drug programs were important to the dispersion of drug markets because drug crimes employ “poorly educated, unemployable, and impoverished youth” in destitute communities (Lurigio & Davis, 1992, p.523). The inclusion of these types of individuals into the drug trade further breaks down neighborhood cohesion by preventing young neighborhood residents from correcting the shortcomings in their education that would enable them to find legitimate work (Lurigio & Davis, 1992). Similar to Park and Burgess, Lurigio and Davis (1992) recognized that drug markets trap neighborhoods in a downward spiral and prevent new residents from viewing the neighborhood as a source of legitimate residential or economic opportunity. Each of the local anti-drug programs studied by Lurigio and Davis (1992) were in-part, or in totality, addressing local drug crimes by targeting neighborhood decay.

In Miami, Florida the anti-drug program targeted neighborhood disorganization by cleaning empty lots where drug dealers stashed their drugs, trimming trees and bushes to aid in visibility, clean trash from the streets, and working with city agencies to help board up or condemn dilapidated buildings (Lurigio & Davis, 1992). Seattle, Washington used their citizens’
anti-drug program to focus more heavily on reporting the actions of individuals to the police, such as identifying the various transient people involved in the drug trade. In order to accomplish this, Seattle utilized a hot-line where community residents could report any details about drug traffickers, or buyers, to the police and have that information incorporated into narcotics investigations (Lurigio & Davis, 1992). The use of community reporting empowered local residents and made them feel as though they had a direct impact on local crime (Lurigio & Davis, 1992). Like Miami, the strategy employed in Philadelphia addressed neighborhood drug crimes by working with local church groups to clean up neighborhood trash, board up vacant drug houses and remove abandoned vehicles (Lurigio & Davis, 1992). But perhaps the most aggressive effort to address neighborhood decay was seen in the city of Baltimore where local residents of the anti-drug program targeted what they called “unacceptable behavior” in or around neighborhood bars, collected trash from the streets and vacant lots, painted over graffiti, boarded up vacant buildings, and worked with city leaders to maintain subsidized housing in target neighborhoods (Lurigio & Davis, 1992).

Each of the anti-drug programs analyzed by Lurigio and Davis (1992) utilized some aspect of police-citizen interaction in order to monitor and report drug crimes in the target neighborhoods. As noted above, reporting drug crimes to the police was most important to Seattle’s strategy. However, a majority of the effort involved with the other three anti-drug programs targeted neighborhood factors that affected the availability of drug markets. Lurigio and Davis (1992) conclude that in each of the four cities surveyed, the anti-drug programs which target neighborhood factors of crime were largely successful in reducing perceptions of crime when compared to control neighborhoods in those same cities. What is important about this study is that Lurigio and Davis report this was the first attempt by researchers to empirically test citizens’ perceptions of factors related to crime prevention (1992). Lurigio and Davis (1992) also acknowledge through their study that not only does neighborhood decay contribute to the installment of drug markets, but the continued visual cues of community disorganization effect perceptions of those markets. In sum, the conclusion of this anti-drug study found that the four
anti-drug programs, which addressed street level drug crimes by targeting neighborhood structural decay, were successful in addressing perceptions and fear of crime by local residents. In all, these research findings suggest that perceptions of drug markets are of particular importance to the establishment, continuance, or dispersion of these markets.

When considering visual cues of structural decay, many different images come to mind, including public housing. Public housing is perhaps the most powerful symbol of social decay, because they have been viewed as hot spots for crime. This generalized perception presents researchers with ample opportunity for study. Through a variety of studies of crime, it has been widely found that law enforcement or resident-based approaches to crime alone cannot successfully eliminate crime from public housing (Popkin, Olson, Lurigio, Gwiasda, & Carter, 1995). Instead what has been determined is that multifaceted approaches to crime provide the best opportunity for dispersing crime and correcting social disorganization (Popkin et al., 1995). This notion of a multifaceted approach to crime is what defined the creation of the Chicago Housing Authority’s (CHA) Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP). The PHDEP was devised in the late 1980’s as a reaction to growing drug and gang crimes in Chicago area public housing units which spurred rapid neighborhood deterioration and high crime rates (Popkin et al., 1995). The PHDEP was characterized by a joint approach between the Chicago Police Department, CHA, local social services, tenant groups and private security guards that involved: “sweeping buildings for drugs and weapons, improving security, removing unauthorized tenants, responding to residents’ needs for services and maintenance, and implementing drug prevention and intervention programs.” (Popkin et al., 1995, p.73). Although this initiative was found to have a positive impact on overall crime rates (as measured by gang violence and drug crimes) in the target housing units, it was not known whether or not the program’s efforts had any lasting effect on tenant’s perceptions of crime (Popkin et al., 1995). In order to make this determination, Popkin et al. (1995) set out in the early 1990’s to study tenants’ perception of crime after a recent housing unit security sweep by CHA personnel.
Popkin et al. (1995) targeted two public housing units for comparison. The first unit was selected because it was characterized by long-term residents, low vacancy rate of building apartments, and a relatively low crime rate when compared to other Chicago area public housing units (Popkin et al., 1995). Tenants of the first building had greater community interaction, knowledge of who did and did not live in the building, and generally cared about the welfare of community residents (Popkin et al., 1995). In this regard, the first building was observed to have less social disorganization than typical public housing units. The second building was selected for study because of its high residential turnover, high vacancy of building apartments, high crime rate and established drug markets (Popkin et al., 1995). Ultimately, the researchers found that the first building (characterized by high social cohesion) had a more positive perception of the impact of the PHDEP and the recent security sweep than did residents in the second building (Popkin et al., 1995). Further, residents of the first building perceived the impact of the security sweep and the PHDEP to be longer lasting and requiring less maintenance than those residents of the second building (Popkin et al., 1995). The building with greater tenant cohesion felt that the PHDEP also had established the parameters of building safety and that the tenants themselves were able to more efficiently maintain those parameters without constant CHA oversight (Popkin et al., 1995). These conclusions are in keeping with Lurigio and Davis’ 1992 study which held that long term social disorganization and the establishment of known drug markets has a lasting impact on residents’ perceptions of crime. Because building one of Popkin et al’s (1995) study had greater tenant cohesion and less crime, the impact of criminological responses to crime had a larger and longer lasting impact on tenant perceptions of crime. What is established by this study is the notion that neighborhood (or building) social conditions affect the impact of programs targeting crime within those neighborhoods. In order for criminological initiatives to be most effective, policy makers must address the social disorganization of a target area before an initiative can be fully implemented. When social ills are addressed before crime-fighting practices are employed, then these practices will have a greater impact on both the target crime rate and perceptions of crime by local residents.
In order to advance the research in neighborhood perceptions of crime, Ivan Y. Sun and Ruth A. Triplett set out to study the varying perceptions of crime as observed by local residents and police officers. In their 2008 study, Sun and Triplett used research from previous data sets in order to measure resident and police perceptions of fear of crime based on participants’ responses to questions regarding: neighborhood structural characteristics, social disorganization, legitimacy of authority, and local crime rates. The information for this secondary study was collected from the 1996 study in Indianapolis titled *The Project on Policing Neighborhoods* (POPN) (Sun & Triplett, 2008). The POPN study obtained information from ninety-five percent of the Indianapolis Police Department’s patrol officers through face-to-face interviews with researchers (Sun & Triplett, 2008). Data was then collected from 5,400 neighborhood residents, who were served by the Indianapolis Police Department from all parts of the city (Sun & Triplett, 2008). The researchers concluded that patrol officers typically had a higher perception of neighborhood crime than did local residents (Sun & Triplett, 2008). Restated, Sun and Triplett (2008) report that the actual crime rate of the neighborhoods studied had little or no effect on perceptions of crime for the police or residents.

Sun and Triplett’s (2008) conclusions become important to the understanding of people’s perceptions of crime because what these researchers find is actual crime rates do not effect perceptions of crime nearly as much as neighborhood characteristics. What can be taken away from this study is that people allow their personal biases to interfere with their perceptions of what is or is not a dangerous or crime ridden neighborhood. It is interesting that Sun and Triplett’s (2008) conclusions were true of both residents and the police. The researchers acknowledge they had presumed patrol officers would have more realistic perceptions of neighborhood crime based on actual crime rates, but again, this was not found to be true (Sun & Triplett, 2008). So the question becomes, if working professionals, who presumably have first-hand knowledge which would allow them to be better informed than average citizens, have similar perceptions about crime as average citizens, what hope is there that society as a whole is making rational judgments about neighborhood crimes? The argument here is that they are not. Sun and
Triplett’s (2008) observations help argue that people’s perceptions of crime, and what is or is not a criminal community, is based solely on individual biases. Community biases interfere with professionals’ ability to focus on actual crime problems and to address those problems systematically. The fact that residents and the police alike still believe that socially disorganized and racially diverse neighborhoods are the most likely sources of crime, fails to recognize the many other sources of crime in cities across the United States.

The introduction of crack cocaine in the 1980’s was instrumental in the creation of America’s War on Drugs; and helped spur on the notion that drug use is a product of poor and racially diverse areas of a city (Chiricos, 2004; Fagan, 1996; Garrison, 2001; Hartley, 2008; Payne & Gainey, 2007). But drug use is not limited by geographical or demographic boundaries. Illegal narcotics can be found across the United States in rural as well as urban neighborhoods; white as well as black; and old as well as young people’s homes. However, the perception in society remains that drug crimes are a poor inner-city problem for racial minorities. Just as crack cocaine conjures up imagines of poor inner-city minorities, other drugs have the reverse perception. Methamphetamine is typically attributed to rural white users, even as methamphetamine distributions from Mexico are becoming more common. Additionally, ecstasy is often thought of as a somewhat harmless recreational street drug for suburban majority groups; forgetting for a moment that the base drug used in the production of ecstasy is methamphetamine, cocaine, or heroin. But the perception is that some drugs are more harmful than others. Along with this perception of levels of harm is the notion that those drugs of less harm are not as widely available to populations which are not socially marginalized. Therefore, society’s perception is that less harmful drugs are typically consumed by the majority and less frequently. In order to highlight this perception, an anonymous article “Wide Gulf Separates Ecstasy Perceptions” (2002), was published in Crime Control Digest based on the annual report from the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. This article reported that only one percent of parents believed that their child had access to ecstasy or was experimenting with the drug, while twelve-percent of children reported actually using ecstasy (“Wide Gulf Separates Ecstasy
Perceptions", 2002). As previously stated, ecstasy has been viewed as an experimental drug for wealthier white users. What is important about this article is that only one in one-hundred parents were reported to believe their child had access to ecstasy, yet twelve in one-hundred children reported using the drug (“Wide Gulf Separates Ecstasy Perceptions", 2002). Therefore, not only does twelve times the number of children believe they have access to ecstasy when compared to parents, but those children have actually been using the drug. As a result of this report, it could be argued that many more children have access to ecstasy than the twelve percent reported, but have merely chosen not to engage in use. This article points out the middle-class majority in this country are largely oblivious to the drug markets operating in or around their neighborhoods and instead continue the perceive drug markets as an inner-city, poor, and minority problem.

