

Organizing Inner City Neighborhoods to Reduce Alcohol and Drug Problems

John D. Clapp, MSW

ABSTRACT. The licit and illicit use of alcohol and other drugs is problematic in many inner city neighborhoods. Community-based responses to such problems can help alter the social and physical environment to improve such problems. This paper provides a case study of an organizing effort to reduce alcohol and other drug problems in one inner city neighborhood of a large southern California city. Specific attention is given to the organizing process used, specific neighborhood interventions, and outcomes. Issues and barriers related to this type of organizing also are discussed.

KEYWORDS. Neighborhood, organizing, alcohol and drugs, prevention, community-based

Problems related to the sale and use of alcohol and other drugs (AOD) can adversely impact the quality of life in inner city neighborhoods. Crime (National Institute of Justice, 1988; Wish, Klumpp, Moorer, Brady, & Williams, 1989) and other correlates of AOD use often exacerbate existing community stressors like poverty and inadequate access to resources (e.g., health care).

John D. Clapp is a doctoral student at the College of Social Work at The Ohio State University. He was formerly Coordinator of the Head Start Substance Abuse Prevention Project, San Diego State University, School of Social Work.

Address correspondence to: John D. Clapp, The Ohio State University, College of Social Work, 1947 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1162.

The author wishes to thank Tom Packard, Jim Ajemian, Louise Stanger, Eric Swank and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

Neighborhood responses to AOD problems can be effective in reducing these problems (e.g., reducing street-level drug dealing). Although frequently covered in the popular press, such responses have not been well documented in the professional literature.

This paper provides a qualitative case study of an organizing effort to reduce AOD problems in one inner city neighborhood of a large southern California city. Specific attention is given to the organizing process used, problem reduction strategies, coalition building, and related outcomes. The goals of this paper are to contribute to the body of knowledge concerning community organization and to provide information that may be useful to professionals working in the drug and alcohol prevention field.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND AOD PROBLEMS

There is no standard model of community organization to organize communities for responding to and prevention of AOD problems. Room (1989) noted that the social planning approach (see Rothman & Tropman, 1987) has been the traditional organizing model in AOD prevention; however, recent AOD organizing efforts have been more consistent with locality development and social action (Rothman & Reed, 1984; Rothman & Tropman, 1987).

Unlike government-directed social planning, locality development stresses planning for change at the neighborhood or community level (Rothman & Tropman, 1987). Such planning can be more responsive to the actual needs of a neighborhood or community by allowing residents to identify and prioritize the nature and range of problems they wish to address (Jefferson & Sparks, 1992). Moreover, giving residents responsibility for both problem definitions and solutions can empower neighborhoods and communities and help ensure the effectiveness of prevention efforts (Johnson, Hansen, & Pentz, 1985).

Congruent with locality development, the community-based approach to preventing AOD problems as outlined by Wechsler (1988) emphasizes community involvement in identifying and solving problems through the development of indigenous leadership and community empowerment. Similarly, Jefferson and Sparks (1992) outlined a multi-issue, relationship-driven model based on

the work of Friere and Alinsky. This model focuses on building coalitions within and among constituencies, and places a high value on democratic participation and values. Like locality development (Rothman & Tropman, 1987) and Wechsler's (1988) community-based approach, this strategy emphasizes developing indigenous leadership, organizations, and constituencies.

Thus, although no single model emerges as a standard approach to organizing communities and neighborhoods around AOD problems, current approaches tend to emphasize community participation in problem identification, intervention planning, and implementation, and are consistent with locality development. The key element of resident participation in the identification and solution of community problems is a fundamental aspect of community organization practice (Alinsky, 1946). Indeed, without the direct input and participation of members of the target community, change is less likely to occur and seldom is robust (Kelly, 1988).

METHODS

The time frame for the case study is the first six months of a community organizing project with two primary goals: (1) to empower neighbors to address their problems by working together as a group (process goal); and (2) to reduce or eliminate illegal drug activity and crime (task goal).

"Neighborhood" is defined here as a four block geographic area of an inner city community, approximating the service area for a Head Start center out of which the organizing effort originated. This definition is consistent with Warren and Warren's (1987) suggestion that neighborhoods be defined by school service areas.

