
The Brownsville Anti-Violence Project

Evaluation Findings

By Elise Jensen, Rachel Swaner, Sarah Picard-Fritsche, and Suvi Hynynen
Lambson



520 Eighth Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10018
646.386.3100 fax 212.397.0985
www.courtinnovation.org

The Brownsville Anti-Violence Project: Evaluation Findings

By Elise Jensen, Rachel Swaner, Sarah Picard-Fritsche, and Suvi Hynynen Lambson

© July 2016

Center for Court Innovation
520 Eighth Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10018
646.386.3100 fax 212.397.0985
www.courtinnovation.org

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude first and foremost to the Brownsville Community Justice Center program staff, in particular James Brodick and Erica Mateo, for their ongoing support of this research, as well as to the Brownsville residents who so kindly gave up their time to answer our questions about their lives and their community. In addition, we are grateful to Justine Belnavis, Emily Genetta, Janell Johnson-Dash, Esther Lee, Jair Mere, Sarah Patterson, Cassandra Ramdath, Elias Rivera, Izzy Sederbaum, and Ariel Wolf for their contributions to the field research that made the unique findings presented in this paper possible. We are grateful to Dr. Patrick Sharkey for his rigorous, independent work assessing the impact of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project and for his willingness to share his own as yet unpublished findings for this document. Lastly, we thank Amanda Cissner and Greg Berman for their comments on an earlier draft of this report.

This research was supported by grants from Rockefeller Foundation (contract 2012 NYC 324) and the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the U.S. Department of Justice (contract 2012-AJ-BX-0012).

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, or the U.S. Department of Justice. For correspondence, please contact Rachel Swaner, Center for Court Innovation, 520 8th Avenue, New York, NY 10018 (rswaner@nycourts.gov).

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary	iv
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Implementing the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project	4
Offender Notification Forums	4
Community Engagement Campaign	7
Model Fidelity	8
Chapter 3. Effects of the Program on High-Risk Residents	9
Sample Selection	9
Survey Instrument	10
Sample Characteristics	11
Adjustments for Sample Differences	12
Findings	13
Chapter 4. Program Impact: Participant Outcomes and Neighborhood Violence	17
Impact on Program Participants	17
Impact on Neighborhood Violence	18
Chapter 5. Conclusion, Challenges, and Next Steps	19
Challenges to Evaluation	19
Future Research	21

Bibliography	23
Appendix A. Baseline Offender Survey	26
Appendix B. Follow-up Offender Survey	36
Appendix C. List of Scales with Items	48

Executive Summary

In New York City, Brownsville, Brooklyn is a neighborhood characterized by high rates of gun violence and low trust in law enforcement among residents. As a means of addressing these issues, the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project was implemented in August 2012. The project was an adaptation of the Project Safe Neighborhoods model, which in the past has had success in reducing gun violence by implementing multiple concurrent intervention strategies (e.g., community mobilization and targeted enforcement) and supporting collaboration between law enforcement and community members. The core programmatic component of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project was holding monthly offender notification forums (i.e., “call-ins”), where high-risk parolees heard from representatives in the New York City Police Department (NYPD); the Kings County District Attorney’s Office; the U.S. Attorney’s Office; the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF); local social service agencies; and ex-offenders who had gotten their lives back on track. The second programmatic component of the Project included a range of community engagement projects and a public education campaign promoting nonviolence. These strategies were, ultimately, meant to deter the use of guns and enhance the legitimacy of law enforcement within high risk neighborhoods and social networks.

The current report focuses on the results from one component of the impact evaluation, an in-depth survey exploring the effects of the project on high-risk residents of Brownsville. The report also summarizes findings from a previous process and impact evaluation of the project (see Picard-Fritsche, Swaner, & Hynynen Lambson 2014).

Methods

Sample Selection

In August 2012 and August 2015, baseline and follow-up surveys were conducted with Brownsville residents who were considered relatively high-risk for gun violence, based on their recent criminal conviction or incarceration. The baseline survey was administered to 271 respondents over a three-week period in August 2012. The follow-up survey was administered to 229 residents over two weeks in August 2015. Researchers used respondent-driven sampling to recruit survey participants at both stages.

Sample Characteristics

Weighting techniques were used to eliminate any significant differences between the baseline and follow-up samples. After weighting, survey participants in both samples had an average age of 30, and the majority of them were male and African American. Over half had completed high school or received their GED, and one-fourth were currently employed. The average age at first arrest was 18, and the average number of prior and violent arrests was nine and two, respectively. Eighteen percent had been arrested for a gun offense; nearly all had been convicted of a crime in the past three years, and approximately one-fourth were currently on probation or parole.

Findings

Changes in Perceptions over Time

Both the baseline and follow-up surveys included scales that examined the perceptions of high-risk residents of Brownsville regarding: law enforcement legitimacy, targeted deterrence efforts, and police effectiveness. Specifically, survey respondents were asked to rate the fairness, respectfulness and effectiveness of law enforcement, as well as their perceptions of the likelihood of being caught and punished by law enforcement if they committed a violent crime. The research team looked at the mean differences on these scales between baseline and follow-up survey samples, with the purpose of assessing the impact of the anti-violence project on perceptions of high-risk residents over time.

- **Perceptions of Police Effectiveness:** Perceptions of police effectiveness increased modestly from 44% at baseline to 47% at follow-up.
- **Perceptions of Deterrence:** Perceptions of deterrence increased slightly from 26% at baseline to 28% at follow-up.
- **Perceptions of Legitimacy:** Contrary to expectations, perceptions of legitimacy decreased modestly over the life of the project, with 32% of respondents reporting positive perceptions of the legitimacy of the police at baseline, but only 24% rating legitimacy as high at follow-up.

Impact of Exposure to Anti-Violence Programming

In addition to exploring the effect of the project on high-risk residents of Brownsville more generally, the research team examined effects on the specific subsample of follow-up survey respondents who reported exposure to antiviolence programming. Specifically, analyses were

conducted to compare the self-reported gun use and perceptions of legitimacy, deterrence, and police effectiveness of respondents who had been exposed to either the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project or another community-based anti-violence initiative (168 people) with those who had not (40 people).

- **Gun Carrier:** Those respondents who *had* been exposed to programming were less likely to report carrying, owning, or using a gun in the last year (35% v. 27%).
- **Perceptions of Legitimacy:** Those with program exposure were also more likely to view law enforcement as legitimate (23% v. 18%).
- **Perceptions of Deterrence:** Nearly equal percentages of those who were exposed to programming and those who were not believed that they would be caught and punished if they were involved in criminal activity (27% v. 30%).
- **Perceptions of Police Effectiveness:** Respondents who had been exposed to anti-violence programming were less likely to believe the police were effective in terms of knowing who was involved in local violence (42% v. 56%)

Challenges

During the three-year implementation of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project, several notable challenges were encountered that may have influenced the outcomes of the project, only some of which were accounted for in the evaluation:

- High profile local and national incidents of police violence affected the public perceptions of the legitimacy of law enforcement more generally.
- Multiple anti-violence initiatives were implemented concurrently in Brownsville, limiting the ability to attribute evaluation results to one program.
- The Project Safe Neighborhoods model was not implemented with full fidelity in Brownsville (as summarized in this report; see Picard-Fritsche et al. 2014 for details).
- Both the target population of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project and the survey population were generally older than the population that generally engages in gun violence.
- The survey research component of the evaluation did not explicitly recruit call-in participants.

Next Steps

Considering the challenges encountered during the implementation of the program, we propose the following recommendations for future programming and research:

- Ensure that high-risk youth are included in programming, so that participants are representative of and potentially networked to those who are currently committing gun crimes in the community.
- Have multiple evaluation components, such as directly interviewing call-in participants to understand direct program effects and to verify whether they shared their experience with others in order to know if there was a diffusion effect.
- Conduct an ongoing media scan to document outside events that could have an effect on the way the program is received by participants or neighborhood residents, which will help to understand the findings.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Gun violence in the United States has been declining over the last 20 years, but remains a significant problem among youth in urban neighborhoods characterized by concentrated disadvantage. Fueled largely by the illegal gun market (Children’s Defense Fund 2013), a growing body of research suggests that gun violence is also concentrated within specific social groups, and that members of such groups are disproportionately likely to be both the victims and perpetrators of violence (Meares, Braga, & Papachristos 2016; Rich & Grey 2005; Schreck, Stewart, & Osgood 2008). These findings have led to the creation of place-based interventions that target small networks of high-risk individuals, such as the Boston Gun Project and Project Safe Neighborhoods (Braga et al. 2001; Braga, Hureau, & Papachristos 2014; Papachristos, Meares, & Fagan 2007; Papachristos et al. 2013). Such programs are typified by multiple concurrent intervention strategies (e.g., community mobilization and targeted enforcement) and by collaboration between law enforcement and community members. A 2008 study suggests that such “lever pulling” strategies are relatively successful in reducing violence at the neighborhood level, when compared with other prevention efforts such as gun buy-back programs or stricter gun licensing laws (McGarrell et al. 2006).

