

success and achievement which were nowhere as evident as their continuing personal failures. Both adolescent and adult users had major problems with intimacy; many were without spouses and children by age 30. Divorce, separation, and conflict were common among the married.

A comparison of the interviews and questionnaires with the psychological tests was illuminating. The interviews and questionnaires provided accurate measures of how individuals presented themselves and how they perceived their behavior and feelings. But these somewhat glorified perspectives contrasted sharply with the psychological tests and subsequent in-depth interviews which uncovered a variety of hidden difficulties. The MMPI located denial of problems and the need of the subjects to present themselves in the most favorable light. The Rorschach revealed intimacy problems, damaged self-images, and other problems.

Overall, this book succeeds in providing rich descriptive material about daily marijuana users and how they perceive their use of this drug. It also provides equally clear findings about how marijuana helps mask major problems in their lives. On other grounds, however, the book is less satisfactory. The author's review of the rich marijuana literature is weak and dated. A comparison with the contemporary survey research findings by Kandel and Clayton and others would have revealed what proportion of marijuana users and drug users may be represented by these subjects. A comparison of these marijuana users with the case studies of cocaine users and daily marijuana (but polydrug) users would have provided important comparisons and more insightful analyses about the specific role of marijuana in the lives of troubled persons.

The utility of these findings for criminal justice is less clear. Virtually all the subjects recruited for the study probably have no or little (and probably old) prior arrest records. Nevertheless, the book can be read quickly for its major findings and for insight about the lives of typical daily marijuana users in middle-class America.

Bruce D. Johnson
New York State Division of Substance
Abuse Services, Narcotic and Drug
Research, Inc.,
and John Jay College of Criminal Justice

**Crime, Fear, and the New York City Subways: The Role of
Citizen Action**

By *Dennis J. Kenney*
New York: Praeger Publishing, 1986
Pp. xi, 136

Crime, Fear, and the New York City Subways, by Dennis J. Kenney, is a valuable contribution to the growing

literature on citizen responses to crime and fear. Traditionally, most of the research on this topic has focused on debilitating, individual reactions to victimization. In more recent years, theorists and researchers have shifted the focus to more constructive responses to the threat of street crime. Thus, the widest attention to this book will likely be given by those interested in the Guardian Angels as a model for community crime prevention (CCP).

Despite all of the scientific, political, and popular media concern with CCP, the only real consensus that has emerged is that there *is* no consensus on CCP and that more and better research is needed. There is little agreement even on what types of organizations and activities should be included under its rubric. "Block watch," civilian patrols, community-oriented policing, home and business security surveys, and property engraving may be the most familiar examples, but they represent only the narrowest and most reactionary approach to CCP. Given the limited success of this target hardening approach, some of us have begun to assume both a broader and a more fundamental perspective on crime prevention. This alternative perspective not only looks at ways to reduce crime opportunities but also addresses some of the root causes of crime and fear in the context of other social, economic, and environmental problems and so includes the efforts of a wide variety of community development organizations. Although the "citizen action" in the subtitle of the present book might suggest that the author adopts the latter, community development perspective, his focus remains squarely within the vigilante tradition of the former.

Whether new or old, innovative or traditional, there are several things that virtually all CCP strategies have shared. Sometimes they focus more on the crime prevention activities of police or local merchants than on resident behaviors, but CCP advocates and critics have inevitably defined the community as the residential neighborhood. This is obviously not the only place in which crime occurs, and Kenney's greatest contribution may be in helping to widen the purview of CCP to include other, nontraditional contexts. There has been research on crime in shopping areas and all forms of public transportation, for example, but almost none that has focused on citizens' collective role in crime control outside their own neighborhoods.

Another commonality is that each CCP strategy has been highly touted at one time or another, yet few have been evaluated with sufficient analytic or methodological rigor. For no organization has the publicity been more intense than for the Guardian Angels, who have played host and protector to subway riders and pedestrians in high-crime neighborhoods. Like the other forms of CCP, the Guardian Angels have been rumored to be an effective deterrent to crime. Such unsubstantiated good public relations may have been the reason that the Angel leadership had shunned all previous inquiries toward conducting an independent

evaluation. The mere fact that Kenney was able to look beyond the headlines and personalities involved and objectively evaluate the effectiveness of civilian subway patrol was itself something of a coup.