The following research questions are addressed in this paper: What was the process used to mobilize neighborhood residents, police, and other related groups; what were the barriers to implementing strategies; what were the strategies implemented by the group; and what effect did these strategies have on neighborhood AOD problems.

Several sources of data are used throughout the case analysis including the author's field notes, data collected during the organizing effort, official communications and documentation, and news

coverage related to the organizing effort. Field notes were taken by the author during each meeting or activity related to the organizing effort. The field notes represent approximately 30 hours of participant observation. The notes were transcribed to electronic files immediately after each activity or meeting to ensure optimum recollection of events (see Warren & Warren, 1987). Observations focused primarily on the process and content of neighborhood meetings and activities. Data were synthesized by coding all data and assigning them to categories consistent with those of the organizing process outlined below.

ORGANIZING PROCESS

The organizing process was adapted from other organizing models (Bracht & Kingsbury, 1990) and generic planning models (Lewis & Lewis, 1983). The organizers used the following steps in the organizing effort: problem identification, goal setting, strategy formation, strategy implementation, strategy evaluation and alteration, and maintenance of effort.

The organizers implemented their efforts under the following set of conceptual assumptions: (1) communities are complex and dynamic (Holder & Giesbrecht, 1989), therefore, singular responses to neighborhood AOD problems would be ineffective; (2) community AOD problems are complex and involve an interaction among several environmental, cultural, economic, and socio-political factors (Holder & Blose, 1987; Holder & Wallack, 1986); (3) mixing and phasing of different organizing approaches can be effective and appropriate depending on the organizing goal and its context (Rothman & Tropman, 1987); and (4) community ownership and participation are crucial for successful organization (Alinsky, 1946).

The organizers' functions varied throughout the organizing effort and included facilitation, research, training, leadership, technical assistance, and staffing. Community leadership and participation were encouraged during all activities, and the organizers consistently took the least directive approach possible by attempting to cultivate indigenous leadership. However, because of the serious and immediate nature of the problem, the organizers often found themselves taking a leadership role (contacting city officials for

instance), especially during the first few months of the organizing effort. Consistent with this approach, Kelly, Balerrabano, and Briseno (1986) suggested that more serious problems warrant a more directive approach by organizers. Similarly, different tasks require different levels of directness (Kelly et al., 1986).

CASE ANALYSIS

Context

The organizing effort originated from a larger AOD prevention project targeting families attending five inner city Head Start centers. The larger project included drug education, staff training, and a treatment referral network. The project was a collaboration between a large community-based agency and a school of social work housed in a large public university.

The organizers, both affiliated with the school of social work and the larger prevention project, were asked by the Head Start staff at one target site to address the neighborhood "drug problem." The request for assistance was based on concern among Head Start staff and parents (mostly residents of the neighborhood) for the safety of themselves and their children. Along these lines, the Head Start staff reported that criminal activity ranging from illicit drug use to murder was common in the neighborhood. Although the organizing effort originated within Head Start, decision-making was shared among neighborhood residents and Head Start staff.

Problem Identification

Ongoing problem identification was approached in several ways, including collection of existing data, community meetings, and social indicator tracking. Initially, however, the most striking indicator of neighborhood problems was visual. On the organizers' first visit to the neighborhood, there were dozens of people in the street selling or using drugs (Ajemian, 1992). Essentially, this neighborhood qualified as what Falco (1992) termed an "open market" for drugs. Related to this illicit activity, several buildings on the street were covered in graffiti, and used AOD paraphernalia (syringes, crack pipes, beer bottles and the like) littered the street.

Within the first two weeks of the organizing effort, the organizers collected existing data related to the target neighborhood's demographic composition (age distribution, race and ethnic distribution, average household income [see Table 1]).