Although American Indian reservations are typically located in rural areas of the country, they have been found to have similar characteristics of social disorganization as inner-city minority neighborhoods; i.e., high unemployment, frequent exposure to violence, substance abuse, and prejudice from majority communities (Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009). Because of the similar marginalization characteristics of Native Americans with other minority groups in the United States, the effects of social disorder on the perceptions of crime are able to be studied outside of the metropolitan environment. Nalls, Mullis & Mullis (2009) did just this as they sought to research the effects of neighborhood and school environments on the depressive symptoms and substance abuse of American Indian adolescents. It was the researchers’ position that environmental effects have a greater effect on adolescents’ fear of crime than demographic factors (Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009). Much of this hypothesis was formed based on prior research that suggested two things: First, that adolescent Indians on reservations experienced higher rates of drug and alcohol abuse than did Indians found in urban settings; and secondly, that Native Americans have higher incidents of violence in their neighborhoods and schools, and thus, perceive higher risks of victimization within those settings than majority students (Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009). In order to test these hypotheses, Nalls, Mullis and Mullis (2009) surveyed Native American students at reservation schools in order to determine the influence of
environmental factors, as they effected perceptions of safety, as predictors of substance abuse and depressive symptoms among American Indian adolescents. In this study, environmental factors which effected perceptions of neighborhood safety were measured by participants’ observations of: graffiti, drug dealing, fighting, or abandoned buildings (Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009). School safety was then measured by asking participants about their observations regarding: threats or injuries using a weapon at school, fighting, bullying, and whether or not a participant felt safe traveling to and from school (Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009). The researchers conclude that decreases in perceived neighborhood and school safety resulted in increases of substance abuse (Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009). Additionally, Nalls, Mullis and Mullis (2009) found that neighborhood safety was the only significant predictor of depressive symptoms among Native American adolescents. The researchers attribute the greater impact of these social disorganizations on adolescence depression and substance abuse due to the likelihood that drug dealing and gang activities are more regulated within the school environment than they are in neighborhoods; even though “large, impoverished, and disorganized schools were more likely to have high rates of peer violence” (Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009, p.968). Ultimately, the conclusion of Nalls, Mullis and Mullis (2009) was that neighborhood safety, as perceived through graffiti, fighting, drug sales and abandoned buildings, lead to decreased feelings of safety, i.e. perceptions of crime.

Prior studies in this literature review (e.g., Dansie & Fargo, 2009; Frabutt & Harvey, 2010; Lurigio & Davis, 1992; Nalls, Mullis & Mullis, 2009; Popkin et al., 1995; Skogan, 2008; Sun & Triplett, 2008) and Social Disorganization theory allude to the compounding nature of social disorganization. As neighborhoods begin to deteriorate and residents perceive increased crime, those residents with the ability to move out of the neighborhood to more affluent areas do so, leaving only the most poor and socially disadvantaged residents behind. This exodus results in even greater social disorganization which inhibits social restructuring. In the same manner, Nalls, Mullis and Mullis showed through their 2009 study that Native American adolescents who perceive greater social disorganization in their neighborhoods are more prone to substance
abuse and depressive symptoms. This conclusion is consistent with the idea that as communities affected by issues of social disorganization enter into a downward spiral, that downward spiral spurs on further crime and disorder. Nalls, Mullis and Mullis (2009) state that some of the social disorganization felt on Indian reservations was the product of outside prejudice of reservation residents. It could be argued that in much the same way, inner-city, racially diverse, and economically disadvantaged neighborhoods are prejudiced against by more affluent areas of the city. This prejudice leads residents of inner-city neighborhoods to have greater perceptions of crime, and perhaps, engage in disorderly activities themselves in order to cope with these negative biases. Perhaps this is why disorganized communities develop reputations for being “drug neighborhoods” where organized neighborhoods, who may engage in drug crimes, do not have the same stigma. The nature of a downward spiral of social disorganization is important to the development of community perceptions of crime. If a neighborhood does not embrace disorganization, are they able to avoid the disorganization stigma?

In some cases, neighborhoods attempt to reorganize and attract new businesses into the local community. Other times, organization may just be a matter of holding onto those businesses that have shown a willingness to remain in socially disadvantaged areas. But ultimately a business’s decision to relocate to, or stay in, a disadvantaged community rests on that business’s ability to make a profit and control expenses. If you consider the types of family owned businesses that are common to low income communities they are typically convenience stores, small grocery stores, video rentals, liquor stores, and other somewhat low cost consumer establishments (McCord, et al., 2007). These types of businesses are often vulnerable to theft and vandalism, which becomes an obstacle to turning a profit if criminal factors cannot be controlled. Businesses are able to control for theft and vandalism by employing what has been termed “guardianship strategies” such as: barred windows, closed-circuit television monitors, silent alarms, watch dogs, security personnel, encased displays, personal check approvals, armed deposit pick-ups, etc (Casten & Payne, 2008). The question here is what causes a business owner to begin employing these guardianship strategies in the first place? Casten and
Payne (2008) set out to uncover the perceptions business owners have about the social disorganization of a neighborhood which would cause them to employ defensive strategies. Casten and Payne (2008) accomplished this by surveying four-hundred and fifty-one small businesses in the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth, Virginia. Small businesses were selected as survey participants because it was Casten and Payne’s (2008) assumption that in disadvantaged neighborhoods, businesses become the meeting place for local residents (both criminal and non-criminal alike). The survey used in this study asked business owners thirty-three questions regarding their perceptions of social disorganization in their community (Casten & Payne, 2008). Some of these questions asked respondents about their observations regarding: litter, barred windows, youth loitering on their premises, graffiti, open prostitution, drug use, shabby buildings or shabbily repaired buildings, noise, and many other characteristics of disorganization (Casten & Payne, 2008). Business owners were then asked about the guardianship strategies employed by their business in order to determine how their perceptions of crime effected their decision to use defensive strategies.

What Casten and Payne (2008) found was business owner’s perceptions of general crime lead to an increase in precautionary measures; such as barring the doors and windows or limiting the number of employees with access to the change drawer. More specifically, perceptions of neighborhood drug crimes had the greatest effect on business owners’ decision to employ these precautionary measures (Casten & Payne, 2008). Because drug crimes are linked to vandalism, theft, loitering and other social disorders, a business owner’s perception of local drug crimes is not only a perception of these particular crimes, but the types of people who engage in those crimes. Casten and Payne (2008) note that perception of crime was highly effected by a business’s exposure and proximity to crime. In this manner neighborhoods characterized by drug crimes often fall into the Broken Window’s Model and exhibit visual cues of disorder through broken windows and fences, litter, graffiti and loitering youth. These social disorders inevitably cost business owners financially through repairs, clean-up, theft and vandalism (Casten & Payne, 2008). Further, those businesses physically closest to these
disorders will bare the brunt of these costs (Casten & Payne, 2008). In this manner, a city's ability to effectively manage social disorder, or at least the perception of disorder, may mean the difference between attracting new businesses to disadvantaged neighborhoods. Casten and Payne (2008) report that thirty percent of businesses surveyed were considering relocating due to local disorder, and another twenty-nine percent were considering going out of business altogether. The ultimate conclusion made by the researchers is that city leaders should consider increasing public security to business owners in disadvantaged neighborhoods in order to increase the perception of order (Casten & Payne, 2008). Inevitably, if local leaders are unable to do this, they will not be able to stop the downward spiral of a socially disadvantaged neighborhood, as not only residents leave, but businesses close down as well.

Additional researchers who have linked the influence of local drug markets to perceptions of safety and crime are Payne and Gainey, who in 2007 published an article concluding that being approached by a drug dealer on the street had just as much impact on perceptions of crime as any other act. Payne and Gainey (2007) studied perceptions of crime by utilizing data collected from the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth, Virginia during the Empowerment Zone 2010 Initiative. This initiative was a project funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development which sought to improve disadvantaged neighborhoods in the target cities (Payne & Gainey, 2007). Although Payne and Gainey’s research was mainly directed towards how rates of victimization and being approached by a drug dealer on the street effected resident’s perceptions of the effectiveness of local police officers, their conclusions heavily discuss how these variables effect perceptions of crime (2007). This research concluded that being a victim of a crime in one’s own neighborhood increased fear of crime by sixty-nine percent; but being approached by a drug dealer, increased fear of crime by two-hundred and fifty percent (Payne & Gainey, 2007). It was also concluded that increased fear of crime also resulted in decreased perceptions about the effectiveness of the police department.

Payne and Gainey (2007) report that their findings are important because the mere fact that someone is living in a socially disadvantaged neighborhood means that they see first hand
the ravages of crime and victimization. These primary observations then influence that person’s perception of crime (Payne & Gainey, 2007). In this manner, socially disadvantaged neighborhoods may have an increased fear of crime simply because they have a close proximity to victimization and drug crimes, which leads them to pull out of the collaborative efforts between the police and citizens that is so necessary to crime-fighting initiatives. This chain of events would only help to strengthen criminal subgroups and prevent law enforcement from routing out crime. What is most interesting from Payne and Gainey’s (2007) research is that the actual victimization of a resident only made that resident sixty-nine percent more fearful of crime, whereas being approached by a drug dealer in the street made that resident two and one-half times more fearful of crime. From this, Payne and Gainey (2007) establish that drug crimes are the ultimate measure of fear of crime in so far as these types of crimes induce the greatest amount of fear in residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods. Amazingly, the perception of neighborhood crime appears to have a greater impact than the act of victimization itself. This begins to explain why neighborhoods that are perceived to be high traffickers of narcotics are also viewed as being safe havens for all types of criminals.

In Payne and Gainey’s (2007) literature review, they use prior research conducted by Crank, Giacomazzi, and Heck in 2003 as a basis for their arguments about social disorder and the effect of drug crimes on perceived criminal activity. This prior study by Crank et al. (2003) was published subsequent to the collection of data in 1997 from Ada County, Idaho. In Crank et al.’s (2003) study, the research sought to understand the perceptions of crime from the perspectives of rural residents who were witnessing rapid urbanization through what was described as “boomtowns”. Boomtowns were defined as rural areas of the United States which were seeing unprecedented population growth that was accompanied by a disproportional increase in crime (Crank, Giacomazzi & Heck, 2003). In order to understand the effects of the social disorganization that accompanied boomtowns, Crank et al. (2003) completed a telephone survey of a sample of Ada County residents who were randomly selected by zip code from Ada’s population of rural residents. What Crank et al. (2003) found was that observations of gang
activities and drug crimes lead to increased perceptions of general crime. Additionally, the researchers found that youthful disorders, drug crimes and gang activity all increased respondents’ fear of victimization (Crank et al., 2003). In order to test whether or not political organization of a neighborhood affected respondents’ perceptions of crime, researchers included measures to determine whether or not local infrastructure had any affect on respondent answers (Crank et al., 2003). What was found was that residents’ fear of personal victimization was unaffected by perceptions of gang activity and drug crimes in neighborhoods with high levels of infrastructure (highly organized) (Crank et al., 2003). However, perceptions of gang activity and drug crimes did affect residents’ perceptions of neighborhood safety within these same organized neighborhoods (Crank et al, 2003). Within organized neighborhoods, respondents felt personally safe in their community when they perceived high levels of crime, even though they felt the community itself was unsafe. Although these are seemingly conflicting ideas, Crank et al’s (2003) point is this: fear of crime can be, in and of itself, a social problem. The notions that fear and perceptions of crime are a social problem in and of themselves, is central to the belief that society’s perceptions of what are or are not drug neighborhoods is based almost solely on perception rather than fact.