The current report highlights findings from one application of the Project Safe Neighborhoods (“PSN”) model in New York City. The PSN model, launched nationally in 2009 with the support of congressional allocations to 94 jurisdictions, is unique for blending theories of focused deterrence and law enforcement legitimacy. The focused deterrence component of the model involves targeted outreach to ex-offenders in high-violence neighborhoods, with the message that future violent or gun-related crimes will result in serious legal ramifications. At the same time, enhanced legitimacy is achieved through conveying this message in a respectful fashion, expressing concern for the well-being of the target group, and offering clinical and social services to those in need. Typically, these messages are conveyed in the context of “call-ins,” or offender notification forums. Call-ins are held periodically a safe space in the local community (e.g., a library or community center) and typically include law enforcement, federal and local prosecutors, community stakeholders, and ex-offenders. Many PSN programs also employ community-level strategies, such as public education campaigns and community mobilization activities. For

example, in Brownsville these campaigns and activities included art shows that highlighted young residents' vision for a strong and prosperous community; and a youth advisory board that planned educational events, disseminated resource information, and attended activities with community peace groups.

Prior evaluations of the Project Safe Neighborhoods model have revealed promising results. Specifically, a 2007 study in Chicago showed a 35% reduction in firearm violence over 2.5 years when compared with similar neighborhoods that did not implement PSN. The evaluators attributed the bulk of this reduction to call-ins (Papachristos et al. 2007). Further, a quasi-experimental study of forum participants in the same Chicago-based program showed a significant reduction in individual recidivism as a result of the program (Papachristos et al. 2013). More broadly, a recent meta-analysis of focused deterrence strategies published by the Campbell Collaboration suggests that this core component of the PSN model is effective above and beyond geographic or specific program contexts (Braga & Weisburd 2012).

Brownsville, Brooklyn was considered an appropriate location for adaptation of the PSN model for several reasons. Most importantly, Brownsville suffers from disproportionately high rates of gun crime relative to the rest of New York City, a significant portion of which is attributable to widespread youth gang activity in the area.¹ Additionally, prior survey research conducted by the Center for Court Innovation documented that gun violence was the number one concern of community residents of Brownsville generally and that residents expressed a lack of trust in law enforcement and cynicism regarding the efforts of local police to respond to gun violence (Hynynen 2011). Such findings suggested that the PSN model's unique blend of focused deterrence and legitimacy building would be an appropriate fit for the Brownsville community.

Beginning in 2012, researchers with the Center for Court Innovation engaged in a mixed-methods evaluation of an adaptation of the PSN model, The Brownsville Anti-Violence Project. This adaptation was implemented by the Brownsville Community Justice Center

¹ In 2014, the 73rd police precinct, located in Brownsville, ranked first in the city for both raw numbers of shootings and relative rate of shootings per resident (NYPD 2015). In the first five months of 2014, more people had been shot in Brownsville than in all of Manhattan (<http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/brooklyn/b-kln-neighborhood-troubled-gun-violence-article-1.1799868>).

between August 2012 and March 2015.² The first component of the study, a process evaluation documenting the planning and implementation of the project, in addition to baseline community survey results, was published in 2014 (see Picard-Fritsche et al. 2014).³ The current report provides an overview of the complete evaluation project, including a summary of findings from the earlier process evaluation (Chapter 2), results from a multisite impact evaluation of PSN in which Brownsville was one site (Chapter 3), and new findings describing the impact of the project on a sub-sample of high risk residents of Brownsville (Chapter 4). The final section of the report (Chapter 5) considers policy implications of the evaluation findings for the field of gun violence prevention, identifies some of the challenges in isolating impacts of comprehensive community programs, and suggests directions for future research.

²The Brownsville Community Justice Center is a project of the Center for Court Innovation.

³See http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/BAVP_Report.pdf.

Chapter 2

Implementing the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project

In June 2014, the research team published a process evaluation of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project (Picard-Fritsche, Swaner, & Hynynen Lambson 2014). The major findings documenting program implementation are summarized here.

Offender Notification Forums

The core programmatic component of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project was holding monthly offender notification forums (i.e., “call-ins”) with high-risk parolees. The call-ins were modeled specifically on the Project Safe Neighborhoods Initiative in Chicago, which aims to enhance deterrence and increase legitimacy by presenting a united front among law enforcement and key community players.

For the call-ins, the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project partnered with local law enforcement and the Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (Parole) to identify high-risk parolees returning to the Brownsville neighborhood. Parolees regarded as high-risk (e.g., as determined by past violence arrest charges) received notification⁴ from their parole office, informing them that they were scheduled to attend a forum at the Stone Avenue Library (a Brooklyn Public Library branch located in Brownsville) on a specific date. At the hour-long forum, a moderator (usually the project director of the Brownsville Community Justice Center) and representatives from the New York City Police Department (NYPD); the Kings County District Attorney’s Office; the U.S. Attorney’s Office; the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF); local social service agencies; and ex-offenders who had gotten their lives back on track made presentations to the parolees, with the goal of providing a three-pronged message:

⁴ Though attendance at the call-in was not mandatory, notification language was carefully worded so that the letter did not state that attendance was voluntary. There were no sanctions for non-attendance, and no direct incentives for attendance.

1. Future violent behavior will be rigorously prosecuted at both the state and federal levels.
2. Many parolees have successfully re-entered the community.
3. Parolees seeking help will be supported by the community and its service providers.

In addition to law enforcement representatives, a rotating group of social service providers acted as panelists, typically including representatives from the following local agencies:

- **Community and Law Enforcement Resources Together (ComALERT):** A reentry program run by the Brooklyn prosecutor's office that provides substance abuse treatment, employment, and housing services for parolees transitioning from prison back into the community.
- **Brownsville Partnership:** A project that works with residents in Brownsville around homelessness, housing, and employment issues.
- **Brownsville Community Justice Center:** A Center for Court Innovation project that works with young Brownsville residents who have had contact with the criminal justice system, supporting them in setting and achieving professional, educational, and personal goals.
- **GRAAFICS (Gang Diversion, Reentry, and Absent Fathers Intervention Centers):** A program that assists active and inactive gang members, the incarcerated, ex-offenders, and absentee fathers to change the attitudes and behaviors that directly contribute to their unhealthy life choices.

The research team conducted structured observations of call-in sessions over a 15-month period along with informal interviews with project stakeholders to document the process and assess the project's fidelity to Chicago's Project Safe Neighborhoods model. The meetings were consistently structured and well attended. Adherence to the Chicago model was moderate, as described further below.

Panelists' Messages

Over the course of the hour-long forum, attendees first heard a law enforcement message, with an emphasis on levels of violence in Brownsville and local and federal agencies'

responses to the violence, including the serious consequences for gun offenses. Next, they heard from a formerly-incarcerated individual from the community who talked about their own choices to turn away from crime, with the upshot that this difficult journey is worth the effort. Finally, speakers from social service agencies and other community organizations (e.g., local churches) told attendees about specific support services available to them, and how to access those services. At the end of the call-in, attendees were invited to stay to talk one-on-one to the panelists.

Table 2.1 below outlines the roles of the call-in panelists and the designated components of each agency’s message, according to the program model.

Table 2.1. Call-In Panelists’ Messages

Role/Agency	Designated Components of Message
Moderator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remind participants that panelists don't want them to pick up a gun or commit another crime; • Introduce the rest of the panel; • Provide an overview of the participant information packet.
NYPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe NYPD’s role: To keep participants safe and engaged in the community; • Describe the Brownsville community, including gun violence; • Describe the purpose of the call-in; • Note the NYPD’s special focus on gun violence; • Assure participants will stay out of trouble with law enforcement if they obey the law.
Kings County DA’s Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warn participants what will happen if they make the choice to pick up a gun; • Give participants a partial DA’s file with their photos and possible sentence for re-offense on the back.
U.S. Attorney’s Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warn participants what will happen if they get prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney's Office; • Tell participants that future prosecution is their own choice; • Describe specific sentences for gun crimes.
ATF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the role of ATF; • Warn participants what ATF will do if they are caught with a gun or bullets.
Ex-Offender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a personal story about early poor choices; • Describe how he/she changed his/her life around (with specifics); • Acknowledge that it can be hard to make these changes; • Emphasize that participants can choose to turn life around.

