

Criminogenic Features of Apartment Complexes: Preliminary Findings

Troy C. Payne

University of Alaska, Anchorage

Heidi L. Scherer

Kennesaw State University

John E. Eck

University of Cincinnati

Study

- Funded by the National Institute of Justice grant 2005-IJ-CX-0030
- Site surveys and owner surveys of apartments in Cincinnati, Ohio, USA 2006
 - Study n=264
- Focus of this analysis is place management

Why rental housing is ideal for studies of place management

- Some apartments are perennial problems
- Expectation that landlords will manage tenant behavior
- Landlords have financial incentives to reduce crime and disorder
- National training programs exist for landlords
 - CDRI's *Keeping Illegal Activity Out of Rental Property*

Disorder calls for service

- Family trouble (non-violent)
- Disorderly person (includes crowd)
- Noise complaint
- Suspicious person or auto
- Trespasser
- Neighbor trouble
- Drug use/sale
- Mentally impaired - non violent
- Animal complaint
- Mentally impaired – violent
- Disorderly group (4 or more)
- Person down, not combative, not sick/injured
- Complaint of panhandlers
- Juvenile complaint
- Fireworks complaint
- Place found open
- Complaint of prostitutes
- Curfew violation
- Prowler
- Person down and out

0

50

100

150

200

250

Apartment buildings

Independent variables: ORCA


- **Organization of space**
- **Regulation of conduct**
- **Control of access**
- **Acquisition of resources**

Odds ratios from logistic regression

	Variable	1+ disorder	5+ disorder
	Pseudo r ²	.120	.243
Organization of space	Units	1.00	1.02*
	Maintenance scale	1.03	0.99
Regulation of conduct	Hire anyone?	1.49	1.52
	# behaviors leading to eviction	1.00	1.15
	1 eviction	2.31*	1.43
	2 or more evictions	3.43**	3.91**
	# behavior restrictions in lease	1.12	0.97
Control of access	Boundary access scale	0.96	0.93
	Reject sex offender?	1.13	0.78
	Reject drug offender?	1.00	5.57*
	Reject violent offender?	0.73	0.42
	Reject non-violent offender?	1.22	0.67
	Generally rent to who you want?	0.46	0.36*
Acquisition of resources	Delinquencies or vacancies?	0.89	0.93

But shouldn't place management
reduce crime?

Place management is a **dynamic process**



A Dynamic Approach to Place Management and Crime

Hypotheses

1. Management is expensive, so a need must drive its application.
2. Management is sticky, so once implemented it will not be changed instantly.
3. Crime is influenced by management.
4. Crime is influenced by amount of earlier crime.

A. $M_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 C_{t-1} + \beta_2 M_{t-1}$, from hypotheses 1 and 2.

B. $C_t = \alpha_0 - \alpha_1 M_t + \alpha_2 C_{t-1}$, from hypotheses 3 and 4.

C. $C_t = \alpha_0 - \alpha_1 \beta_0 - \alpha_1 \beta_2 M_{t-1} + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \beta_1) C_{t-1}$, from combining A and B.

D. $C_t = \gamma_0 - \gamma_1 M_{t-1} + \gamma_2 C_{t-1}$, from combining terms in C.

Conclusions

1. Autocorrelation in M and C confound relationship between M and C.
2. We need to look at changes in management and crime overtime to understand how they are related.