Findings by researchers outlined in this section confirm conclusions made by Social Disorganization Theory, the urbanization effect, and Broken Window’s Model. In particular, it is concluded that perceptions of crime are greatly influenced by visual cues of social disorganization, such as dilapidated buildings, loitering teenagers, being approached by a drug dealer on the street, and many others. This conclusion is based on a variety of research projects spanning several decades and inclusive of both urban and rural communities. What prior researchers point to is a need for additional study in the area of perceptions of narcotics crime rather than crime in general. For this reason, the following research is presented in order to add to the existing body of knowledge on perceptions of drug neighborhoods.
3.1 Surveying Undergraduate Students at the University of Texas at Arlington

3.1.1 Introduction

This section details the research methodology used in completion of this study. Specifically, the current research study employed a cross-sectional quantitative research method to capture respondents’ perceptions of drug neighborhoods. The purpose of this study was to explore whether or not visual cues of social disorganization effect perceptions of drug neighborhoods within a student population. By “explore” it is meant that research questions probed respondents about their individual perspectives of drug neighborhoods based on visual cues identified by past researchers. The current study occurred during the Fall 2011 academic semester at the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA). For the purpose of this research, a “drug neighborhood” was defined as a specific geographical area, which is commonly associated with narcotics use or narcotics trafficking. This definition was provided to students in the cover letter which accompanied the survey instrument. Undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory criminology course at UTA during the fall 2011 academic semester served as the survey group for this study.

3.1.2 Sample

A sample population of students enrolled in introductory criminology and criminal justice courses during Fall 2011 were selected as potential research subjects for the following reasons. Undergraduate students at UTA present a convenience sample which was readily available to this researcher. It is assumed that these students provide the best opportunity for an unbiased analysis because of the lack of prerequisites for introductory courses in the Criminology and
Criminal Justice Department at UTA. Therefore this assumption is predicated upon the notion that introductory courses will include a cross section of all majors, with varying levels of interest. The inclusion of a variety of students allows for generalizability of the collected survey data to other student populations that are not intimately familiar with criminological literature; and it is expected that the majority of students enrolled in the identified survey courses will not be majoring in criminology and criminal justice (i.e. non-majors or undecided). It was important to include non-majors with the current research because of the possible bias which could exist if only criminology and criminal justice majors were selected as survey participants; as would likely be the case if upper-level courses were surveyed. It is not necessarily the absence of students educated in the legal field which is important, but rather the reduction of any undue bias that could be present if the survey group only consists of criminology and criminal justice majors.

The selection of introductory students within the possible range of students was made in order to increase diversity among the survey sample. It is expected that introductory classes have the greatest amount of diversity on a university campus. The University of Texas at Arlington enjoys a racially and culturally diverse campus made up of a variety of ethnicities and nationalities. Further, in so far as it is hoped that the current research results can be generalized to the greater population, introductory courses are expected to capture more students who are in earlier stages of their academic careers. These students are expected to have a reduced knowledge of criminological theories, and it is hoped their answers to research questions will be based on personal observation rather than learned facts. The surveying of undergraduate students at UTA allows for the inclusion of perspectives of this diverse population in order to reduce possible bias. Therefore, surveying introductory course students is likely to include the greatest variety of personal opinions and perspectives.

The identification of introductory criminology and criminal justice courses offered at the University of Texas at Arlington during fall 2011 yielded twelve possible survey classes with a combined possible enrollment of 711 students. Of these twelve courses, three courses were offered as online classes and would not meet on campus together at any one time. The 172
students enrolled in these three online courses were excluded from the research study due to the requirement to obtain their identifying information from the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department for contact for this study, which would have reduced anonymity of participants. The exclusion of these students resulted in identification of nine possible introductory criminology and criminal justice courses with a combined possible enrollment of 539 students. The actual number of student enrolled in these nine introductory courses was 519 at the time the survey was distributed. In accordance with Institutional Review Board (IRB) standards, the professors of these introductory courses were contacted for permission to survey their students as potential research participants. In all nine cases, the presiding professor agreed to allow distribution of the survey instrument during one class period in the month of September 2011. Of the 519 potential survey participants, a total of 302 surveys were returned to this researcher over a two week period. Of the 302 surveys, 7 were blank and represent those students who did not wish to participate in this research. The remaining surveys offered a sample size of 295 students who took part in the study. The survey instrument is available in Appendix A.

The inclusion of 295 respondents represents a fifty-seven percent response rate to the research instrument. Although this percentage represents a high response rate for a survey instrument, the response rate was expected to be closer to one-hundred percent. This high expectation of return was due to the fact that the research instrument was distributed during participants’ scheduled classroom hours with encouragement from their instructor to complete the survey. However, it should be considered that in those cases that a research participant is a criminology or criminal justice major, it should be expected that a student enrolled in one introductory course would likely be enrolled in another. Further, student absences on the day of the survey would also account for the lower number of returned surveys.

3.1.3 Method of Analysis

The survey sample of 295 students (n=295) will be used to analyze students’ perceptions of drug neighborhoods. Unit of analysis was conducted at the individual level, although the
answers of individuals point to a greater social understanding of the key issues discussed in the literature review. Next, the hypotheses for this study are outlined. These hypotheses are analyzed through a series of t-Tests and Pearson’s r tests throughout chapter four. The analysis is followed by discussion of the results in chapter five as the data relates to the relevant hypotheses. Outcomes of this study are expected to be generalizable to other diverse college campuses in the United States. However, caution should be used in interpreting the results from this study because answers provide by research participants are specific to the time and place they were made.

3.2 Research Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that the survey of the research sample will result in the following:

H1: In general, students will agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods.

H2: Respondents who are more concerned with crime (violent, property and narcotic) will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than those respondents who are less concerned with crime.

H3: Caucasians will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than minorities.

H4: Females will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than males.

H5: Older respondents will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than younger respondents.

3.2.1 Conclusion of Methods

The hypotheses outlined in this section represent a broad spectrum of personal characteristics which may effect a person’s perceptions of drug neighborhoods. These research variables (i.e.: students, concern with crime, race, gender, and age) were selected due to their
representation in prior research which points to the impact demographic factors may have on participant’s perceptions. t-Tests and Pearson’s r Tests were selected as the method of analysis due to the ability of these tests to compare the means of one group with the mean of another group, as well as the relationship these variables have with each other. What follows is an outline of these tests and the analysis of the research data.
CHAPTER 4

STATISTICS & ANALYSIS

4.1 University and Survey Demographics

This section details the demographics of the research participants. Demographics are described in terms of the student population at the University of Texas at Arlington and the residential population of the City of Arlington. Demographic variables listed in this section will provide a foundation for understanding respondents’ responses to the survey instrument which will allow for the stratified analysis of perceptions of drug neighborhoods. Both the City of Arlington and the University of Texas at Arlington offer ethnically diverse populations with which to conduct research. According to the university website, the student population included the following: As of the latest update in 2010, there were 32,975 students enrolled at the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA, 2011). Forty-five percent of these students were male and fifty-five percent were female. The mean age of the student population is twenty-seven years of age, with three percent of students being under the age of eighteen and less than one-half of one percent being sixty years of age or older (UTA, 2010). Academic standing is reported to be: sixteen percent freshman, thirteen percent sophomore, seventeen percent junior, twenty-seven percent senior, twenty-one percent master level graduate students and three percent doctoral students (UTA, 2011). Racial breakdowns are reported to be fourteen percent black, less than one half of one percent Native American, forty-four percent white, seventeen percent Hispanic, nine percent Asian, ten percent international students, less than one-quarter of one percent Pacific Islander/Hawaiian, and two percent multicultural (UTA, 2011).

Similarly, the City of Arlington reports on their website to have a total population of 370,450 residents. Of these residents, the median age is thirty-one years old; with twenty-five percent of those residents being under eighteen years of age and six percent of residents being sixty-five years of age or older. Racial demographics are reported to be sixty percent Caucasian,
twelve percent African American sixteen percent Hispanic, half of one percent American Indian, six percent Asian or Pacific Islander, and eleven percent of other or multicultural races (City of Arlington, 2011). These figures show that within the City of Arlington, the University of Texas at Arlington’s campus has a slight over representation of black and Hispanic students. Additionally the combination of Asian and Pacific Islander students is found to be represented twice as often on the UTA campus as within the city or Arlington. These over representations result in an under representation of white students on the UTA campus when compared to their percentage in the Arlington population. Further there is a large disparity between the age of UTA students and Arlington residents both in terms of the mean age and the percentage of students/residents being found at the opposite ends of the age range. Because of these disparities, caution should be taken in generalizing any analysis presented below from the UTA campus to the City of Arlington.

Within the framework of this research, there were six questions posed to respondents in order to understand their various demographic variables. These variables included: gender, age, marital status, race, academic standing, and whether or not the respondent was a criminal justice and criminology major. The collection of the survey data resulted in the following statistics. Fifty-two percent of respondents were male and forty-eight percent were female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean age of respondents was twenty-three years of age with a range of eighteen to sixty-five years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>23.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents primarily reported to be single-never married at eighty-five percent, with ten percent of respondents claiming to be married, three percent divorced, two percent separated, and less than one-half of one percent widowed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnically, thirty-eight percent of respondents were Caucasian, twenty-three percent African American, twenty-eight percent Hispanic, nine percent Asian or Pacific Islander, and three percent being of other or multiple races.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The academic standings of respondents are: four percent freshman, twenty-nine percent sophomores, forty-two percent juniors, twenty-three percent seniors, and one percent non-degree seeking students. There were no graduate students at either the masters or doctoral level as reported by students who submitted to the survey.
Table 5 – Demographic Frequencies (Academic Standing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Standing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree seeking student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 295 respondents, fifty-eight percent were criminology and criminal justice majors, thirty-six percent were not criminology and criminal justice majors, with six percent undecided about their major.

Table 6 – Demographic Frequencies (Criminology/Criminal Justice Major)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminology/Criminal Justice Major</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the demographic breakdown of respondents is unexpected in terms of racial composition and the amount of criminology and criminal justice students captured with this survey instrument. Although unexpected, the fact that minority groups make up the majority of respondents allows for useful analysis of the hypotheses which would not be available in a racially homogeneous city or campus. However, the result that over one-half of respondents were criminology and criminal justice majors is cause for concern because of the possible bias which may be present in students who have been educated in criminological theories. Although it was expected for criminology and criminal justice majors to be included in this data set, fifty-eight percent is a much greater percentage of students in this field of study than anticipated. Therefore caution should be used in interpreting the results from this study to populations without formal education in this field because of different perspectives that result from the accumulation of criminological knowledge. Due to this unexpected reality, additional analysis will be performed in
order to account for any differences among criminal justice and non-criminal justice majors which may affect the outcomes of the hypotheses.

Categorically, the survey instrument is divided into four sections: demographics, knowledge of crime and drug neighborhoods, fear of crime and drug neighborhoods, and finally, perceptions of drug neighborhoods. The analysis that follows will focus primarily on respondents’ perception of drug neighborhoods as it relates to those visual cues outlined in the body of this thesis. In addition, perceptions of drug neighborhoods will be analyzed in terms of its relationship to respondent’s fear of crime. Finally respondents’ demographic variables will be analyzed in order to better understand what effect, if any, those demographics have on respondents’ perception of drug neighborhoods.