Social Service Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe specific services offered; • Detail how participants can access services; • Show that these services can help them re-establish a connection with the community.
---------------------------------	---

Call-In Structure All 15 observed call-in sessions were held at the Stone Avenue Library in Brownsville. Participants and panelists were seated in a circle, with all seats on a single level. The library setting, combined the physical layout of the room, the circular configuration of the tables, and the informal presentation style were intended to provide a nonthreatening atmosphere for participants.

Attendance Of the 357 eligible parolees invited to one of the 20 call-ins held between August 2012 and March 2014, 304 attended—an 85% attendance rate. While most of these parolees attended the first time they were invited, some were extended a second invitation after missing their scheduled forum. Over 95% of call-in participants were male.

Re-arrest During the observation period (i.e., 15 months, slightly less than the full number of months of the program), 106 of the 304 (35%) forum participants had a new arrest. The vast majority of these arrests were for relatively minor charges, including possession of marijuana/controlled substance (20%), trespassing (5%), fare evasion (12%), shoplifting (9%), disorderly conduct (8%), traffic (4%), and general violations (4%). Only four call-in participants (1%) were arrested for gun-related charges and none of those were shooting-related.

Model Fidelity

Aspects of the Brownsville project that were reproduced with fidelity to the Chicago Project Safe Neighborhoods model included:

- **Panelist Approach:** The panelists included in the Brownsville call-ins were consistently respectful of call-in participants and emphasized that the participants had a choice about their future.
- **Attendee Response:** The call-in attendees consistently appeared highly engaged when the ex-offenders were speaking and frequently remained after the call-in to speak with panelists.

- **Prosecutor Message:** Panelists from the Kings County (Brooklyn) District Attorney’s Office and the U.S. Attorney’s Office were consistent in conveying all components of their designated message.

There were, however, some deviations from the Chicago model:

- **NYPD Message:** The precinct captain did not consistently convey the designated messages. Importantly, he often failed to convey a message of personal investment in the community and frequently departed from the recommended focus of enhanced enforcement efforts of *gun* as opposed to *general* crime.
- **Absenteeism:** One of the key law enforcement players, a representative from the Bureau of Alcohol and Firearms (ATF), was absent from more than a third of the call-ins.
- **Social Service Providers:** The social service agencies were not specific about the services they were offering.
- **Straying from Designated Message:** Both the social service providers and ex-offenders went off-topic at numerous times during the call-ins.

Overall, we classify fidelity to the program model as moderately strong.

Community Engagement Campaign

While not a core component of the PSN model or an explicit focus of the evaluation, the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project also included community level components that may have influenced violence and perceptions of violence in the neighborhood. The community engagement campaign included a range of activities promoting nonviolence:

- **Community Education Tour:** Project staff completed a seven-stop community education tour focused on visiting local schools and educating youth about the consequences of gun violence. The tour included an art-making component for youth that culminated in the design of the campaign’s logo and slogan and a final art exhibition at the Van Dyke recreational center.
- **Youth Advisory Board:** During the summer of 2013, nine neighborhood youth, ages 16-24, were convened and given a stipend to plan educational events, disseminate resource information, and attend activities with community peace groups.

- **Community Contact List:** Project staff compiled a contact list with phone numbers, addresses, and emails for over 400 Brownsville residents with an interest in the mission of the Anti-Violence Project. A social media campaign was launched to network with these contacts.

Chapter 3

Effects of the Program on High-Risk Residents

In August 2012 and August 2015, the research team conducted baseline and follow-up surveys with Brownsville residents who were considered relatively high-risk for gun violence. The survey population included residents considered to be high-risk for gun violence—as opposed to Brownsville residents more generally or program participants exclusively (though program participants could still take part in the survey)—because gun violence is known to be highly concentrated in local social networks. Presumably, the effects of being exposed to the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project would spread to others in these networks, thus decreasing the likelihood of gun violence throughout the network.

Respondent risk status was determined by asking a series of screening questions, including: 1) Have you been convicted of a crime in the last three years? 2) Have you been released from jail or prison the last three years? 3) Are you currently on probation or parole? If a person answered yes to at least one of these questions, and they were at least 18 years of age and lived in Brownsville, they were eligible to participate in the survey.

The purpose of the pre-post surveys was to measure change, potentially influenced by the anti-violence program, in high-risk groups over time. This section discusses the survey methodology and findings.

Sample Selection

The baseline offender survey was administered to 271 respondents over a three-week period in August 2012. The follow-up survey was administered to 229 residents over two weeks in August 2014. Researchers used respondent-driven sampling (RDS) to recruit survey participants at both stages. RDS is the appropriate methodology for building a sample from

hidden populations, including groups at high risk for criminal behavior who are not currently under criminal justice supervision.⁵

Participation in the survey and survey responses were anonymous in that, even though the interviews were conducted orally by research assistants, respondents were asked to provide a pseudonym for consent and interview labeling purposes, so no real names or identifying information were collected. The decision to anonymize responses in this way was made primarily to protect participants given the nature of the survey/interview (e.g., the instrument included question regarding illegal drug use, criminal behavior, and gang involvement). Each survey participant received a \$20 cash stipend for their participation in the survey and was given three numbered coupons to refer others who might be eligible for the survey. The original participant received an additional \$10 for each successful referral, for a possible total of up to \$50 for their participation in the survey.

Survey Instrument

The baseline and follow-up surveys covered a range of domains, including details of recent justice system involvement, violence perpetration and victimization, perceptions of law enforcement and the courts, and social norms regarding guns and violence; the follow-up survey added specific questions about the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project and community awareness campaigns against gun violence in Brownsville (see Appendix A for the baseline survey and Appendix B for the follow-up survey).

Scales were created to capture concepts the program was intended to impact, such as gun use, legitimacy of the law and law enforcement, and deterrence. The specific items for the scales were developed either conceptually by the authors or based on the existing literature on police legitimacy and focused deterrence (e.g., Meares, Tyler, & Gardener 2012; Papchristos et al. 2012; Tyler & Fagan 2008; Tyler & Wakslak 2004); all composite variables and scales were tested for reliability. The following variables and scales were created based on multiple items from the survey instrument:⁶

⁵ For a more detailed explanation of RDS and why it was selected, see the process evaluation report at http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/BAVP_Report.pdf.

⁶ See Appendix C for complete item listings and reliability statistics for each of the final scales.

- **Gun Carrier:** A respondent was identified as a “gun carrier” if he/she responded in the affirmative to any of three questions, including whether respondents carried a gun in the past year, were arrested for a gun offense in the past year, or own a gun.
- **Deterrence:** Deterrent effect refers to the perception that police will detect and apprehend individuals who have committed a violent crime, that these crimes will be prosecuted, and that offenders will be punished. This seven-item scale was comprised of questions asking respondents to rate how likely it was that they would be caught and punished if they committed a crime involving a gun. Responses were based on a five-point Likert scale (from “very unlikely” to “very likely”). All responses were summed and coded so that higher scores reflect greater perceived deterrent power. The scale was divided into three categories based on the following scores: low (5-25), medium (26-30), and high (31-35) deterrent effect.
- **Legitimacy:** Legitimacy refers to public support for the law and a belief that those who enforce the law are wielding their authority fairly. Ten statements comprised the legitimacy scale, with responses based on a five-point Likert scale (from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”). All responses were summed and coded so that a higher score reflects greater perceived legitimacy. The scale was divided into three categories based on the following scores: low (10-31), medium (32-36), and high (37-49).
- **Police Effectiveness:** Police effectiveness measures respondent awareness that police know which neighborhood residents have committed a crime or are involved in the criminal justice system. Three statements comprised the police effectiveness scale, with responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale (from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”). All responses were summed coded so that a higher score reflects greater perceived police effectiveness. The scale was divided into three categories based on the following scores: low (3-6), medium (7-9), and high (10-15) legitimacy.

Sample Characteristics

The final baseline sample consisted of 271 resident respondents and the follow-up sample consisted of 229 resident respondents. Table 3.1 provides a demographic and criminal history profile of the samples. We used bivariate analyses (t-tests and chi-square tests) to compare the samples to determine whether the samples were substantially different on theoretically important variables. These tests revealed statistically significant differences between the baseline and follow-up samples on the following important characteristics: Respondent age, history of arrest for a gun offense, current probation or parole status, and average age of first arrest. Table 3.1 presents the characteristics for the raw 2012 and 2015 samples, which were ultimately weighted (see Table 3.2) to compensate for these differences.