The organizers also collected crime statistics. Within the four-month period preceding the organizing effort, there were 108 arrests in the neighborhood, including sixty-five for violent crimes (robberies, assaults, domestic violence, rape, and homicide) (San Diego Police Dept., 1992). The police, however, indicated that these statis-

TABLE 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Target Neighborhood

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Age ¹	
0-17 years	37.3
18-29 years	23.4
30-44 years	18.7
45-64 years	12.3
> 65 years	8.3
	(N = 8,257)
Household Income ²	
< \$10,000	25.7
\$10,000-19,000	38.5
\$20,000-34,999	30.5
> \$35,000	5.3
Race ³	
White	13.9
Black	21.7
Indian	.6
Asian	1.7
Other ⁴	62.0

Notes.

1. Source: San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG; 1991), U.S. Census data (Tract #39).

2. Source: SANDAG (1991), U.S. Census Data; although average household size was not available, SANDAG reported that this is San Diego's most densely populated area; median household income = \$16,499.

3. Source: SANDAG (1991), U.S. Census data.

4. The Hispanic population in this SRA \geq 30% (SANDAG, 1989).

tics did not reflect the true level of crime in the target neighborhood, as much of the crime went unreported because of the large number of undocumented residents in the area. Also, gang-related crimes such as drive-by shootings were seldom reported to the police because the victims of such crimes are often involved in crime themselves.

Similarly, the organizers used a sheriff's department report to identify two youth gangs active in the neighborhood (San Diego County Deputy Sheriff's Association, 1990). According to the police and neighborhood residents, these two gangs accounted for the majority of violent crime in the area.

Over sixty (67) neighborhood residents attended the first community meeting, which was marketed by word of mouth, and held on a Wednesday morning. The demographic composition of the group was consistent with the characteristics of the larger community. About two-thirds of the neighborhood residents present were women. Representatives of a local city councilman, and several police officers also attended the meeting. The organizers interpreted the unexpectedly large turnout as a significant indicator of the extent of the problem. During the meeting, neighborhood residents identified several problem indicators. Among these were used hypodermic needles littering the street, lack of police response to crime, problems with a corner market that sold drug paraphernalia and inexpensive high-potency alcohol products (malt liquors, fortified wines), loitering around the Head Start center, broken street lights, and a vacant lot frequented by homeless people and prostitutes. Additionally, the Head Start teacher reported that the Head Start center typically was burglarized several times a month.

Beyond identifying problem areas not reflected in official crime statistics, meeting participants identified several potential barriers to reducing neighborhood AOD problems. Police indicated that compared to the high level of serious crime in the neighborhood, loitering by drug users and other less serious crimes were not a high priority. In addition, several of the neighborhood residents were undocumented workers who spoke only Spanish and were therefore reluctant to come into contact with the authorities. Similarly, Spanish speaking residents who were legal U.S. residents also reported being apprehensive of calling the police, and indicated that when

they did call, they had trouble communicating with police dispatchers. Finally, the police outlined jurisdiction barriers. For instance, problems associated with the corner market technically were under the jurisdiction of the state alcohol beverage control board.

Subsequent community meetings identified new problems or barriers, or refined the organizers' knowledge of existing problems. Additionally, the organizers included neighborhood residents in problem identification data collection strategies. For example, the organizers developed a tracking form that was used to monitor drug paraphernalia cleaned up by area residents. This form allowed neighborhood residents to see how their efforts were impacting the number of drug-related artifacts found each day.

Goal Setting

The group set two primary goals. First, the group wanted to eliminate the drug dealing on the corner of the street on which the Head Start center was located, and close all the drug houses on that street (at the time the goals were set, neighbors identified three drug houses on this street). The rationale for this goal was that once illicit drug sales ceased, other related crimes like prostitution, shootings, and violence also would stop, thereby making the neighborhood safer. The group's second goal was to clean up the physical appearance of the neighborhood. The group also set an informal long-term goal to address other community issues like poverty, housing, and education once the drug problem was under control. (Most residents at the first meeting believed that until the AOD problems in the neighborhood were reduced, no meaningful action could be taken to address larger problems like poverty.)

Strategy Formation

Strategy formulation began during the first neighborhood meeting. During this meeting, neighborhood residents, Head Start staff, and police decided to meet weekly. A core group including approximately 20 neighborhood activists, a representative from the city councilman's office, and two police officers became the primary coalition responsible for developing and carrying out strategies.