4.2 Analysis for First Hypothesis

With respect to the first hypothesis, Social Disorganization Theory and the prior research discussed in the literature review indicate that visual cues of social disorder are instrumental in people’s perceptions of drug neighborhoods. In order to determine whether or not these visual cues also apply to student perceptions of drug neighborhoods, eleven questions were presented to respondents using a five-point Likert scale in order capture which, if any, physical characteristics of social disorder effected these perceptions. Using this Likert Scale, a mean answer less than 3 would indicate that on average respondents agreed with the statement, whereas a mean answer of greater than 3 would indicate that on average respondents disagreed with the statement. The eleven questions posed to respondents asked whether or not they felt neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought or sold were characterized by: dilapidated buildings, abandoned vehicles, excessive graffiti, litter/unkept streets, loitering teenagers, households where children are left unsupervised after school, multi-family housing structures, low-socioeconomic residents, frequent police patrols, under performing public schools, or racial diversity. Table 4.2 displays the results of these eleven variables.
Table 7 – Frequencies of Visual Cues of Social Disorganization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexes, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by low socio-economic residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by frequent police patrols.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by under performing public schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterized by racial diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the eleven variables, it was found that students typically agreed that these visual cues of social disorganization were characteristic of drug neighborhoods in all but one instance. The single variable that respondents did not feel was associated with drug neighborhoods was the variable for abandoned vehicles. Abandoned vehicles yielded a mean response of 3.06, indicating a slight majority of responding students felt that abandoned vehicles were not an indicator of drug neighborhoods. However, within the other ten variables, there was agreement that visual cues were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. The variable which yielded the strongest result was
multi-family housing (mean = 2.36), followed closely by a perception that low-socioeconomic residents were also indicative of drug neighborhoods (mean = 2.38). Additionally, within the ten variables where there was agreement that a variable was characteristic of drug neighborhoods, the weakest agreement was found with the variable for frequent police patrols (mean = 2.86), followed closely by excessive graffiti (mean = 2.85). The combined mean for all 295 respondents to the visual cue variables is 2.682.

It should be noted that of the variables targeting respondent’s perception of drug neighborhoods based upon visual characteristics of those neighborhoods, there were no more than five non-responses to any one variable, with six variables receiving answers from all respondents. A review of the variable concerning dilapidated buildings (which had the most non-responses) showed that in three of the five cases, respondents made a notation on the survey indicating that they did not know the definition of “dilapidated”. In the four other variables which received non-responses, no notes were left by respondents as to why they did not answer these questions. Due to the fact that four or less respondents failed to respond to these final questions, no assumptions are made on the part of this researcher to account for this small number of non-responses.

The findings presented in table 4.2 suggest that students at the University of Texas at Arlington agree with prior research that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods. This conclusion is made from agreement by respondents in ten of the eleven visual cue variables that the variable presented was characteristic of a drug neighborhood. What follows is an analysis of what characteristics of the respondents themselves may have effected their decision to agree or disagree that a proposed visual characteristic was indicative of drug neighborhoods.

### 4.3 Analysis for Second Hypothesis

A Pearson’s r test was performed in order to determine whether or not there is a correlation between student’s concern about crime (property, violent and narcotic) and their
perception of the visual characteristics of drug neighborhoods. For this analysis, the same eleven variables used in the analysis of the first hypothesis are used to account for student perceptions of the visual cues which are characteristic of drug neighborhoods. These eleven variables were analyzed with an additional three variables from the survey instrument which asked respondents to indicate how concerned they were about property, violent, and narcotics crimes in general. Respondents were offered a five point Likert scale as possible answers to these questions. Using this Likert Scale, the lower the mean answer result to each of the concern variables, the more concerned they were with that particular type of crime, with 3 denoting a neutral stance from the respondents. Table 4.3.1 displays the results of the concern variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicate how concerned you are about property crime in general.</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate how concerned you are about violent crimes in general.</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate how concerned you are about narcotics crimes in general.</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3.1 shows that on average respondents felt concerned about each of the three types of crime (property, violent and narcotic). In general, respondents were most concerned with violent crime (Mean = 1.68), followed by property crime (Mean = 2.04), with students being least concerned with narcotics crimes (Mean = 2.22). It was anticipated that students would be most concerned about violent crimes and least concerned with narcotics crimes due to the relative level of victimization that violent crimes pose to students as compared to narcotics crimes. However, the fact that respondents nonetheless did report an average concern about narcotics crimes does lend credibility to the analysis of narcotics crimes as an independent variable from other types of crime. The Pearson r Test results are depicted in Table 4.3.2 as follows.
### Table 9 - Pearson’s R Test Results for Concern and Visual Cues Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Property Crimes</th>
<th>Violent crimes</th>
<th>Narcotics Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.035*</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.035*</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexs, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.008**</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighborhoods where narcotics are
commonly bought and sold are
characterized by under performing public
schools. Pearson Correlation
Sig. (2-tailed) N
.198 .169 .201
.001** .004** .001**
291 291 291

Neighborhoods where narcotics are
commonly bought and sold are
characterized by racial diversity. Pearson Correlation
Sig. (2-tailed) N
.131 .090 .167
.025* .123 .004**
292 292 292

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The completion of a Pearson’s r Test resulted in a variety of significant correlations between respondent’s concern about the three types of crimes and the eleven visual cues of social disorganization which effect respondent’s perceptions of drug neighborhoods. In each of the visual cue variables, there was a significant correlation with at least two of the concern variables; and in all but two of the visual cue variables a significant correlation with all three concern variables existed. All correlations detected by the Pearson’s r Test were determined to be positive within this data set. A positive correlation between the variables in this study means that as students responded that they were less concerned with crime, they were also less likely to agree that physical cues were characteristic of a drug neighborhood. Consequently, the reverse is also true; i.e., as respondents noted a greater concern about crime, they are also more likely to agree that visual cues were characteristic of drug neighborhoods.

The Pearson’s r Test determined a weak positive correlation between the physical cue variable of dilapidated buildings and all three concern variables. The strongest of these correlations was the correlation between dilapidated buildings and narcotics crimes (r = .156). The correlation for dilapidated buildings was significant at the .05 level for both the property and violent crimes variables; where as the correlation between dilapidated buildings and narcotics crimes was significant at the .01 level.

Like the previous variable, the correlation between abandoned vehicles and the concern variables produced all positive weak correlations. The correlation between the abandoned
vehicles variable was found to be significant at the .01 level for all three of the concern variables. Additionally, although still a weak correlation, there was a stronger positive correlation between the abandoned vehicles variable and the concern variables than there were between the dilapidated buildings variable and the concern variables. The strongest of these correlations was found between the variables for abandoned vehicles and property crimes \((r = .252)\).

The third visual cue variable for excessive graffiti continued the pattern of weak positive correlations with all three concern variables. The strongest of these weak correlations was found between excessive graffiti and concern for narcotics crimes \((r = .197)\). However, the strength of the correlation between excessive graffiti and property crimes was a close second \((r = .192)\). These correlations for the excessive graffiti variable were significant at the .01 level for both property crime and narcotics crime concern variables; whereas the correlation between excessive graffiti and violent crime variable was significant at the .05 level.

Litter/unkept streets is arguably the most subjective measure of social disorganization because there are varying degrees of litter and each respondent has to make up their own mind as to how much litter or trash in the streets constitutes a visual cue of social disorganization. Nevertheless, litter/unkept streets as a variable of visual cues of drug neighborhoods was found to be correlated to concern about crime in all three concern variables. Each of these correlations were found to be positive weak relationships which were significant at the .01 level. The strongest of these correlations was the relationship between litter/unkept streets and concern about narcotics crimes.

As a variable of a physical cue of drug neighborhoods, the presence of loitering teenagers was the fifth variable tested for a possible correlation; and was the first variable to not have a correlation with all three concern variables. The Pearson’s \(r\) Test determined there was a significant correlation between the physical cue variable for loitering teenagers and the concern variables for property crime and narcotics crime. However, no correlation was found between this physical cue variable and concern for violent crimes. The correlation between loitering teenagers and the property crimes variable was found to be significant at the .05 level, whereas the
correlation between loitering teenagers and concern about narcotics crimes was significant at the .01 level. Again, each of these correlations was determined to be positive and weak, with the strongest correlation for loitering teenagers found with concern for narcotics crime (r = .182).

The sixth physical cue variable to be tested was the variable for neighborhoods where children are left unsupervised after school. This variable saw a weak positive correlation with all three concern variables that were significant at the .01 level. The strongest correlation within this grouping was the relationship between neighborhoods where children are left unsupervised after school and the concern variable for property crimes (r = .225).

The relationship between neighborhoods with multi-family housing units as a physical cue of drug neighborhoods and the concern variables saw a continuation of weak positive relationships. The strongest correlation was observed between this physical cue variable and concern for narcotics crimes (r = .222). This correlation was significant at the .01 level, as was the correlation between neighborhoods with multi-family housing structures and concern over property crimes. The relationship between the physical cue variable for multi-family housing structures was weakest as it related to concern over violent crime (r = .137). The correlation between multi-family housing structures and concern for violent crime was significant at the .05 level.

An additional visual cue of social disorganization was determined to be neighborhoods characterized by low socio-economic residents. This variable was tested against responses to each of the concern variables and was found to have the strongest correlations out of any of the other visual cue variables. Low socio-economic residents as a visual cue of a drug neighborhood had a correlation of .216 with the property crime concern variable, a correlation of .200 with the violent crime concern variable, and a correlation of .314 with the narcotics crime concern variable. Each of these correlations were significant at the .01 level. The correlation between low socio-economic residents and concern about narcotics crimes offers the only correlation within this data set which is a borderline medium strength relationship. As such, the relationship between these two variables offers the strongest correlation among respondents.
The relationship between the physical cue variable for frequent police patrols and all three concern variables offered additional weak positive correlations. The strongest correlation was found between frequent police patrols and concern about violent crimes ($r = .158$) which was significant at the .01 level. This relationship was followed closely by the correlation between this visual cue variable and concern about property crimes ($r = .156$) which was also significant at the .01 level. The weakest relationship was found between the variable for frequent police patrols and respondent’s concern about narcotics crimes ($r = .129$). However, this weaker relationship was still significant at the .05 level.

Under performing public schools are a sign of social disorganization and was included as a possible visual cue of drug neighborhoods. The Pearson’s R Test determined this variable was positively correlated with each of the concern variables and was significant at the .01 level in each instance. The strongest of these correlations was found between the variable for under performing public schools and concern about narcotics crimes ($r = .201$). The strength of this correlation was followed by a correlation between the visual cue variable and concern for property crimes ($r = .198$), and lastly by the relationship with concern for violent crimes ($r = .169$).

The last visual cue variable to be tested in this data set regarded those neighborhoods with racial diversity. This variable was the other visual cue variable which offered mixed results through the Pearson’s $r$ Test. A correlation was found between racial diversity and concern over property or narcotics crimes, but not with concern for violent crimes. The stronger of these two correlations was the relationship between racial diversity as a characteristic of drug neighborhoods and concern for narcotics crimes ($r = .167$) which was significant at the .01 level. The correlation between racial diversity and property crimes was weaker ($r = .131$), but was still significant at the .05 level.