Table 3.1. Respondent Background Characteristics, Pre-Weighting

	Baseline 271	Follow-up 229
N		
Demographics		
Average Age	33	26***
Male	81%	78%
Race ¹		
Black	89%	84%
Hispanic	10%	8%
Native American	2%	3%
White	1%	2%
Other	4%	4%
Completed High School/GED	54%	52%
Employed	25%	30%
Criminal Justice History		
Prior Arrests		
Average Number of Prior Arrests	10.6	8.2 ⁺
Average Age at First Arrest	18	17**
Number of Violent Arrests	1.78	2
Ever Arrested for a Gun Offense	35%	69%***
Convicted of Any Crime, Past 3 years	92%	95%**
Currently on Probation or Parole	37%	21%***

¹ Because participants could identify more than one race, percentages may add up to be more than 100%.

⁺p<.10 ^{*}p<.05 ^{**}p<.01 ^{***}p<.001

Adjustments for Sample Differences

Before conducting the outcome analyses, we implemented weighting techniques to correct for the differences between the samples. Weighting strategies successfully eliminated the significant differences between the samples, as shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2. Respondent Background Characteristics, After Weighting

	N	Baseline 271	Follow-up 229
Demographics			
Average Age		30	29
Male		80%	74%
Race ¹			
Black		87%	84%
Hispanic		11%	9%
Native American		2%	3%
White		1%	3%
Other		3%	4%
Completed High School/GED		52%	54%
Employed		26%	30%
Criminal Justice History			
Prior Arrests			
Average Number of Prior Arrests		9	9
Average Age at First Arrest		18	18
Number of Violent Arrests		2	2
Ever Arrested for a Gun Offense		18%	18%
Convicted of Any Crime, Past 3 years		92%	95%
Currently on Probation or Parole		26%	25%

¹ Because participants could identify more than one race, percentages may add up to be more than 100%.

*p<.10 **p<.05 ***p<.001

Findings

Two sets of analyses were conducted. First, we looked at the differences on the created scales between baseline and follow-up survey administrations, using weighted data. The purpose of this analysis was to explore whether, over time, the establishment of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project had an effect on perceptions of high-risk residents of Brownsville. Second, we isolated responses for only the *follow-up* survey and compared the responses of those who said they had been exposed to anti-violence programming (either the

Brownsville Anti-Violence Project or another community-based anti-violence initiative) to responses of those who were not exposed to such programming. As this second set of analyses examined only the follow-up survey responses, these comparisons were based on the unweighted data.

Change in Perceptions over Time

A comparison of the baseline and follow-up survey results revealed one significant change in respondent perceptions. Specifically, perceptions of law enforcement legitimacy decreased modestly, with 32% of respondents assigning the highest level of legitimacy to police at baseline, but only 24% rating legitimacy as high at follow-up. These findings are counter to expectations of program effect, given that adaptation of the PSN model is intended to *enhance* perceptions of law enforcement legitimacy. While there were small increases in perceptions of deterrence (26% v. 28%) and police effectiveness (44% v. 47%) at follow-up, the changes were not statistically significant (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3: Changes in Perceptions Pre- to Post-Program Implementation

	Baseline	Follow-Up
N	271	229
High Legitimacy	32%	24%*
High Deterrent Effect	26%	28%
High Police Effectiveness	44%	47%

*p<.10 **p<.05 ***p<.001

Impact of Exposure to Anti-Violence Programming

Bivariate analyses (chi-square and t-tests) were used to compare self-reported gun use, as well as perceptions of legitimacy, deterrence, and police effectiveness, between respondents who had been exposed to either the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project or another community-based anti-violence initiative (168 people) and those who had not (40 people). This analysis was restricted to respondents in the follow-up sample who were residents of Brownsville while the program was in place. A dichotomous variable was created to measure exposure to local anti-gun violence initiatives. Respondents were coded as having been exposed to anti-violence programming if they answered in the affirmative to any one of three questions:

1. Have you ever been invited by your parole officer or did you receive a letter asking you to come in to a meeting with prosecutors, police and social service providers to discuss avoiding violent crime?
2. Do you know of anyone else who attended such a meeting?
3. During the last 12 months, have you seen or heard of people or groups in the neighborhood who are doing anything to try to stop or reduce gun violence?
4. During the last 12 months, have you noticed any kind of public awareness campaign in the neighborhood about reducing violence, stopping shootings, or increasing peace?
5. During the last 12 months, have you participated in efforts or campaigns to reduce gun violence?

Table 3.4 shows the results of the comparisons between respondents who had been exposed to anti-violence programming to respondents who had not. Those respondents who had been exposed to programming were less likely to report carrying, owning, or using a gun in the last year (35% v. 27%). Those with program exposure were also more likely to view law enforcement as legitimate (23% v. 18%). In other words, they were more likely to feel that the police and prosecutors in the community treated them with respect. However, respondents who had been exposed to anti-violence programming were *less* likely to believe the police were effective in terms of knowing who was involved in local violence (42% v. 56%). Nearly equal percentages of those who were exposed to programming and those who were not believed that they would be caught and punished if they were involved in criminal activity (27% v. 30%). While overall these findings suggest mixed effects of being directly exposed to programming, only one of the findings came close to statistical significance (i.e., police effectiveness measure). Given the low sample size in the non-exposure group, however, all differences should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3.4: Impact of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project

	No Exposure 40	Exposure 168*
Gun Carrier	35%	27%
High Legitimacy	18%	23%
High Deterrent Effect	30%	27%
High Police Effectiveness	56%	42%+

*21 respondents did not answer this question respond to questions about exposure to anti-violence programming and were thus excluded from the analysis.

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 3.5 presents additional descriptive information comparing individuals who had been invited to a call-in to those who had seen or heard of people or groups in the neighborhood who are doing anything to try to stop or reduce gun violence or noticed any kind of public awareness campaign in the neighborhood about reducing violence, stopping shootings, or increasing peace. Presumably, individuals who were invited to a call-in attended it and were more directly exposed to the messages of the Anti-Violence Project; whereas, the other group was more indirectly exposed. Only 21 survey respondents reported that they were invited to a call-in (three of whom did not actually attend), and 147 had been exposed to some other anti-violence programming. Given the disproportionate sample sizes between the groups, significance testing was not conducted. The only differences between the groups were that those who were invited to a call-in were more likely to report being a gun carrier and were less likely to have high perceptions of legitimacy.

Table 3.5: Comparison of Call-in Attendees to Those Exposed to Other Parts of the Intervention

	Other Exposure 150	Attended a Call-in* 18
Gun Carrier	27%	33%
High Legitimacy	24%	17%
High Deterrent Effect	26%	28%
High Police Effectiveness	42%	44%

*21 respondents were invited to a call-in, but only 18 reported attending.

Chapter 4

Program Impact: Participant Outcomes and Neighborhood Violence

In February 2013, approximately six months after the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project held its first call-in, the project was invited to become one of five sites across the state to participate in an experimental evaluation of the impact of the PSN model.⁷ Funded by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS), the evaluation was conducted by Dr. Patrick Sharkey of New York University and was designed to estimate the effect of the program on several key outcomes: new criminal behavior by individuals called in to attend the forums; new criminal activity by individuals in targeted neighborhoods who *were not* called in to attend the forums; and rates of violent crime in neighborhoods where the intervention was implemented.⁸ This chapter represent findings from Dr. Sharkey's impact evaluation, which he has generously allowed us to present here.

Impact on Project Participants

The impact evaluation tracked the outcomes of Brownsville Anti-Violence Project participants for a period of one year (June 2013-July 2014) and compared them to the outcomes of eligible offenders who were randomly removed from the participant pool as part of the research. The study found a significantly lower rate of parole violations among offenders who were assigned to attend call-ins compared with those who were not, but no significant differences in new criminal activity, including violent or gun-related crimes. These results depart from prior findings regarding new criminal activity among forum participants in Chicago's PSN sites (Papachristos 2013). While the Brownsville findings may suggest a null effect of the project, it is worth noting that individual impact findings were similar across all five evaluation sites and may therefore reflect a failure of the *model* rather than the particular site. The New York State evaluation also followed participants for a significantly shorter period (one year) when compared with the Chicago evaluation, which

⁷ Other evaluation sites included Manhattan, the Bronx, Albany, and Schenectady.