Weekly meetings, however, were open to all neighborhood residents (flyers advertising meeting times were distributed each week) and input from all neighborhood residents was encouraged. Meetings were co-facilitated by the organizers and Head Start staff or neighborhood residents. A Head Start parent also translated the discussion from English to Spanish at each meeting. From the outset, the organizers stressed democratic decision making. Thus, most decisions concerning strategies or activities were achieved by consensus. Strategies for which no consensus was achieved (for example, creating a community garden) were abandoned.

Strategies formulated by the group to address the AOD-related problems fell into two broad areas: coalition building and environmental changes. Coalition building focused on establishing linkages among neighborhood residents, Head Start staff, city officials, schools, police and other law enforcement agencies, and professional organizations. Environmental strategies focused on both the physical and social environment.

Establishing a working relationship between neighborhood residents and the police was an important aspect of coalition building. There was a mutual feeling among both the police and the neighborhood residents that to reduce neighborhood AOD problems, the two groups must first establish a working relationship with each other. The police already had established a neighborhood policing team in the area that used a problem-oriented policing approach. (Problem-oriented policing focuses on integrating police into the community and systematically addressing neighborhood problems by working with community members [Wolter, 1993].) The organizing effort provided the police with an opportunity for direct involvement in solving the neighborhood's problems. Also, neighborhood residents provided intelligence for the police by identifying specific drug dealers and drug houses.

In addition to the police, the group decided to establish a relationship with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (Border Patrol). Although the organizers were apprehensive of establishing this linkage because of the large number of undocumented residents in the area, both the police and area residents participating in the organizing effort encouraged this contact because of the ostensibly large number of undocumented drug deal-

ers in the neighborhood. A representative of the U.S. Border Patrol attended the second weekly meeting under an informal agreement with the organizers and the police not to harass law abiding undocumented residents of the neighborhood.

The coalition developed other linkages with the press and city officials. The relationship with the press drew attention to the serious problems in the neighborhood, and encouraged residents, police, and Head Start staff and parents to continue their efforts. The coalition developed the linkage with city officials to bring resources into the neighborhood such as street lights.

Environmental change strategies included improving cooperation in the neighborhood to address common problems, as well as altering aspects of the physical environment that contributed to AOD problems. At the first meeting the organizers learned that several neighborhood residents had taken some action to address neighborhood problems, but these actions were exclusively individual efforts, and neighbors were unaware of each other's efforts. Physical manipulations focused on fixing broken street lights, removing graffiti, and removing trash daily.

Strategy Implementation

Within one month of the first neighborhood meeting, neighborhood residents and the organizers undertook several activities to implement the group's strategies. Activities developed by neighborhood residents were similar to activities that had been successful in other local neighborhoods and nationally (Falco, 1992). Most activities cut across both strategic areas: coalition building and environmental change (see Table 2).

Neighborhood residents participated in the planning and implementation of all activities, with the one exception of the special law enforcement efforts. Relationships established with the police and city officials facilitated activity implementation. For example, the police provided protection and traffic control for the drug-free marches; city officials provided paint and equipment to eliminate graffiti and helped establish a drug-free zone (a special law enforcement zone that mandates extended sentences for persons arrested and convicted of selling crack within its boundaries).

Similarly, relationships established with other community groups

TABLE 2. Activities, Primary Actors, and Participants

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Primary Actor(s)</u>	<u>Total Participants</u>	<u>Total Events</u>
Drug-Free March	community, police	580	6
Neighborhood Patrol	community	5-12	Daily
Street Clean up	community	5-10	Daily
Block Party	organizers, community, police	180	2
Community Training ¹	community activists, police, organizers	60	4
Environmental Manipulations ²	city officials, organizers, police	N/A	6
Special Law Enforcement ³	police, U.S. INS, state department of alcohol beverage control	N/A	6
Media Coverage	organizers, press	N/A	8

Notes.

N/A = Not applicable

1. Community training topics included how to contact the local neighborhood policing team, how to patrol the streets safely, and how to conduct a meeting.

2. Environmental manipulations included fixing street lights, locking up vacant lots, painting over graffiti, and establishing a Drug-Free Zone.