4.4 Analysis for Third Hypothesis

Hypothesis number three states that Caucasians will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than minorities. In order to
determine this, a series of t-Tests were performed in order to uncover any statistically significant differences in the manner in which Caucasians answered the relevant research questions than minorities. It was the intent of this researcher to recode the race demographic variable into “Caucasian” and “Non-Caucasian”. However, after input of the survey instrument revealed a higher percentage of minority respondents than expected, it is only prudent that a series of t-Tests be performed in order to analyze the responses of Caucasians with that of each individual racial group instead of a single t-Test to compare Caucasians with Non-Caucasians. The possible choices respondents had to choose from on the survey instrument in terms of race were: Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Other. A review of the surveys themselves revealed that the majority of respondents who selected “Other” as their race wrote in two or more ethnic identities, with a small minority of respondents circling this option but leaving the line next to the answer choice blank. Therefore, for analysis of “Other” racial demographic, this variable will designate respondents who are either multicultural or do not claim any of the other races with which they were able to choose from. Individual t-Tests were completed in this manner with one exception. Of the 295 respondents, only one student was a Pacific Islander. Therefore, the answers for this respondent were included as part of the “Asian” t-Test. The tables in this section outline the results of each of the t-Tests as the answers of Caucasian respondents were analyzed against the answers of the four remaining answer choices for the race variable.

Prior to completion of the t-Tests, the mean answers of each race were determined in order to understand that race’s overall view of each of the eleven visual cues of drug neighborhoods. Caucasian respondents, on average, agreed that ten of the eleven visual cue variables were characteristic of drug neighborhoods with mean answers ranging from the strongest agreement with the “multi-family housing structures” variable (mean = 2.39) to the least agreement with the “excessive graffiti” and “frequent police patrols” variables (both means = 2.82). The only visual cue variable that Caucasian respondents felt was not characteristic of drug
neighborhoods was for “abandoned vehicles” (mean = 3.06). The combined mean for all eleven visual cue variables for Caucasian respondents was 2.689.

With African American respondents, there was an overall agreement that the visual cue variables presented in the survey were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. However, this agreement was only found in eight of the eleven variables. Of the eight variables which garnered agreement, the strongest agreement was determined to be for the “multi-family housing structures” variable (mean = 2.44) and the weakest agreement was found for the “under-performing public schools” variable (mean = 2.82). The three physical cue variables which African American respondents on average felt were not characteristic of drug neighborhoods were: “households where children are left unsupervised after school” (mean = 3.00), “excessive graffiti” (mean = 3.01), and “abandoned vehicles” (mean = 3.16). The combined mean for all of the eleven visual cue variables for African American respondents was 2.773.

Table 10 – T-Test for “Caucasian” and “African American” Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Caucasian Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>African American Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>2.76 (0.967)</td>
<td>2.77 (1.020)</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>3.06 (0.956)</td>
<td>3.16 (1.087)</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.020)</td>
<td>3.01 (1.099)</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td>2.73 (1.000)</td>
<td>2.62 (1.093)</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td>2.55 (0.979)</td>
<td>2.69 (1.026)</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td>2.60 (0.966)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.133)</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexes, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).</td>
<td>2.39 (1.020)</td>
<td>2.44 (1.056)</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 - Continued

| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents. | 2.41 (1.003) | 2.60 (1.194) | .204 |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols. | 2.82 (1.011) | 2.70 (1.030) | .350 |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by underperforming public schools. | 2.66 (0.929) | 2.82 (1.108) | .250 |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by racial diversity. | 2.78 (0.957) | 2.69 (0.972) | .434 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Similar to Caucasian respondents, Hispanic respondents felt that the visual cue variables were characteristic of drug neighborhoods in ten of the eleven variables. Of the ten variables which held agreement among Hispanic respondents, the strongest agreement was found to be with the “low socio-economic residents” variable (mean = 2.22) and the weakest agreement with the “frequent police patrols” variable (mean = 2.96). Like Caucasians and African Americans, Hispanic respondents believed that “abandoned vehicles” was not characteristic of drug neighborhoods as calculated by the mean response within this demographic (mean = 3.07). The average combined response for Hispanic respondents was 2.660 for the eleven visual cue variables.

Table 11 – T-Test for “Caucasian” and “Hispanic” Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Caucasian Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>Hispanic Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>2.76 (.967)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.927)</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>3.06 (.956)</td>
<td>3.07 (1.058)</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.020)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.122)</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td>2.73 (1.000)</td>
<td>2.58 (1.082)</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td>2.55 (0.979)</td>
<td>2.72 (1.003)</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Caucasian Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td>2.60 (0.966)</td>
<td>2.56 (1.129)</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexes, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc.).</td>
<td>2.39 (1.020)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.037)</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents.</td>
<td>2.41 (1.003)</td>
<td>2.22 (1.129)</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.011)</td>
<td>2.96 (1.068)</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by under performing public schools.</td>
<td>2.66 (0.929)</td>
<td>2.62 (1.136)</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by racial diversity.</td>
<td>2.78 (0.957)</td>
<td>2.70 (1.136)</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Agreement by demographic group that the visual cue variables presented are characteristic of drug neighborhoods continued when reviewing the means for Asian/Pacific Islander respondents. The greatest amount and strength of support for the visual cue variables was found within this racial group. Asian/Pacific Islander respondents agreed that all eleven variables were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. The strongest agreement was found to be with the “litter/unkept streets” variable (mean = 2.12) and the weakest agreement with the “frequent police patrols” variable (mean = 2.92). The combined mean response to all visual cue variables for Asian/Pacific Islander respondents was 2.425.

Table 12 – T-Test for “Caucasian” and “Asian/Pacific Islander” Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Caucasian Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>2.76 (0.967)</td>
<td>2.42 (0.987)</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>3.06 (0.956)</td>
<td>2.69 (0.982)</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.020)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.898)</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td>2.73 (1.000)</td>
<td>2.12 (0.864)</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td>2.55 (0.979)</td>
<td>2.27 (0.919)</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last set of means for Other races continued the overall agreement that visual cues are characteristic of drug neighborhoods. However, disagreement with three of the visual cues presented to respondents more closely resembled answers from African American respondents than that of Asian/Pacific Islanders. For Other races, there was agreement that eight of the eleven visual cues were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. The strongest agreement was determined to be with the “multi-family housing structures” and “loitering teenagers” variables (both means = 2.25), while the weakest agreement was found with the “dilapidated buildings” variable (mean = 2.88). Those variables which Other races generally did not agree were characteristic of drug neighborhoods were: “abandoned vehicles” (mean = 3.00), “excessive graffiti” (mean = 3.00), and “frequent police patrols” (mean = 3.25). It should be noted that a mean answer of 3.00 for the “abandoned vehicles” and “excessive graffiti” variables signifies that, statistically, Other races were neutral as to whether or not these variables were characteristic of drug neighborhoods, giving neither average agreement nor disagreement for these variables. Therefore the only variable that Other races disagreed was characteristic of drug neighborhoods was “frequent police patrols”. However, like the other racial categories, the combined mean for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12 - Continued</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td>2.60 (0.966)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.941)</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexes, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).</td>
<td>2.39 (1.020)</td>
<td>2.23 (1.070)</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents.</td>
<td>2.41 (1.003)</td>
<td>2.19 (1.096)</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.011)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.055)</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by under performing public schools.</td>
<td>2.66 (0.929)</td>
<td>2.50 (0.860)</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by racial diversity.</td>
<td>2.78 (0.957)</td>
<td>2.58 (0.857)</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
all eleven visual cue variables showed that in general Other races also agreed that the visual
cues presented to respondents were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. The combined
average for all variables within the Other race category was 2.662.

Table 13 – T-Test for “Caucasian” and “Other [Races]” Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Caucasian Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>Other Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>2.76 (0.967)</td>
<td>2.88 (0.835)</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>3.06 (0.956)</td>
<td>3.00 (0.926)</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.020)</td>
<td>3.00 (0.756)</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td>2.73 (1.000)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.061)</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td>2.55 (0.979)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.035)</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td>2.60 (0.966)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.744)</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexs, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).</td>
<td>2.39 (1.020)</td>
<td>2.25 (0.707)</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents.</td>
<td>2.41 (1.003)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.916)</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.011)</td>
<td>3.25 (1.282)</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by under performing public schools.</td>
<td>2.66 (0.929)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.916)</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by racial diversity.</td>
<td>2.78 (0.957)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.744)</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The completion of four t-Tests to analyze any statistically significant differences between
the answers of Caucasian respondents with those of the other races produced a surprisingly few
amount of differences in the manner in which each race identified whether or not a particular
visual cue was characteristic of drug neighborhoods. In fact, in each of the eleven visual cue
variables, no statistically significant differences were found between the answers of Caucasian
respondents and that of Hispanic or Other races. Of the remaining race options (African American and Asian/Pacific Islander), only three statistically significant differences were determined to exist within the entire data set.

The first statistically significant difference was found in the t-Test for Caucasian and African American respondents for the variable “neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school”. Caucasian respondents had a mean answer of 2.60 while African American respondents had a mean answer of 3.00. These means represent that on average Caucasians were more likely to feel that households where children are left unsupervised after school was generally more characteristic of a drug neighborhood, both within their racial group, but also, when compared to the responses of African American respondents. The mean response of 3.00 within African American students represents that, statistically, African American students are neutral as to whether this visual cue variable is characteristic of drug neighborhoods. When these two means were compared, the T-Test revealed that the answers of Caucasian and African American students were statistically significantly different at the .01 level.

The other two significant differences were found within the analysis of the responses for Caucasians and Asian/Pacific Islanders. The first significantly significant difference of this t-Test was for the visual cue variable “excessive graffiti”. Caucasians had a mean answer of 2.82 for this variable, whereas Asian/Pacific Islander respondents had a mean answer of 2.38. These means represent that each ethnic group felt excessive graffiti was characteristic of drug neighborhoods, with Asians/Pacific Islanders more strongly agreeing with this statement than Caucasians. The t-Test found the difference in the strength of these means to be significant at the .05 level. The second statistically significant difference within the T-Test analysis for Caucasian and Asian/Pacific Islander was determined to be for the visual cue variable of “litter/unkept streets”. Like the means for excessive graffiti, both Caucasians and Asians/Pacific Islanders agreed that litter/unkept streets were characteristic of drug neighborhoods, with Asians/Pacific Islanders more strongly agreeing with this statement. The mean answers for
Caucasians and Asians/Pacific Islanders for this visual cue variable were 2.73 and 2.12 respectively. The t-Test determined that Asians/Pacific Islanders were statistically more likely to agree that litter/unkept streets were characteristic of drug neighborhoods than Caucasian respondents, and that this statistically significant difference was significant at the .01 level.

### 4.5 Analysis for Fourth Hypothesis

Similar to the analysis between races, a t-Test was performed in order to determine whether or not there existed a statistically significant difference in the manner in which males and females responded to the relevant research questions regarding visual cues of drug neighborhoods. Table 4.5 below displays the results.