⁸ Results from the study have been summarized and approved for public release (Sharkey 2015) but are as yet unpublished.

tracked participants for three years. The relatively short tracking period could partially explain the null impact findings.

Impact on Neighborhood Violence

While not the primary purpose of the evaluation, Dr. Sharkey’s impact evaluation also examined the effect of the five PSN projects on neighborhood-level violence using two strategies. First, the research examined whether overall rates of arrests (and arrests for violence and gun violence specifically) declined significantly in those areas that implemented the PSN model compared to randomly matched areas that did not. No significant reductions in violence were detected in any of the studied sites, including the Brownsville catchment area. Second, the study tested for a “diffusion effect” by examining whether high-risk individuals in the catchment areas who *did not* attend forums were less likely to offend, based on the theory that the message of the forums diffused through high-risk social networks. In this case, again, no effects were found in any of the five studied sites, including the Brownsville target area.

Taken together, these findings strongly suggest that the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project did not meet its goal of decreased neighborhood gun violence—at least in the first year following the project. However, as previously mentioned, methodological limitations of the impact evaluation—specifically a short tracking period—may be inhibiting our ability to identify neighborhood level trends. Further research in this area may be called for, as discussed in the final section of this report.

Section 5

Conclusion, Challenges, and Future Research

The Brownsville Anti-Violence Project arose from a need to address disproportionately high rates of gun violence in the community and a lack of trust in law enforcement’s ability to reduce gun violence among residents. The program was adapted from the Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) model, which uses “call-ins” with representatives from local law enforcement, county and U.S. District Attorney offices, ATF, local social service providers, and ex-offenders to deter future gun violence while building legitimacy with high-risk parolees. Ultimately, the goal of the intervention was to reduce gun violence first among call-in participants, and then among other high-risk residents in similar social networks through a diffusion effect.

The evaluation of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project included multiple components, including process (see Picard-Fritsche et al. 2014) and impact components (see Sharkey 2015). This report has summarized the results of these components and presented new findings from baseline and follow-up surveys of Brownsville residents at high-risk for committing gun violence. Results from a comparison of the pre- and post-program groups reveal minimal or no significant changes in perceptions of either deterrent power (certainty of detection and response) or legitimacy of law enforcement—both of which are critical goals of the PSN model. On the other hand, further analyses suggest that those who were directly exposed to the intervention were less likely than those who were not directly exposed to report carrying or using a gun. Those with direct exposure also perceived law enforcement as more legitimate. While on the whole, neither the prior or current impact measures suggest overwhelming significant positive effects (e.g., lower violence, improved legitimacy), particular challenges to evaluating these types of programs may have inhibited our ability to isolate program effects, as described below.

Challenges to the Evaluation

For many multi-year community-based initiatives, it is hard to control for external factors that may affect how the program is received. Even evaluations with strong designs face

threats to validity from outside events. While it is important to document events that may have an impact on outcome evaluation results, it is nearly impossible to control them. Therefore, it is often difficult to attribute any positive or negative change to the program itself, and both program success and program failure should be declared cautiously.

Over the relatively short time frame of this evaluation (about three years), much has changed in the sociopolitical environment in which the program took place—both locally in New York City and nationally across the United States. There have been numerous external events that may have had an impact on the way the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project was received, and on some of the indicators that we measured in this evaluation (e.g., police legitimacy and effectiveness). In the summer of 2014, Eric Garner, an African-American Staten Island resident, died after being put in a chokehold by a New York City police officer who suspected him of selling loose cigarettes. Less than a month later, Michael Brown, an unarmed black 18-year old male, was shot and killed by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri. A few months later still, in November 2014, an NYPD officer fatally shot an unarmed 28-year old black male, Akai Gurley, in a public housing complex in East New York, Brooklyn—not far from Brownsville. That same month, police officers shot and killed Tamir Rice, a 12-year old African-American boy in Cleveland. These shootings, along with the acquittals of police officers who were involved in similar events, sparked protests in major cities across the country, and elevated tensions and distrust between communities of color and police officers. This may have contributed to the lack of positive findings from the offender survey—indeed, in some cases, it may have even caused attitudes to change in the opposite direction of what was intended.

Additionally, during the period that the evaluation was taking place, other anti-violence programs—including an adaptation of Cure Violence—started in Brownsville, further complicating our ability to attribute any change to one specific program.

Another factor to consider when looking at the lack of findings is that there was flawed implementation of the PSN model. As described in Chapter 2, some components of the offender call-ins were not implemented with complete fidelity. Additionally, some of the participants objected to being at the call-in, stating that either they did not have a past gun charge, or that the forums should focus on younger people with no prison history, as many people who were there were older and had “changed their ways.” Moreover, because of the older age of some of the participants, as compared to the younger average age of those who are committing many of the gun crimes in Brownsville, the call-in participants may not be

representative of or networked to those younger Brownsville residents who are actually carrying guns. Unlike the issue of model fidelity, these last two challenges are inherent to the PSN model and not necessarily specific to Brownsville’s adaptation of the model.

Finally, the lack of positive findings may also be an indication of a failure of *evaluation* design. The evaluation did not directly survey the call-in participants. We tried to measure the diffusion to others in the community of the message given to call-in participants, without knowing whether the call-in messages changed the attitudes and behaviors of actual participants first. Moreover, we only spoke to people ages 18 and older, though we know that many underage youth are carrying and using guns. The decision to limit the research to respondents 18 and older was made for a pragmatic reason, rather than for theoretical reasons; obtaining parental consent for minor research participants—including those involved in high risk and illegal activity—was deemed overly onerous, given the scope of the current project. Additionally, call-in attendees were 18 years of age or older, and presumably their network—to whom the model expects them to convey the call-in messaging—would also be comprised of those 18 and older.

Next Steps

While these challenges are significant, there is room for future research to account for some of these issues related to program implementation, evaluation design, and outside effects. Below we advance several recommendations for future research:

- **Ensure the target population is included in programming.** Future replications of the Chicago model should ensure that call-in participants are representative of and potentially networked to those who are currently committing gun crimes in the community. Researchers can provide analysis of official records (e.g., police and court data) to help program staff determine the population most at-risk for committing future gun crimes.
- **Have evaluation components for each part of the theory of change—not just ultimate outcomes.** For programs that intend to have neighborhood-level diffusion effects, it is important to understand where along the theory of change something may have broken down, or if all components of the theory hold true. In order to do this, it is necessary to interview actual program participants to gain a better understanding of how they received the call-in messaging; whether they will share that message with anybody, and if so, with whom; and if they will not, why not (e.g., they do not feel it is relevant to them).

- **Conduct an ongoing media scan to document outside events.** Future research should include an ongoing local and national media scan to accurately document events that could have an effect on the way the program is received by participants, or on the intended measures the program is trying to change. Because over the course of multi-year initiatives other anti-violence programs may come up (e.g., administered by a different community organization that may have a slightly different message), it is also important to document these initiatives and their prevailing messages.
- **Include younger people in the research.** In places like Brownsville, young people under the age of 18 are involved in much of the violent crime that takes place in the neighborhood. Therefore, it is important to talk to people who are under 18 years of age to better understand the situational factors that influence their decision to acquire, carry, and use guns. In order to better understand both motives and networks, the research design should be mixed methods, including a significant qualitative component that will help illuminate key community-level risk and protective factors, social norms around violence, and how their social networks contribute to their ability to access guns.

Bibliography

Braga, Anthony A., and David L. Weisburd. 2012. *The Effects of "Pulling Levers" Focused Deterrence Strategies on Crime*. Oslo, Norway: The Campbell Collaboration. Available at https://nnscommunities.org/uploads/Pulling_Levers.pdf, last retrieved 14 July 2016.

Braga, Anthony A., David M. Hureau, and Andrew V. Papachristos. 2014. "Deterring Gang-Involved Gun Violence: Measuring the Impact of Boston's Operation Ceasefire on Street Gang Behavior." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 30(1): 113-139.

Braga, Anthony A., David M. Kennedy, Elin J. Waring, and Anne M. Piehl. 2001. "Evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire: Problem-oriented Policing, Deterrence, and Youth Violence." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38: 195-221.

Children's Defense Fund. 2013. *Protect Children, Not Guns*. New York: Children's Defense Fund.

Heckathorn, David. 1997. "Respondent-Driven Sampling: A New Approach to the Study of Hidden Populations." *Social Problems* 44: 174-199.

Hynynen, Suvi. 2011. *Community Perceptions of Brownsville: A Survey of Neighborhood Quality of Life, Safety, and Services*. New York: Center for Court Innovation.