3. Special Law enforcement included multi-agency raids, and undercover operations, decoy operations, and use of mobile police station trailer.

facilitated the implementation of the community patrol and daily street cleanings. Community members from nearby neighborhoods with similar organizing projects provided technical assistance and participated in activities. Technical assistance focused on how to approach drug dealers safely, how to handle and dispose of used syringes, and how to interact with the police while patrolling.

Strategy Evaluation and Alteration

Evaluating the effectiveness of strategies and specific activities was difficult. The organizing effort was not equipped with sophisticated evaluative tools, nor did the project have sufficient resources (dollars and time) to undertake a controlled evaluation. Thus, the primary methods of evaluating strategy effectiveness were informal. For instance, during weekly meetings neighbors were asked if the situation was improving, worsening, or remaining the same. As the organizing effort progressed, the majority of neighborhood participants consistently reported the situation was improving. One striking example of such an observation occurred when a woman living in the target neighborhood reported that for the first time in the seven years she had lived there, her children could safely play in her yard.

Other qualitative indicators included the general appearance of the street. For example, youth gang-related graffiti that were painted over by area residents were not replaced during the first six months of the organizing efforts. (It is common for graffiti to reappear the next day.) Also, the number of used syringes and other drug-related trash found by neighborhood residents decreased as the organizing effort progressed.

Some social activities could be deemed successful simply because they occurred. Block parties, for instance, provided a gathering that was consistent with the group's goals and strategies. Before the group began its efforts, such a gathering would have been impossible because of the illicit drug activity on the street.

The drug-free marches also were successful in several respects. First, they cleared the streets of illicit activities for several hours after they occurred. Second, the marches enhanced neighborhood residents' feelings of efficacy. Third, the marches recruited new members. Fourth, the marches provided an excellent media oppor-

tunity: several local media agencies (television, radio, and print) reported on each march. Finally, the marches tended to draw the attention of politicians. Along these lines, the assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services participated in one march.

The organizers monitored other activities closely due to the degree of danger associated with them. For instance, the neighborhood patrol initially was aggressive in its approach toward drug dealers. After two incidents in which a gun was brandished by drug dealers toward members of the patrol, a less aggressive tactic was employed. The new tactic involved approaching drug dealers and asking for their help to make the street safe for the neighborhood children. This approach was somewhat successful in getting drug dealers to move away from the Head Start center.

Although there were times when illicit activities temporarily worsened, the physical and social condition of the neighborhood improved greatly during the first six months of the organizing effort. The group believed that the goals they had set were attained.

Maintenance of Effort

The group continued its efforts for approximately six months. During the seventh month of the organizing effort, the principal organizer was awarded a community development grant to begin to address community problems like poverty. This grant resulted in the formation of a new neighborhood group that developed a food cooperative. Currently, the new group and a scaled-down version of the original group are operating parallel projects in the neighborhood. Both groups collaborate with other members of the coalition formed during the original organizing effort.

DISCUSSION

Several issues were identified in the organizing effort including: membership issues, barriers to mobilization/maintaining effort, evaluation issues, and unintended consequences. Each issue is discussed below.

Membership Issues

The dangerous nature of the organizing effort (e.g., confronting drug dealers) required the organizers to proceed carefully. Moreover, interaction with law enforcement agencies is almost a necessity in such projects. Of all the possible solutions to neighborhood problems, the group viewed the involvement of law enforcement as a key component to the organizing effort. Hence, police-resident relations becomes an important issue. Additionally, a balance must be achieved between sometimes competing interests and values (authoritarian versus humanistic) when considering strategies and inviting key players to participate in an organizing effort.

Barriers to Mobilization/Maintaining Effort

Conflicting perspectives of the nature and cause of AOD problems can be a barrier to mobilizing residents and maintaining effort: residents may view drug users and addicts as morally corrupt rather than persons in need of help; youth gang members may be viewed as criminals rather than disenfranchised members of the community; and ethnic and racial groups may blame each other for neighborhood problems. Organizers may spend substantial amounts of time addressing such issues as they arise. By keeping groups task-oriented, organizers can keep such differences from hampering progress.