Table 14 – T-Test for “Male” and “Female” Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>Female Means (Std Dev)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>2.72 (0.988)</td>
<td>2.72 (0.948)</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>3.12 (1.047)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.975)</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td>2.90 (1.077)</td>
<td>2.80 (1.040)</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td>2.75 (1.042)</td>
<td>2.46 (1.029)</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td>2.69 (1.053)</td>
<td>2.50 (0.928)</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td>2.68 (1.043)</td>
<td>2.65 (1.079)</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexes, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).</td>
<td>2.39 (1.096)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.956)</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents.</td>
<td>2.39 (1.107)</td>
<td>2.38 (1.086)</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols.</td>
<td>2.80 (1.013)</td>
<td>2.91 (1.072)</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by under performing public schools.</td>
<td>2.71 (1.107)</td>
<td>2.62 (0.931)</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by racial diversity.</td>
<td>2.70 (1.033)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.959)</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
When comparing the mean answers for the eleven visual cue variables, it was found that females more strongly agreed that visual cues were characteristic of drug neighborhoods in eight of the variables, with one variable tied, and two variables receiving more agreement among men than women. The eight variables which received more agreement among females than males were: "abandoned vehicles," "excessive graffiti," "litter/unkept streets," "loitering teenagers," "households where children are left unsupervised after school," "multi-family housing structures," "low socio-economic residents," and "under performing public schools." Of these eight variables, the visual cue which received the greatest agreement among female respondents was "multi-family housing structures" (mean = 2.32) and the variable which received the least amount of agreement was "abandoned vehicles" (mean = 2.99). The physical cue variable which was found to be statistically equal in men and women’s responses was for "dilapidated buildings" (both means = 2.72). The remaining two variables which received greater agreement from men as characteristic of drug neighborhoods than from women were: “frequent police patrols" and “racial diversity.” Of male respondents “racial diversity” received the most agreement as a characteristic of drug neighborhoods with a mean answer of 2.70, than did “frequent police patrols” which had a mean answer of 2.80.

Although the means of ten of the eleven visual cue variables tended to favor one gender over the other, only two of the variables were found to have statistically significant differences among male and female respondents. The first statistically significant difference was for the "litter/unkept streets" variable. Although both men and women both agreed this variable was generally characteristic of drug neighborhoods, women more strongly agreed with this statement than men. The average means for males and females for “litter/unkept streets” variable were 2.75 and 2.46 respectively. These findings were determined to be significant at the .01 level. The second variable which received statistically significant different answers among men and women was for the variable “loitering teenagers.” As with the “litter/unkept streets” variable, “loitering teenagers” received agreement from both men and women as a characteristic of drug neighborhoods with women more strongly agreeing that this variable was characteristic of drug
neighborhoods than men. The mean answers for males and females to the “loitering teenagers” variable were 2.69 and 2.50 respectively. The difference in findings for the “loitering teenagers” variable was found to be significant at the .05 level. On average, both men and women agreed that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods; with women responding in agreement more strongly than men. Males had a combined mean for all eleven visual cue variables of 2.714, while females had a combined mean of 2.645.

4.6 Analysis for Fifth Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that older respondents would more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than would younger respondents. In order to make this determination, a Pearson’s r Test was performed in order to capture whether or not there was a correlation between age and the eleven visual cue variables. Table 4.6 displays the results from this test.

The completion of a Pearson’s r Test between the age of respondents and visual cues which are characteristic of drug neighborhoods resulted in the lack of a correlation within most of the variables. Of the eleven possible correlations, age only had a statistically significant relationship with the variables for “low socio-economic residents” and “racial diversity.” In both instances, the correlations were weak and positive. For this Pearson’s r Test, a positive correlation means that as a respondent’s age increases their belief that a visual cue is characteristic of a drug neighborhood decreases. Consequently, the reverse is also true; i.e., as a respondent’s age decreases, their belief that a visual cue is characteristic of a drug neighborhood increases. Of the correlated variables the stronger of the two relationships was found between age and “racial diversity” (r = .198), which was significant at the .01 level. The weaker of the two correlations was between age and “low socio-economic residents” (r = .124), was significant at the .05 level. In eight of the nine other variables, the relationship found between age and the visual cue variables were positive. However, these positive correlations were so weak that they were not determined to be statistically significant. The only variable which had a negative correlation with
age was “dilapidated buildings” ($r = -.003$), meaning that as age increased so did agreement that this visual cue was characteristic of drug neighborhoods.

Table 15 – Pearson’s R Test Results for Age and Visual Cue Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti.</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets.</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers.</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school.</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexes, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents.</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.036*</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols.</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborships where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by under performing public schools.</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborships where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by racial diversity.</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4.7 Additional Analysis

The analysis found in section 4.6 was expected to be the final analysis of this thesis. However, during the course of analyzing data from respondents it was learned that fifty-eight percent of students surveyed were criminology and criminal justice majors. An additional t-Test was performed in order to account for any possible bias that may be present within criminology and criminal justice students and to determine whether criminology and criminal justice majors had a bearing on how the relevant research questions were answered. In order to accomplish this, any respondent who answered “Undecided” to the research question “Are you a Criminology/Criminal Justice major” had their answer recoded to “No” in order to combine these responses with the answers of respondents who answered that they were not criminology or criminal justice majors. Thereby changing the possible outcomes of this variable to “criminal justice majors” and “non-criminal justice majors”. Table 4.7 outlines the results from this additional test.

Table 16 – T-Test for “Criminal Justice Majors” and “Non-Criminal Justice Majors” Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CJ Majors (Std Dev)</th>
<th>Non-CJ Majors (Std Dev)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by dilapidated buildings.</td>
<td>2.63 (0.901)</td>
<td>2.85 (1.068)</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>2.98 (1.017)</td>
<td>3.22 (1.014)</td>
<td>.018*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 - Continued

| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by excessive graffiti. | 2.69 (1.010) | 3.12 (1.119) | .000** |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by litter/unkept streets. | 2.52 (0.980) | 2.82 (1.136) | .008** |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by loitering teenagers. | 2.52 (0.980) | 2.72 (1.021) | .050* |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by households where children are left unsupervised after school. | 2.62 (1.049) | 2.78 (1.069) | .119 |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexes, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc). | 2.24 (0.931) | 2.56 (1.180) | .007** |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by low socio-economic residents. | 2.21 (1.017) | 2.70 (1.164) | .000** |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by frequent police patrols. | 2.85 (1.090) | 2.89 (0.989) | .702 |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by under performing public schools. | 2.57 (0.987) | 2.90 (1.068) | .002** |
| Neighbors where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by racial diversity. | 2.56 (0.954) | 2.29 (1.030) | .000** |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The completion of this additional t-Test resulted in a finding that in general, criminal justice majors more strongly agreed that visual cues presented to respondents were characteristic of drug neighborhoods than did non-criminal justice majors. This finding was true for ten of the eleven visual cue variables. The only visual cue variable that non-criminology and criminal justice majors more strongly agreed was characteristic of drug neighborhoods than criminology and criminal justice majors was “racial diversity.” Respondents who were criminology and criminal justice majors, on average, agreed that all eleven visual cue variables were characteristic of drug neighborhoods; whereas non-criminology and criminal justice majors felt that the variables for “abandoned vehicles” and “excessive graffiti,” typically, were not characteristic of drug neighborhoods. The combined mean for criminology and criminal justice majors was 2.581, with a mean range from 2.21 for the “low socio-economic residents” variable to 2.98 for the “abandoned vehicles” variable. The combined mean for non-criminology and criminal justice majors was 2.673, with a mean range from 2.48 for the “abandoned vehicles” variable to 3.00 for the “low socio-economic residents” variable.
majors was 2.805, with a mean range from 2.29 for the “racial diversity” variable to 3.22 for the “abandoned vehicles” variable.

A statistically significant difference between how criminology and criminal justice majors answered the relevant research questions from non-criminology and criminal justice majors was found to exist in nine of the eleven visual cue variables. Significant difference were found in the variables for: “dilapidated buildings” (significant at the .05 level), “abandoned vehicles” (significant at the .05 level), “excessive graffiti” (significant at the .01 level), “litter/unkept streets” (significant at the .01 level), “loitering teenagers” (significant at the .05 level), “multi-family housing structures” (significant at the .01 level), “low socio-economic residents” (significant at the .01 level), “under performing public schools” (significant at the .01 level), and “racial diversity” (significant at the .01 level). Of the two remaining visual cue variables where a statistically significant difference was not detected, “households were children are left unsupervised after school” and “frequent police patrols”, non-criminology and criminal justice majors were less likely to agree that these two visual cue variables were characteristic of drug neighborhoods than criminology and criminal justice majors. However, as already stated, these final two differences were not determined to be statistically significant.
CHAPTER 5
DISUSSION & CONCLUSION

5.1 Discussion of Hypotheses

This section will discuss conclusions inferred from the analysis of the research data in terms of each hypothesis. The analysis in Chapter 4 finds that, on average, student respondents from the University of Texas at Arlington agree with prior research that the visual cues presented to them are characteristic of drug neighborhoods. But to make this generalization does not necessarily capture the complete story told by the analysis of this study. Therefore, what follows is a discussion of the proof or disproof of each hypothesis by this data set.

The first hypothesis, “In general, students will agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods”, is confirmed based upon the data. Prior research outlined in Chapter 2 had shown an overwhelming agreement that visual cues of social disorganization lead people to associate those cues with drug neighborhoods. The results, as calculated by the mean answers for student respondents, to these research variables confirmed the first hypothesis by finding that on average students did agree that visual cues of social disorganization were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. Specifically, agreement was found in ten of the eleven visual cue variables with the only disagreement resulting for the “abandoned vehicles” variable. The exclusion of “abandoned vehicles” as being characteristic of drug neighborhoods may be a result of the location of the UTA campus. The University of Texas at Arlington is located within the city of Arlington, Texas, and although urban, presents more of a suburban style of living, as there is no agreed upon downtown area. Therefore, it may not be uncommon for UTA students to see an abandoned vehicle on the side of the road which has broken down. But this disagreeing result would seemingly contradict the study conducted by Philip Zimbardo in 1969 which used the destruction of abandoned vehicles to help form the foundation of the Broken Windows Model of crime. However, in so far as students agreed that
the other ten visual cue variables were characteristic of drug neighborhoods, and a combined average mean which confirmed general agreement with all visual cues, it can be said that hypothesis number one is confirmed. On average students within this data set agree with those conclusions made by Dansie and Fargo (2009), that visual cues of social disorder are characteristic of drug neighborhoods.

Although general agreement with prior research studies was found to exist among UTA students, further hypotheses were formed in order to test what segments of respondents were most likely to agree that visual cues of social disorder were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. Therefore the second hypothesis was developed as: “Respondents who are more concerned with crime (violent, property, and narcotic) will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than those respondents who are less concerned with crime.” This hypothesis was analyzed through the use of a Pearson’s R Test in order to determine whether a respondent’s concern about property, violent, or narcotics crimes correlated with whether or not they agreed that visual cues of social disorganization were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. It can be stated that among the survey group, concern with crime correlated with agreement of visual cues as indicators of drug neighborhoods. This statement is made because relationships were found to exist between each visual cue variable and at least two of the concern variables. In fact, within this analysis, the only variables which did not produce a correlation occurred for the violent crimes concern variable and the two visual cue variables of “loitering teenagers” and “racial diversity”. Perhaps because the University of Texas at Arlington student population is decisively younger and more racially diverse than the city of Arlington with which it resides, it may be that the age and diversity of the student population feels that these two visual cue variables do not apply to their characterization of drug neighborhoods as it relates to concern for violent crimes. However, for these two visual cue variables, respondents still correlated the presence of loitering teenagers and racial diversity with property and narcotics crimes. Therefore, UTA students still correlate all visual cues presented to them with either property or narcotics crimes. In so far as a positive correlation was found to exist
among thirty-one of the possible thirty-three correlations (eleven visual cue variables by three concern variables), it can be said that hypothesis number two is true. Respondents who are more concerned with property, violent, or narcotics crimes are more likely to agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods, especially as it relates to concern about property or narcotics crimes.