Kirk, David S. and Andrew V. Papachristos. 2011. "Cultural Mechanisms and the Persistence of Neighborhood Violence." *American Journal of Sociology* 116(4): 1190-1233.

Lauritsen, Janet, Robert J. Sampson, and John H. Laub. 1991. "The Link Between Offending and Victimization Among Adolescents." *Criminology* 29(2): 265-292.

Makarios, Matthew D. and Travis C. Pratt. 2012. "The Effectiveness of Policies and Programs That Attempt to Reduce Firearm Violence a Meta-Analysis." *Crime & Delinquency* 58(2), 222-244.

McGarrell, Edmund F., Steven Chermak, Jeremy M. Wilson, and Nicholas Corsaro. 2006. "Reducing Homicide Through a Lever-pulling Strategy." *Justice Quarterly* 23(1), 226.

Meares, Tracey L., Andrew V. Papachristos, and Jeffrey Fagan. 2009. *Homicide and Gun Violence in Chicago: Evaluation and Summary of the Project Safe Neighborhoods Program*. Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago. Available at http://www.psnchicago.org/PDFs/2009-PSN-Research-Brief_v2.pdf, last retrieved 14 July 2016.

Meares, Tracey L., Tom R. Tyler, and Jacob Gardener. 2012. *The Two Different Worlds We Live In: Lawfulness and Perceived Police Misconduct*. Yale Law School, Pub. Law Working Paper No. 255

New York City Police Department. 2015. [2014 Shooting Incidents, Homicide and Shooting Complaints by Census tract and Borough]. Unpublished raw data. New York, NY: NYPD.

Papachristos, Andrew V., Tracey L. Meares, and Jeffrey Fagan. 2012. "Why Do Criminals Obey the Law? The Influence of Legitimacy and Social Networks on Active Gun Offenders." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 102(2): 397-440.

Papachristos, Andrew V., Tracey L. Meares, and Jeffrey Fagan. 2007. *Attention Felons: Evaluating Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago*. U Chicago Law & Economics, Olin Working Paper No. 269; Columbia Public Law Research Paper No. 05-97.

Papachristos, Andrew V., Danielle Wallace, Tracey L. Meares, and Jeffrey Fagan. 2013. *Desistance and Legitimacy: The Impact of Offender Notification Meetings on Recidivism Among High Risk Offenders*. Columbia Public Law Research Paper No. 13-343.

Picard-Fritsche, Sarah, Rachel Swaner, and Suvi Hynynen-Lambson. 2014. *Deterrence and Legitimacy in Brownsville, Brooklyn: A Process Evaluation of the Brownsville Anti-Violence Project*. New York: Center for Court Innovation.

Rich, John A and Courtney M. Grey. 2005. "Pathways to Recurrent Trauma Among Young Black Men: Traumatic Stress, Substance Use, and the 'Code of the Streets'." *American Journal of Public Health* 95(5): 816-824.

Sampson, Robert J. and Dawn J. Bartusch. 1998. "Legal Cynicism and (subcultural?) Tolerance of Deviance: The Neighborhood Context of Racial Differences." *Law and Society Review* 32(4): 777-804.

Schreck, Christopher J., Eric A. Stewart, and D. Wayne Osgood. 2008. "A Reappraisal of the Overlap of Violent Offenders and Victims." *Criminology* 46(4): 871-906.

Sharkey, Patrick. 2015. *Executive Summary: Evaluation of the New York State Gun Violence Reduction Program*. New York: New York University.

Skogan, Wesley G., Susan M. Hartnett, Natalie Bump, and Jill Dubois. 2008. *Evaluation of CeaseFire- Chicago*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Justice.

Tracy, Melissa, Anthony A. Braga, and Andrew V. Papachristos. 2016. "The Transmission of Gun and Other Weapon-Involved Violence within Social Networks." *Epidemiologic Reviews* 38(1): 70-86.

Tyler, Tom R. and Jeffrey Fagan. 2008. "Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in their Communities?" *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 6(23): 231-275.

Tyler, Tom R. and Cheryl J. Wakslak. 2004. "Profiling and Police Legitimacy: Procedural Justice, Attributions of Motive, and Acceptance of Police Authority." *Criminology* 42(2): 252-282.

Appendix A.

Baseline Offender Survey

Interview with Brownsville Residents

Regarding experiences with the criminal justice system and violent crime

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our survey. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes. It is completely voluntary and you may stop or refuse to answer at any question. I will ask you some questions that are personal in nature and would appreciate your honest responses. There are no right or wrong answers. All of your answers will be kept confidential, unless you tell me about a plan to commit a future crime. While we will keep your responses confidential, as an extra precaution when we ask you about past criminal activities, please do not share any identifying information, such as names, dates or specific locations with the researcher.

1. Coupon Number:	2. Interviewer Name:
3. Interview Date:	4. Interview Time:
5. Coupons offered: a) b) c)	6. Location

I. Screening Questions

7. Have you been convicted of a crime in the last 3 years? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	8. Have you been released from prison or jail in the last 3 years? (<i>Jail is for a short duration, usually less than a year (like Riker's) while prison is for a longer term and can be state or federal</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Prison <input type="checkbox"/> Jail <input type="checkbox"/> Both <input type="checkbox"/> Neither
9. Are you currently on probation or parole? <input type="checkbox"/> Probation <input type="checkbox"/> Parole <input type="checkbox"/> Neither	10. How old are you? 10a. DOB: _____
11. Do you live in the Brownsville neighborhood of Brooklyn? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Complete the interview only if the respondent answers "yes" to at least one of questions 7, 8, or 9 AND is at least 18 years of age AND lives in Brownsville.

II. Additional Respondent Information

12. How many years have you lived in Brownsville?	
13. Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Transgender	14. What is your race or ethnicity? <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American <input type="checkbox"/> White <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic/Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
15. What type of housing do you live in? <input type="checkbox"/> Private home or apartment <input type="checkbox"/> Public housing (NYCHA) <input type="checkbox"/> Shelter/transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	16. Who do you live with: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> Parents <input type="checkbox"/> Girlfriend/boyfriend <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse <input type="checkbox"/> Friends <input type="checkbox"/> Children <input type="checkbox"/> Strangers <input type="checkbox"/> Grandparents <input type="checkbox"/> Alone <input type="checkbox"/> Other family <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
17. What is your marital status? <input type="checkbox"/> Single/never married <input type="checkbox"/> Married <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced/separated <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed	18. Do you have any children? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 18a. If yes, how many? 18b. Do your children live with you?
19. Did you complete high school or obtain a GED? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	20. Do you work: <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Not employed <input type="checkbox"/> Retired or on disability
21. How do you make a living?	
22. How do you spend your free time?	

II. Self-Reported Criminal Involvement

The following questions have to do with your involvement in criminal activities, especially violent crimes. I want to remind you that this information will not be shared with anyone, and will never be used against you. Please be as honest and complete as possible with your responses.

23. How many times have you been arrested?	24. How many times have you been convicted of a crime?
25. Age at first arrest?	26. About how many months ago was your most recent arrest? (<i>Just give us your best estimate</i>)

27. How many times have you been arrested for violence against another person? (<i>Including assault, robbery and attempted murder</i>)	28. How many times have you been convicted of a violent crime?
29. Have you spent time in jail or prison? If so, how many times and how long? <input type="checkbox"/> Jail _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Prison _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Neither	30. [<i>If yes</i>] Did you spend time in jail or prison for a crime committed with a gun or for possession of a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
31. Since your last arrest, have you stopped doing what you were arrested for? Can you tell me why or why not?	
<i>The next few questions ask about violent activity you may have engaged in over the past year. We are not interested in knowing exactly any details, just generally speaking if you engaged in any of the following activities, whether or not you were arrested. Again, your responses will be kept confidential.</i>	
32. At any point during the past year, did you engage in violence against another person, regardless of whether or not you were caught? (For example, physical or sexual assault, robbery, manslaughter, attempted murder, or murder) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	32a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you engage in a violent act against another person in the <i>last year</i> , regardless of whether or not you were caught?
33. At any point during the past year, did you carry a gun, regardless of whether or not you were caught? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	33a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you carry a gun in the <i>last year</i> ?
34. At any point during the past year, did you carry a knife or other weapon besides a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	34a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you carry a knife or other weapon in the <i>last year</i> ?
35. At any point during the past year, did you engage in any illegal drug sales (buying or selling), regardless of whether or not you were caught? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	35a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you engage in illegal drug sales in the <i>last year</i> ?
36. Do you use any drugs? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

36a. If yes, during the past year, how often did you use each of the following substances?