A second barrier to maintaining effort concerns the level of energy required to sustain gains. The organizing effort reported here was activity intensive. Daily activities such as patrolling and cleaning the neighborhood require the ongoing interest of neighborhood residents. As neighborhood interventions become more successful, there can be a tendency for residents to "let down" in the absence of an immediate problem. Such "let downs" often result in a quick return of illicit activities and re-stimulate the interest of neighborhood residents. In the above project, this "let down" cycle occurred twice before neighborhood residents concluded that their efforts would need to be on-going to sustain the gains they had made.

Evaluation Issues

The issue of evaluation also must be addressed. Determining valid and reliable measures related to community outcomes can be a

difficult enterprise. As Mizrahi (1992) states, "it is difficult to predict or control outcomes of community interventions because of the interconnectedness and uncertainty of conditions, ideology, goals, strategies, and resources" (p. 197).

Police data provide a good example of a complicated outcome measure. First, they can underestimate the actual level of crime in a neighborhood. In addition, determining the direction of objectives concerning crime statistics requires serious thought. For instance, arrest rates might increase as a result of increased police activity associated with an organizing effort. Or, arrests rates may simply change from one type of crime to AOD-related crime, as police shift their enforcement efforts.

Unintended Consequences

Organizing a small geographic area like a neighborhood also presents its own problems. The success of one neighborhood in removing illicit activities can be at the expense of an adjacent neighborhood. In the project reported here, drug dealers simply moved to the adjacent block once the organizing effort began. To counteract this, residents from the surrounding neighborhoods were recruited to participate in the organizing effort and the police stepped up enforcement in the entire area. Although this strategy significantly reduced the presence of illicit activities in the target and surrounding neighborhoods, it likely created problems for yet another area. Ajemian (1992) suggested that neighborhoods could work together with law enforcement and city officials to counter this problem.

CONCLUSIONS

There is a dearth of literature concerning community or neighborhood organizing around alcohol and other drug issues. Community-based organizing efforts targeting AOD problems in inner city neighborhoods can be effective in reducing illicit activities at the neighborhood level. Case studies like the one reported on here are important first steps in guiding future efforts and developing effective practice models. Similarly, as increasing attention is placed on America's inner cities, community-based projects like the one

described above may be an effective and responsible means of approaching a host of problems.

Unlike social planning approaches, the community-based approach facilitates neighborhood empowerment by allowing residents to guide each phase of problem solving. The community-based approach does not impose problem definitions and solutions determined by the dominant culture. As Glugoski, Reisch, and Rivera (1994) suggest, multi-cultural communities are seldom involved in defining problems requiring attention in their own communities. Community-based approaches provide an excellent opportunity for community workers and social work educators to develop and advance culturally-sensitive and socially just practice approaches.

Additionally, the community-based approach is well suited to address the complexity of AOD problems. Given the wide-range of problems addressed in the organizing effort (e.g., graffiti and inadequate street lighting), it is unlikely traditional social planning approaches would have been effective, as several different public agencies would have had to identify and respond to each problem.

With careful and sustained efforts, residents can improve the social and physical conditions of their neighborhood. Coalition building and ongoing neighborhood activities were crucial components in the above project. The organizing effort was successful in building relationships among neighborhood residents and public agencies to address a common problem. Coalition building linked the neighborhood to outside services and brought resources into the neighborhood. Neighborhood activities facilitated resident interaction and collective problem-solving.

Although some AOD problems still exist, a working mechanism is now present in the neighborhood to address them. The community-based approach, coupled with attention and cooperation from public agencies, may prove to be effective for other neighborhoods addressing AOD or related problems.