The third hypothesis is stated as: “Caucasians will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than minorities”; and provided the most intriguing analysis within this research study. It was hypothesized that Caucasians would be most likely to agree that visual cues of social disorganization were characteristic of drug neighborhoods because of prior researchers including “racial diversity” as one of these visual cues. If prior research identifies racial diversity is a visual cue of social disorganization, then racial homogeneity should represent the opposite. Criminology bookshelves are littered with articles and books dedicated to fear about minority crimes. So it should be no surprise to suggest the majority group of the United States is more sensitive to visual cues of crime than minority groups. What was found was that, on average, all responding demographic groups agreed that visual cues where characteristic of drug neighborhoods when controlling for race. Even more interesting was the finding that of all visual cue variables, there were only three variables where the mean answers from each racial group provided statistically significant different answers from Caucasian respondents. By this it is meant that of the forty-four possible opportunities for each racial demographic to have a statistically significant difference in the manner in which they answered the relevant research questions, differences were only detected in three of these opportunities. Therefore, race did not have a statistical impact on the way respondents answered the relevant research questions in the majority of cases. However, in order to provide a general answer to hypothesis number three as to whether or not Caucasians were the most likely race to agree that visual cues of social disorganization were characteristic of drug neighborhoods, the average mean to all eleven visual cue variables were calculated for each race separately. The results in order from least agreement to most agreement are as follows: African American =
2.773, Caucasian = 2.689, Other = 2.662, Hispanic = 2.660, and Asian/Pacific Islander = 2.425.

A review of these combined means show that the category for Asians/Pacific Islanders produced the greatest average agreement in identifying visual cues as characteristic of drug neighborhoods. Asian/Pacific Islanders were followed by Hispanics with the second most agreement, then Other races (or multi-cultural), Caucasians, and lastly by African American respondents who showed the least agreement with the visual cues presented by the survey instrument. Again, it is important to note that each racial demographic had an average agreement that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods. But Asian and Pacific Islander students were found to be most sensitive to these visual cues, as determined by their average mean, rather than Caucasians, within the survey sample; thereby disproving the third hypothesis.

Given that prior research within the field of criminology includes racial diversity as a visual cue of social disorder, it is not surprising that African American respondents were found to be least likely to agree that the visual cues presented through the survey instrument were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. But what is surprising was that Caucasians were not the most sensitive to these visual cues. In fact, Caucasian respondents were only slightly more sensitive to visual cues as being characteristic of drug neighborhoods than African Americans. What is interesting about these results is that the majority of sociological and criminological references contained in this thesis regularly discuss the differences among the races when it comes to crime. What this study shows is that we may not be as different from one another as history would have us believe. However, caution should be taken when interpreting the results from this study because the lack of a statistically significant difference in answers does not mean that each race had the same answer; rather that the differences among answers from one race to another were not statistically different. Further, in the Other (or multi-cultural) racial category, the survey results only produced eight respondents who selected this demographic choice from the other possible choices. Therefore, additional caution should be exercised in attempting to generalize answers from Other race groups to the UTA student population or any other
population. Finally, UTA has a student population with an average age of 27, nearly four years younger than the general population of Arlington, Texas. It is likely that UTA attracts like-minded students, who may develop similar ideas about politics, crime, and culture as students interact with each other in this micro-community. Therefore, similarities in the manner in which UTA students answered questions in the survey instrument may represent their similar stances on issues as students, rather than as ethnically independent people. Further research is needed to determine whether or not similarities exist among students of a variety of homogeneous or heterogeneous campuses.

The fourth and fifth hypotheses of: “Females will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than males”, and “Older respondents will more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods than younger respondents”, were made based upon the large body of research in the area of perspectives of crime which indicate that women and the elderly tend to be more fearful of crime than other segments of the population (Cops & Pleysier, 2011; Cossman & Rader, 2011; Powell & Wahidin, 2008; Sutton et al., 2011). Dansie and Fargo’s (2009) secondary analysis of the 1998 study Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety in 12 Cities, concluded that the greater a person’s fear of victimization, the more likely they were to allow their perspectives of crime to be influenced by visual cues of social disorder. Therefore, the fourth and fifth hypotheses were analyzed in order to determine if gender and/or age had an effect on students’ perceptions that visual cues are characteristic of drug neighborhoods.

In terms of gender, the analysis of the research data showed that for a majority of visual cues, women more strongly agreed that the cues presented to them were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. Men had a combined mean for all eleven visual cue variables of 2.714 and women had a combined mean of 2.645. These means confirm a stronger agreement by women than by men. However, within this data set, not all variables garnered more agreement from women than from men. The three cues which were not found to receive greater agreement from
females than from males was for the variables: “dilapidated buildings”, “frequent police patrols”, and “under performing public schools”. Of the eight visual cues which did receive stronger agreement from women than from men, only two variables (“litter/unkept” streets and “loitering teenagers”) were found to have statistically significant more agreement from women. Although somewhat mixed in the results, it may be generally stated that women more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods, even though these results lack consistent statistical significance.

Rachel King’s (2009) research on perceptions of crime of female university students was examined in order to make sense of these seemingly mixed gender findings. In the article Women’s Fear of Crime on University Campuses: New Directions?, King (2009) analyzes the effect of various police responses to crime as it relates to corresponding feelings of safety on campus among female students. What was found was that campus police departments often employ reactive police strategies in their investigation of on-campus crimes against female students (King, 2009). Although this strategy often results in the arrest of a perpetrator, this reactive style of policing does little to make women feel safer on campus (King, 2009). What King (2009) suggests, is that the use of community-oriented policing strategies, which involve community outreach and proactive responses to crime, have a greater impact on both on-campus crime and feelings of safety among female students. The idea that proactive police strategies affect female student’s perceptions of crime and safety may explain why female respondents within the current research study were less likely to feel dilapidated buildings, frequent police patrols, and under performing public schools were indicative of drug neighborhoods, while litter/unkept streets and loitering teenagers were more characteristic of drug neighborhoods. Responses to dilapidated buildings, under-performing schools, or addressing crime through more frequent police patrols, represent reactive strategies to problems which have already occurred. In this manner, a reaction to these visual cues of social disorganization have little impact on the way females perceive the neighborhood, just as women in Rachel King’s (2009) study experienced little change in their perception of crime from on-campus reactive police responses. However,
litter or unkept streets and loitering teenagers may signal to female respondents that something is about to happen, which makes them more aware of a problem. Although perhaps a loose connection, women’s sensitivity to what they perceive as an after effect of social disorganization, versus a pending cue of social disorganization, may give perspective on the results from this study. However, additional research is recommended in order to determine if women are truly more sensitive to visual cues of social disorganization than men as these cues relate to the perception of drug neighborhoods as suggested by this research, and whether or not the type of social disorganization affects women differently than other demographic groups.

The analysis of age and visual cue variables was different, although more simple in nature, than the analysis of many of the other demographic variables within this study. A Pearson’s r Test was able to capture within a few statistics whether or not there is a correlation between age and the use of visual cues as indicators of drug neighborhoods. A correlation between age and visual cue variables were found to exist only for “low socio-economic residents” and “racial diversity”. These two correlations presented weak positive relationships which mean that as age increased, it decreased the perception that “low socio-economic residents” or “racial diversity” were characteristic of drug neighborhoods. Further, no correlation was found to exist between age and the nine remaining visual cue variables presented to respondents. Prior research indicates that economic status and racial makeup of a neighborhood impacts perceptions that a specific neighborhood is involved in the drug trade. However, it would seem that as respondents age, they are less likely to feel visual cues are characteristic of drug neighborhoods. This may be, as I have suggested in this thesis, that older respondents – through their life experiences – have come to understand that visual cues of social disorganization are not necessarily characteristic of a drug neighborhood. In so far as there was disagreement within the variables for “low socio-economic residents” and “racial diversity”, it may be that life experiences have taught older respondents that economics and race have nothing to do with a person’s likelihood of being involved with narcotics. Therefore, it can be said that within this survey
sample, older respondents did not more strongly agree that visual cues of social disorganization were characteristic of drug neighborhoods than younger respondents.

In Chapter 2, it is reported that Sun and Triplett (2008) conclude from their 1996 study in Indianapolis, Indiana (Project on Policing Neighborhoods) that police officers reported a higher perception of crime than local residents due to an overexposure to crime through the course of their employment, or, a possible need to overemphasize the importance of social disorder issues to justify that employment. Although these researchers make compelling, and interesting, arguments it was not the intent of this research project to study the impact of knowledge of the criminal justice system on the perception of visual cues of drug neighborhoods. However, upon discovering that over fifty-percent of respondents to the current research project were criminology and criminal justice majors at the University of Texas at Arlington, it became prudent to include analysis of this category of respondents in order to determine whether or not Sun and Triplett’s (2008) findings were applicable to a student population. What was found was that in all but one case, being a criminal justice major resulted in stronger agreement among students that a particular visual cue was characteristic of drug neighborhoods. Additionally, of the eleven visual cue variables, nine of the differences detected between criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors were found to be statistically significant. The only visual cue that received less agreement from criminal justice majors as being characteristic of drug neighborhoods was the variable for “racial diversity”. In this instance “racial diversity” was shown to decrease agreement that a neighborhood is involved in the drug trade. This tendency to down grade the impact of racial diversity as a visual cue of social disorganization may be due to courses at UTA within the Criminology Department which are dedicated to race and crime issues. Therefore, students who have received instruction on these principals may be reluctant to include race as a possible characteristic of drug neighborhoods than students who have no knowledge of race and crime topics. However, it can be generally stated that within this survey group, students who are criminology and criminal justice majors tend to more greatly emphasize the impact of visual cues as indicators of drug neighborhoods just as Sun and Triplett concluded in their 2008 article, due
to agreement being found in ten of the eleven visual cue variables. Because of this, additional caution should be exercised in making generalizations from the proof or disproof of the hypotheses contained within this research project as correlations between some variables may be due to a respondent’s knowledge of the criminal justice system, rather than their individual perceptions as a student within the UTA population.

5.2 Conclusion

In the beginning of this thesis several questions were posed which served as the basis for a desire to complete research on perceptions of drug neighborhoods. These questions revolved around an attempt to understand why we as residents of cities know exactly where the drug neighborhoods in our communities are located even if we have never been there before. Prior research and results from the current study indicate at least one answer to this central question is – that we as members of a community pick up on visual cues which we believe to be characteristic of neighborhoods involved in the drug trade. With the current research project confirming that visual cues of drug neighborhoods are relevant to student respondents, as these cues were to other previously studied populations, then the real question becomes: what is it about visual cues of social disorganization that cause us to perceive these seemingly irrelevant observations as being characteristic of the narcotics trade? Simply it can be said that we are biased. But more specifically, we are class-ist. To be an American is to value the American Dream. Pulling oneself up by the proverbial bootstraps is not only promoted by the capitalist society we live in, but it is celebrated once achieved. Therefore, the reverse is also true: those who are unwilling, or unable, to live the American Dream are viewed as rejecting this societal ideal. Therefore it is not necessarily that we as Americans believe visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods, but rather that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of all crimes.