Kenney's literature review on citizen involvement in law enforcement is interesting and well written as far as it goes, which unfortunately is not far enough. It covers fairly well the history of the Guardian Angels and of American vigilantism generally. But much of the abundant literature on CCP programs around the country and abroad is completely ignored. To be fair, however, some of the best evaluations may be too recent for Kenney to have included them.

Following two informative chapters on officially reported crime, social incivilities (disorderly conduct), fear, and protective behavior in the project area and throughout the New York City Subway, Kenney reports on the impact of the Guardian Angels. Rider estimates of the impact of patrols on reducing crime and fear and the Angels' overall approval ratings were quite high even though awareness of patrols was relatively low. In terms of experimental effects, varying the actual level of patrols had little or no impact on crime, incivilities, fear, perceived efficacy of patrols, or perceived likelihood of bystander intervention during the commission of a crime.

Some or all of these noneffects may have been due to methodological limitations of the study, however, such as the low base rate of officially reported crime. Another admitted weakness is that, despite their best efforts, the research team was unable to obtain any independent verification or even any self-monitoring of the independent variable (patrol levels and timing). Indeed, Kenney cites anecdotal evidence that the quasi-experimental conditions may have been routinely ignored, with Angels entering trains and stations when they were not supposed to. It is not surprising that the maverick nature of the Angels, like any self-help group, would exacerbate the usual vicissitudes of field research. This is especially troubling since the experimental design of this study, in which patrolling was removed and later resumed at a higher level, was less than ideal to begin with. For example, there is no way of knowing whether or not patrol levels at control sites, which were supposed to continue routinely, were contaminated by patrol variation at test sites. Nor can we be sure what relevance stopping and restarting a patrol in part of a system has for a whole system that has never had a civilian patrol. (Only a true experiment could answer that.)

Other design issues include the apparent use of different respondents in each wave of interviews and the one-month timing of each of the various experimental phases. A true panel design (reinterviewing the same respondents) may have been impossible under the circumstances, but the implications deserve some discussion. Regarding the time lag, it may have been sufficient for daily commuters to notice and

respond to patrol changes, but less frequent riders might not notice the patrol stoppage at all or, worse, might not react to it until after patrolling had actually resumed.

With regard to the questionnaire itself, Kenney did well to adapt the fear-related items from the Hartford Neighborhood Crime Prevention Study. But he mistakenly equates "worry" about being victimized with dealing "directly with fear" (p. 60). My own research with Ralph Taylor suggests a clear difference between worry, which is more of a cognitive concern over crime, and the emotional reaction of fear, which is better measured with the phrase, "How safe do you feel . . . ?"

Kenney briefly justifies the choice of New York City as the setting for the study. Despite New York's uniqueness, this choice is certainly not a fatal one, as some might argue. Still, the issue of external validity, or generalizability to other situations and settings, does not receive the discussion it deserves.

The concluding chapter does an excellent job of applying some of the historical lessons of vigilantism to present-day civilian control over subway crime. In particular, Kenney cautions that several important conditions of appropriate and effective vigilante action in the past are no longer present, despite what news accounts would have us believe. According to R. M. Brown, these conditions include very high rates of lawlessness combined with unqualified support for vigilante action and the almost total absence of official law enforcement.

The present study notes support for the Guardian Angels but finds that it seems to be based more on media hype or rumored success than on actual experience. There are at least two problems with this kind of support. First, if the Angels really do make subway riders feel safer without making them actually safer, riders may unwisely let their guard down. This is the same charge that has been leveled against other forms of community crime prevention. But it may be even more important in the context of subway crime, given that riders are generally both more vulnerable and more anonymous than in their own neighborhoods.

The other concern with poorly substantiated support for the Angels, or for any other program, is, of course, that if people believe that current efforts are effective they will be less inclined to try to improve those limiting their own presence. Riders may not put the pressure they should on the city for better protection. And Angel members themselves will mistakenly believe that they must be doing the right thing in the right place at the right time. Although Kenney's methods could be a little more rigorous, they are sufficient to begin to dispel the rumor of the Guardian Angels.

Douglas D. Perkins
Temple University