	Never	Only a few times	1-3 times a month	1-5 times a week	About every day
Alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Marijuana	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Cocaine or Crack	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Heroin	<input type="checkbox"/>				

The next few questions ask about other experiences in the past year and are not necessarily connected to anything you were arrested or convicted for. The information you share will be kept confidential and will not be accessible to anyone but the researchers, but please DO NOT provide specific details about crimes you may have committed in the past, such as names or dates of the incidents.

In the past year....	Never	1-2 times	3-4 times	5 times or more
37.... how often were you threatened with physical harm?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38. ... how often did you threaten someone else with physical harm?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39.... how often were you slapped, punched, or hit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.... how often did you slap, punch, or hit someone else?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41.... how often were you beaten up or mugged?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.... how often did you beat up or mug someone else?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43...how often were you threatened with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44... how often did you threaten someone with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45....how often were you attacked with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46.... how often did you attack someone with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47... how often was the weapon from the questions above a gun?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48. Violent incidents that I have committed or been a victim of in the last year have occurred... <i>[Be sure to check all that apply.]</i>				
<input type="checkbox"/> in my home.				
<input type="checkbox"/> on the block near my home/in my building.				
<input type="checkbox"/> on Pitkin Ave or another shopping area.				
<input type="checkbox"/> where I work/go to school or nearby.				
<input type="checkbox"/> on rival gang territory/apartment building.				
<input type="checkbox"/> in a park/other recreation facility.				
<input type="checkbox"/> outside of Brownsville/East New York.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:				

III. Attitudes about Violence

CHECK IN: How are you feeling? I know those were some tough questions but I really appreciate your responses.

The following questions are about when you feel the use of violence is appropriate. Please answer as honestly as possible.

49. Suppose someone was trying to start a physical fight with you. What is most important in deciding whether or not you would get in a physical fight? <i>(Open ended)</i>			
<i>For the following statements, tell me if you always agree with the statement, sometimes agree, or never agree.</i>			
	Always	Sometimes	Never
50. Threatening to use a weapon is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
51. Avoiding or walking away from someone who wants to fight you is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52. Carrying a weapon is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53. Apologizing (saying you're sorry) is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

54. If someone hits me first, my family/friends would want me to hit them back.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55. If someone attacked me, my family/friends would want me to defend myself even if it meant using a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56. If one of my friends or family members were hurt or killed, I would find the person responsible and retaliate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57. If I was going to be in a physical fight, I'd feel safer if I had a knife.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58. If I was going to be in a physical fight, I'd feel safer if I had a handgun.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59. I would fight someone if they disrespected me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IV. Attitudes about the Law and the Criminal Justice System

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about your perceptions about the law and the criminal justice system, including the police and the courts. When I read a statement, tell me on a scale from 1 to 5 how much you agree with the statement, 1 being that you strongly disagree and 5 that you strongly agree.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
60. Laws are intended to protect people.	1	2	3	4	5
61. Laws do not protect people like me. <i>(This can mean whatever you want it to)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
62. Laws protect only white people.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Laws only protect rich people.	1	2	3	4	5
64. Laws provide me with freedom to do many of the things I want.	1	2	3	4	5
65. Laws prevent me from doing what I want.	1	2	3	4	5
66. I believe that all laws are good laws.	1	2	3	4	5
67. Laws are enforced more when some people break them than when others do.	1	2	3	4	5
68. People should obey the law even if it goes against what they think is right.	1	2	3	4	5
69. Anything can be fixed in court if you have the right connections.	1	2	3	4	5
70. Bankers, lawyers, and politicians get away with breaking the law every day.	1	2	3	4	5
71. This country's justice system was designed to treat everyone equally.	1	2	3	4	5
72. Nothing you do is going to make a difference in the way you are treated.	1	2	3	4	5
73. Breaking the law is no big deal as long as you do not physically harm someone.	1	2	3	4	5
74. Prosecutors often tell witnesses to lie in court.	1	2	3	4	5
75. Most police in Brownsville treat people with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
76. Most police in Brownsville treat some people better than others.	1	2	3	4	5
77. Most police in Brownsville are dishonest.	1	2	3	4	5
78. Most police in Brownsville are trying to protect the public from violent crime.	1	2	3	4	5

79. Most police in Brownsville have a good reason when they arrest people.	1	2	3	4	5
80. Most police in Brownsville are interested in understanding the needs of the community.	1	2	3	4	5
81. The local prosecutor is interested in understanding the needs of people in this community.	1	2	3	4	5
82. Most police in Brownsville don't take the time to talk to community residents and organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
83. People who work for the local prosecutor don't take the time to talk to community residents and organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
84. The police in Brownsville know who in this community has committed a gun crime in the past.	1	2	3	4	5
85. The police in Brownsville know who has committed violent crimes in the past.	1	2	3	4	5
86. The police in Brownsville know who in this community is on probation or parole.	1	2	3	4	5
87. The police in Brownsville want to help people get the services and other help for their problems.	1	2	3	4	5
88. Most Brownsville residents want people who commit crimes with a gun to be locked up.	1	2	3	4	5
89. Most Brownsville residents want people who commit other kinds of violent crimes to be locked up.	1	2	3	4	5

CHECK IN: You are doing great! Do you need some water or anything?

The following questions are about your interactions with law enforcement and the court system.

90. Have you been stopped and frisked by the police within the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 90a. →If yes, how many times?_____	91. Have you been the victim of a crime in the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 91a. →If yes, how many times?_____
92. Have you been the victim of a <i>violent</i> crime such as attempted murder, rape, assault, or robbery in the last year. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know 92a. →If yes, how many times?_____	93. Have you sought help from the police in the last year. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know 93a. →If yes, how many times?_____
94. Have you witnessed a crime in the last 12 months. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know 94a. →If yes, how many times?_____	94b. If yes, did you report it to the police? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A 94c. Why or why not?
95. Have you had a positive experience with a police officer in the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	96. Have you had a negative experience with a police officer in the last year. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
97. In the last year, have you been to court for something you did wrong or for something that you was told you did wrong. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	98. If yes, Did you feel that you were treated fairly by... Police <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No The judge <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Prosecution <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Defense attorney <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	Other court staff Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
--	--

IV. Consequences of Crime

I am going to list some situations and possible consequences to those situation. Not all of these will apply to you but I'd still like you to tell me how likely you think the consequences mentioned are for each situation.

	Very Unlikely				Very Likely
	1	2	3	4	5
100. If you owned a gun, how likely is it that you would get caught if you used it?	1	2	3	4	5
101. If you are on probation or parole, how likely is it that your P.O. would find out if you violated probation/parole?	1	2	3	4	5
102. If you do not show up to court, how likely is it that the court will try to track you down?	1	2	3	4	5
103. If you do not show up to court for a ticket, how likely is it that the next time you are stopped by the police you will be arrested?	1	2	3	4	5
104. If you committed a robbery, how likely is it that the police would arrest you for it?	1	2	3	4	5
105. If you committed a crime with a gun, how likely is it that you would be arrested?	1	2	3	4	5
106. If you committed a crime with a gun, how likely is it that you would be sent to jail or prison?	1	2	3	4	5
107. If you committed a crime with a gun, how likely is it that your sentence would be much harsher than if you had committed the same crime without a gun?	1	2	3	4	5
108. If you had an open warrant, how likely is it that you can still get a driver's license?	1	2	3	4	5
109. If you had a criminal record, how likely is it that a potential employer will not hire you because of that fact?	1	2	3	4	5
110. If you threatened someone with a gun, how likely is it that they or someone else would turn you in to the police?	1	2	3	4	5
111. If you killed someone, how likely is it that you would be arrested by the police?	1	2	3	4	5
112. If you killed someone, how likely is it that the victim's family or friends would retaliate against you or your family/friends?	1	2	3	4	5
113. If you hurt your girlfriend/boyfriend/spouse, how likely is it that someone would call the police?	1	2	3	4	5
114. If you were not a U.S. citizen, how likely is it that getting arrested will impact your immigration status?	1	2	3	4	5
115. If you got arrested for a violent gun crime, how likely is it that you would be prosecuted by both state and federal authorities?	1	2	3	4	5
116. If you committed a gun crime, how likely is it that local and federal law enforcement will both be after you?	1	2	3	4	5

V. Services you Need or Have Received in the Past Year

The following questions are about services you may currently need or have needed in the past.