Park and Burgess established a model for understanding the development of criminal neighborhoods through their urbanization effect. This model was then used by Shaw and McKay
as the foundation for understanding crime as they outlined Social Disorganization Theory. Therefore it should be expected that not only does social disorganization lead to crime, but also, that the perception of social disorganization is indicative of criminal neighborhoods. When we as residents make observations of social disorganization (such as: litter, dilapidated buildings, low socio-economic residents, etc) we classify that disorganization as being characteristic of neighborhoods where the only way to survive is to become involved in crime. Unfortunately this bias does not leave room for the casual observer to consider that many residents within a disorganized neighborhood are transitionally attached to that area, such as those residents who have recently immigrated to the city (as discussed by Park and Burgess in their model of urbanization). When it comes to crime, we ultimately think of the stereotypical disorganized inner-city neighborhood with its low income housing, littered streets, and teenagers loitering on every street corner. Therefore, when we see visual cues that are indicative of that characterization, we equate one with the other. These observations are often made unconsciously without us even noticing; whether from watching the news, driving past a neighborhood on the highway, or listening to personal accounts of “bad neighborhoods” from friends. But no matter where these observations come from, once they are made, visual cues of social disorganization will likely lead us to believe a neighborhood is criminal in nature. It is our biases that take over at this point and give the perception that a disorganized neighborhood is involved in crime. Unfortunately these biases are often based on wide spread fear of a prevailing criminal problem which is regularly discussed within a community or reported in the news during a given time period.

Ted Chiricos wrote the article The Media, Moral Panics, and the Politics of Crime Control in an effort to describe society’s “moral panic”. Moral panic is a term coined by Stanley Cohen which refers to how “the public becomes almost hysterical over some perceived threat to societal values and interests.” (Chiricos, 2004, p.41). In his article, Chiricos (2004) focuses on the two moral panics of crack cocaine in the 1980’s and youth violence of the 1990’s. What is most interesting about these moral panics is that the subsequent hysteria that occurred, took place
after these two problems were already in decline (Chiricos, 2004). Yet fears about crack cocaine and youth violence spurred a demand for action that resulted in a 372 percent increase in drug related incarcerations during the 1980’s and doubling of the United State’s prison population (Chiricos, 2004). Chiricos (2004) blames sensationalization of drug and violence topics by the media and the political ambitions of presidential advisors during this time period who refused to allow another network or party to “scoop” their reaction to public outcry. Although the media and politicians have the ability to promote crime related issues, it is ultimately us as citizens who have demanded strict crime prevention policies. Chiricos (2004) concludes that the public demands policy makers to take action in those circumstances where: 1) there is fear and perception that behaviors of society which are thought of as being characteristic of urban ghettos are spreading to middle America and 2) that the perpetrators of these crimes are increasingly involving our children. Ultimately it is not the underlining crime which causes moral panic which society fears, but rather that those crimes which we feel are reserved for specific segments of the population are spreading to the majority. What moral panics fail to allow us to see is that crime, particularly narcotics crime, is found all around us. If we rely solely on observations of social disorganization, we fail to consider that crime has already spread around the United States and that it has been decades, if ever, since drug markets were localized in urban ghettos. The current research study determined that a relationship existed between student’s fear of crime and their agreement that visual cues of social disorganization are characteristic of drug neighborhoods. What Ted Chiricos (2004) offers is that society too often allows the emotions connected with these fears to influence our perceptions. Without acknowledging the rampant nature of crime, aside from prevailing panics, we will fail to focus our votes on crime prevention policies which will address the totality of the crime problem.
APPENDIX A

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF DRUG NEIGHBORHOODS SURVEY 2011
Dear Participant,

As a student enrolled in a criminology/criminal justice course at the University of Texas at Arlington, you have been selected to participate in a research study focusing on perceptions of drug neighborhoods. For this study, “drug neighborhood” is being defined as any geographical area where narcotics are illegally bought, sold, or otherwise trafficked. Your perceptions as a student and as a member of the city of Arlington community are important to professionals in the criminal justice system and will aid in understanding what policies may need to be developed in order to adequately address narcotics crimes.

For your information, this research is part of a graduate thesis project and is not connected to your course objectives. Your involvement in this study is voluntary and the decision to participate in this survey will have no bearing on the grade received in your current class. If you chose to participate in this survey, no identifying information will be solicited (other than basic demographics); I can assure you that all survey results will be kept anonymous.

Please take a few moments to answer the questions in this survey and then return the questionnaire to the researcher present in your class today. This survey is not expected to take longer than five minutes to complete. If you do not wish to participate in this study, please return your survey to the researcher when the surveys are collected from the class. If you have completed this survey in another class, please DO NOT complete a second survey. I appreciate your time and willingness to help me in this research.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Thompson
Graduate Student/Researcher
University of Texas at Arlington
Student Perceptions of Drug Neighborhoods Survey 011
Researcher: Jeremy Thompson (University of Texas at Arlington)

Below you will be asked questions relating to your knowledge and perceptions of drug neighborhoods in and around the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex. For this study, “drug neighborhood” is being defined as any geographical area where narcotics are illegally bought, sold, or otherwise trafficked. Please answer each question by circling only one answer for each question. These questions are being asked anonymously for research purposes. Your answers will not be shared as individual surveys, but rather, will be included with other data as part of a final thesis.

1. What is your academic standing?
   a. Freshman  
   b. Sophomore  
   c. Junior  
   d. Senior  
   e. Non-degree seeking student  
   f. None of the Above

2. Are you a Criminology/Criminal Justice major?
   a. Yes  
   b. No  
   c. Undecided

3. What is your gender?
   a. Male  
   b. Female

4. What is your race?
   a. Caucasian  
   b. African American  
   c. Hispanic  
   d. Asian  
   e. Pacific Islander  
   f. Other __________

5. What is your age?_____________

6. What is your marital status?
   a. Single (never married)  
   b. Married  
   c. Divorced  
   d. Separated  
   e. Widowed

7. How long have you lived in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex (include time in on-campus housing)?
   a. Less than 1 year  
   b. 1-2 years  
   c. 2-3 years  
   d. 3-5 Years  
   e. 5-10 years  
   f. Over 10 years

8. Indicate how concerned you are about property crimes in general.
   a. Very Concerned  
   b. Somewhat Concerned  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Not Concerned  
   e. Not at all Concerned

9. Indicate how concerned you are about violent crimes in general.
   a. Very Concerned  
   b. Somewhat Concerned  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Not Concerned  
   e. Not at all Concerned
10. Indicate how concerned you are about narcotics crimes in general.
   a. Very Concerned   d. Not Concerned
   b. Somewhat Concerned   e. Not at all Concerned
   c. Neutral

11. Which source do you get most of your information about narcotics crimes (Please only choose one):
   a. Local Television News   e. Internet
   b. National Television News   f. Conversations with other students
   c. Campus Newsletter   g. Conversations with parents/relatives
   d. City-wide Newspaper   h. Conversations with UTA faculty

12. Do you ever specifically seek out information about narcotics crimes through media outlets?
   a. Yes
   b. No

13. While living in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex, have you ever witnessed a narcotics transaction?
   a. Yes
   b. No

14. While living in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex, do you know someone who witnessed a narcotics transaction?
   a. Yes
   b. No

15. While living in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex, have you ever called the police to report a narcotics crime?
   a. Yes (Continue)
   b. No (Skip to #17)

16. If you have reported a narcotics crime to the Police Department, how seriously do you feel your report was taken by the police?
   a. Very Seriously   d. Not Seriously
   b. Somewhat Seriously   e. Not at all Seriously
   c. Neutral

17. How accurate do you feel the media is in identifying drug neighborhoods?
   a. Very Accurate   d. Not Accurate
   b. Somewhat Accurate   e. Not at all Accurate
   c. Neutral

18. How accurate do you feel other people's observations (friends/family/acquaintances) are in identifying drug neighborhoods?
   a. Very Accurate   d. Not Accurate
   b. Somewhat Accurate   e. Not at all Accurate
   c. Neutral

19. How accurate do you feel your own observations are in identifying drug neighborhoods?
   a. Very Accurate   d. Not Accurate
   b. Somewhat Accurate   e. Not at all Accurate
   c. Neutral
20. Drug use is most common among which race/ethnicity?
   a. Caucasians   d. Hispanics
   b. African Americans   e. Asians
   c. Pacific Islanders   f. Other_________

For the next section, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

21. As a general rule, I feel safe from narcotics crimes on the University of Texas at Arlington campus.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

22. As a general rule, I feel safe from narcotics crimes in the city of Arlington.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

23. As a general rule, I feel safe from narcotics crimes in the city of Fort Worth.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

24. As a general rule, I feel safe from narcotics crimes in the city of Dallas.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

25. As a general rule, I feel safe from narcotics crimes during daylight hours.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

26. As a general rule, I feel safe from narcotics crimes at night.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

27. There are certain places within the city of Arlington that I would not feel safe from narcotics crimes during daylight hours.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

28. There are certain places within the city of Arlington that I would not feel safe from narcotics crimes at night.
   a. Agree Strongly   d. Disagree
   b. Agree   e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral
29. There are certain places on the University of Texas at Arlington campus that I would not feel safe from narcotics crimes during daylight hours.
   a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
   b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

30. There are certain places on the University of Texas at Arlington campus that I would not feel safe from narcotics crimes at night.
   a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
   b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

31. I feel narcotic crimes are on the rise in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex.
   a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
   b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

32. I feel narcotic crimes are on the rise at the University of Texas at Arlington.
   a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
   b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
   c. Neutral

33. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by *dilapidated buildings*.
    a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
    b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
    c. Neutral

34. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by *abandoned vehicles*.
    a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
    b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
    c. Neutral

35. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by *excessive graffiti*.
    a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
    b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
    c. Neutral

36. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by *litter/unkept streets*.
    a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
    b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
    c. Neutral

37. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by *loitering teenagers*.
    a. Agree Strongly  d. Disagree
    b. Agree  e. Disagree Strongly
    c. Neutral
38. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by **households where children are left unsupervised after school.**
   a. Agree Strongly  
   b. Agree  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Disagree  
   e. Disagree Strongly

39. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by **multi-family housing structures (such as quadroplexs, apartment complexes, housing projects, etc).**
   a. Agree Strongly  
   b. Agree  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Disagree  
   e. Disagree Strongly

40. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by **low socio-economic residents.**
   a. Agree Strongly  
   b. Agree  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Disagree  
   e. Disagree Strongly

41. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by **frequent police patrols.**
   a. Agree Strongly  
   b. Agree  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Disagree  
   e. Disagree Strongly

42. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by **under performing public schools.**
   a. Agree Strongly  
   b. Agree  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Disagree  
   e. Disagree Strongly

43. Neighborhoods where narcotics are commonly bought and sold are characterized by **racial diversity.**
   a. Agree Strongly  
   b. Agree  
   c. Neutral  
   d. Disagree  
   e. Disagree Strongly

Thank you for completing this survey. At this time, whether you completed the survey or not, please return your survey to the researcher at the front of the classroom. Once again let me assure you that all answers and surveys are kept strictly anonymous and will only be included as part of the previously mentioned thesis project. If you can think of anything which would have made this survey easier to understand or easier to take part in, please use the following lines to share your thoughts:

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
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