REFERENCES

- Ajemian, J. (1992, October 19). A community just says no to drugs. *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, p. B-5.
- Alinsky, S. (1946). *Rules for radicals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bracht, N., & Kingsbury, L. (1990). *Community organizing principles in health*

- promotion: A five-stage model. In N. Bracht (Ed.), *Health promotion at the community level*. Sage: Newbury Park.
- Falco, M. (1992). *The making of a drug-free America*. New York: Time Books.
- Glugoski, G., Reisch, M., & Rivera, F.G. (1994). A wholistic ethno-cultural paradigm: A new model for community organization teaching and practice. *Journal of Community Practice: Organizing, Planning, Development & Change*, 1, 1, 81-99.
- Holder, H., & Blose, J.O., (1987). Reduction of community alcohol problems: Computer simulation experiments in three counties. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 48, 124-135.
- Holder, H., & Giesbrecht, N. (1989). Perspectives on the community in action research. In *Research, action, and the community: Experiences in the prevention of alcohol and other drug problems*. OSAP Monograph-4. DHHS Pub. NO. (ADM)89-1651.
- Jefferson, A., & Sparks, M. (1992, July 16). *Principles of community organizing*. Lecture presented at the University of California, San Diego, Summer School of Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Studies.
- Johnson, C.A., Hansen, W.B., & Pentz, M.A. (1985). Comprehensive community programs for drug abuse prevention. *Journal of Child Contemporary Sociology*, 18, 1-2, 181-199.
- Kelly, J.G., (1988). *A guide to conducting prevention research in the community: First steps*. New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.
- Kelly, J.B., Balerrabano P.A.L., and Briseno L.E. (1986). The roles of community workers in the United States and Mexico. *Community Development Journal*, 21(1), 12-22.
- Lewis, J.A., & Lewis, M.D. (1983). *Management of human service programs*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Mizrahi, T. (1992). The future of research utilization in community practice. In A.J. Grasso and I. Epstein (Eds.), *Research utilization in the social services: Innovations for practice and administration* (pp. 197-220). New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.
- National Institute of Justice (1988). *Report to the nation on crime (2nd edition)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Room, R. (1989). Community action and alcohol problems: The demonstration project as an unstable mix. In *Research, action, and the community: Experiences in the prevention of alcohol and other drug problems*. (pp. 1-26). OSAP Monograph-4. DHHS Pub. NO. (ADM)89-1651.
- Rothman, J., & Reed, B.G. (1984). Organizing community action to address alcohol and drug problems. In F.M. Cox, J.L. Erlich, J. Rothman, and J.E. Tropman (Eds.), *Tactics and techniques of community practice*, (2nd ed). Itasca IL.; F.E. Peacock and Publishers, Inc.
- Rothman, J., and Tropman, J. (1987). Models of community organization and macro-practice perspectives: Their mixing and phasing. In F.M. Cox, J.L. Erlich, J. Rothman, and J. Tropman (Eds.) *Strategies of community organization*, (4th ed.) (pp. 3-25). Itasca IL.; F.E. Peacock and Publishers, Inc.

- San Diego Association of Governments (1989). Unpublished data.
- San Diego Association of Governments (1991). SourcePoint-1990 U.S. Census data.
- San Diego Police Department (1992). Unpublished data.
- San Diego County Deputy Sheriff's Association (1990). *Gangs, groups, cults: An informational aid to understanding*. Nevada: Stuart-Bradley Productions, Inc.
- Holder, H. & Wallack, L. (1986, Autumn). Contemporary perspectives for preventing alcohol problems: An empirically-derived model. *Journal of Public Health Policy*, 7(3), 324-339.
- Warren, R.B., & Warren, D.I. (1987). How to diagnose a neighborhood. In F.M. Cox, J.L. Erlich, J. Rothman, and J. Tropman (Eds.), *Strategies of community organization* (4th ed). (pp. 27-40). Itasca IL.; F.E. Peacock and Publishers, Inc.
- Wechsler, R. (1988). Community organizing principles for local prevention of alcohol and other drug abuse. In A. Mecca (Ed.) *Prevention 2000-A Public/Private Partnership*. (pp. 41-52). San Rafael, CA: California Health Research Foundation.
- Wechsler, R. (1990, June). Harnessing people power: A community-based approach to preventing alcohol and other drug abuse. *Western City*, 34-36.
- Wish, E.D., Klumpp, K.A., Moorer, A.H., Brady, E., & Williams, K.M. (1989). *Analysis of drugs and crime among arrestees in the District of Columbia-Final Report*. Washington, DC U.S. Department of Justice.
- Wolter, P. (1993, March/April). Community policing. *The Utne Reader*, 72-73.