<p>117. Do you currently need assistance with any of the following:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting <input type="checkbox"/> Anger management <input type="checkbox"/> SSI benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Intimate partner violence </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Drug or alcohol abuse <input type="checkbox"/> Health or health insurance <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional problems <input type="checkbox"/> Getting out of a gang <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ </td> </tr> </table>		<input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting <input type="checkbox"/> Anger management <input type="checkbox"/> SSI benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Intimate partner violence	<input type="checkbox"/> Drug or alcohol abuse <input type="checkbox"/> Health or health insurance <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional problems <input type="checkbox"/> Getting out of a gang <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting <input type="checkbox"/> Anger management <input type="checkbox"/> SSI benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Intimate partner violence	<input type="checkbox"/> Drug or alcohol abuse <input type="checkbox"/> Health or health insurance <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional problems <input type="checkbox"/> Getting out of a gang <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____																					
<p>118. Do you know how to access the services you need in Brownsville?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know																						
<p>119. Have you gone to a social service agency for help with any of the following in the last 12 months?</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting <input type="checkbox"/> Anger management <input type="checkbox"/> SSI benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Intimate partner violence </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Drug or alcohol abuse <input type="checkbox"/> Health or health insurance <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional problems <input type="checkbox"/> Getting out of a gang <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ </td> </tr> </table>		<input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting <input type="checkbox"/> Anger management <input type="checkbox"/> SSI benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Intimate partner violence	<input type="checkbox"/> Drug or alcohol abuse <input type="checkbox"/> Health or health insurance <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional problems <input type="checkbox"/> Getting out of a gang <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting <input type="checkbox"/> Anger management <input type="checkbox"/> SSI benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Intimate partner violence	<input type="checkbox"/> Drug or alcohol abuse <input type="checkbox"/> Health or health insurance <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional problems <input type="checkbox"/> Getting out of a gang <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____																					
<p>119a. Were they able to help you?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<p>120. Do you think there are enough social services accessible to former offenders in Brownsville?</p>																					
<p>121. In the past year, did any of the following kinds of people help you get services?</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Police</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Probation Officer</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parole Officer</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prosecutor</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defense attorney</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priest or minister</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other community member</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> </table>		Police	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Probation Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Parole Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Prosecutor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Defense attorney	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Priest or minister	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Other community member	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Police	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Probation Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Parole Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Prosecutor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Defense attorney	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Priest or minister	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Other community member	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
<p>122. If you sought help from any of the following kinds of people, do you think they would help you get services?</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Police</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Probation Officer</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parole Officer</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prosecutor</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defense attorney</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priest or minister</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other community member</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> No</td> </tr> </table>		Police	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Probation Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Parole Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Prosecutor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Defense attorney	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Priest or minister	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Other community member	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Police	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Probation Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Parole Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Prosecutor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Defense attorney	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Priest or minister	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
Other community member	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No																				
<p>123. Did accessing a social service program make you feel like you had more options in your life? Why or why not?</p>																						

VI. Reported Violent Crime in the Community

CHECK IN: We are nearing the end! How are you feeling?

This next section will ask about violent crime in your community and among your family and friends.

124. How often do you hear gunshots in your neighborhood? <input type="checkbox"/> At least once a week <input type="checkbox"/> Once a month <input type="checkbox"/> Once every few months <input type="checkbox"/> Every six months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a year <input type="checkbox"/> Never or very rarely	125. When was the last time you heard gunshots?
126. In your opinion, does Brownsville feel more or less violent from the past year? <input type="checkbox"/> More violent <input type="checkbox"/> About the same <input type="checkbox"/> Less violent <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	
127. What are the major causes of gun violence in your neighborhood? (ex: drugs, gangs, etc).	
128. Do you feel safe in your neighborhood? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	128a. Why or why not?
129. Do you think others feel safe in the neighborhood? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	129a. Why or why not?
130. If Brownsville feels more or less dangerous than before, why & when do you think that this happened?	
131. How many of your friends and family members own a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> A few <input type="checkbox"/> Less than half <input type="checkbox"/> About half <input type="checkbox"/> More than half <input type="checkbox"/> Almost all <input type="checkbox"/> All	132. Of your friends and family members who have a gun, how often do they carry the gun with them? <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> About half the time <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently <input type="checkbox"/> Almost always <input type="checkbox"/> Always
133. Do you own a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No response 133a. If yes, why do you own a gun?	

For the following questions, please tell me if you think something is a big problem, a minor problem or not a problem in Brownsville.

	Big problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
134. How big of a problem do you think gun violence is in Brownsville?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
135. How big of a problem is violence between people in a romantic relationship?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
136. How big of a problem are assaults?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
137. How big of a problem are sexual assaults?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
138. How big of a problem is robbery?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
139. How big of a problem is gang violence?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
140. Do you have any friends or family members who have been injured by a gun? If yes, how many?				

140. Do you have any friends or family members who have been killed by a gun? If yes, how many?
141. Why do you think people are committing violent gun crimes in Brownsville?
142. If you get arrested again and sent to jail, what sort of impact will that have on your family? 142a. If you have spent time in jail before, what impact did it have on your family last time?
143. What role do you play in your community?
144. Are there any community members speaking out about gun violence in the community? Who are they?

Appendix B.

Follow-Up Offender Survey

Interview with Brownsville Residents Regarding experiences with the criminal justice system and violent crime

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our survey. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes. It is completely voluntary and you may stop or refuse to answer at any question. I will ask you some questions that are personal in nature and would appreciate your honest responses. There are no right or wrong answers. While we will keep your responses confidential, as an extra precaution when we ask you about past criminal activities, please do not share any identifying information, such as names, dates or specific locations with the researcher.

1. Coupon Number:	2. Interviewer Name:
3. Interview Date:	4. Interview Time:
5. Coupons offered: a) b) c)	6. Location

I. Screening Questions

7. Have you been convicted of a crime in the last 3 years? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	8. Have you been released from prison or jail in the last 3 years? (<i>Jail is for a short duration, usually less than a year (like Riker's) while prison is for a longer term and can be state or federal</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Prison <input type="checkbox"/> Jail <input type="checkbox"/> Both <input type="checkbox"/> Neither
9. Are you currently on probation or parole? <input type="checkbox"/> Probation <input type="checkbox"/> Parole <input type="checkbox"/> Neither	10. How old are you? 10a. DOB: _____
11. Do you live in the Brownsville neighborhood of Brooklyn? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	167. How many people do you know in Brownsville who are at least 18 years old, and have either been convicted of a crime in the last 3 years, have been released from prison or jail in the last 3 years, or are currently on probation or parole? _____ (<i>Note to interviewer: If they do not know an exact number, tell them they can give their best estimate.</i>)

Complete the interview only if the respondent answers "yes" to at least one of questions 7, 8, or 9 AND is at least 18 years of age AND lives in Brownsville.

II. Additional Respondent Information

12. How many years have you lived in Brownsville?	
13. Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Transmale <input type="checkbox"/> Transfemale	14. What is your race or ethnicity? (check all) <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American <input type="checkbox"/> White <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic/Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
15. What type of housing do you live in? <input type="checkbox"/> Private home or apartment <input type="checkbox"/> Public housing (NYCHA) <input type="checkbox"/> Shelter/transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	16. Who do you live with: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> Parents <input type="checkbox"/> Girlfriend/boyfriend <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse <input type="checkbox"/> Friends <input type="checkbox"/> Children <input type="checkbox"/> Strangers <input type="checkbox"/> Grandparents <input type="checkbox"/> Alone <input type="checkbox"/> Other family <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
17. What is your marital status? <input type="checkbox"/> Single/never married <input type="checkbox"/> Married <input type="checkbox"/> In a serious relationship, unmarried <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced/separated <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed	18. Do you have any children? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 18a. If yes, how many? _____ 18b. Do your children live with you?
19. Did you complete high school or obtain a GED? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	20. Do you work: <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Not employed <input type="checkbox"/> Retired or on disability
21. How do you make a living?	
22. How do you spend your free time?	

II. Self-Reported Criminal Involvement

The following questions have to do with your involvement in criminal activities, especially violent crimes. I want to remind you that this information will not be shared with anyone, and will never be used against you. Please be as honest and complete as possible with your responses.

23. How many times have you been arrested?	24. How many times have you been convicted of a crime?
25. Age at first arrest?	26. When was your last arrest? (give us your best estimate)

27. How many times have you been arrested for violence against another person? (<i>Including assault, robbery and attempted murder</i>)	28. How many times have you been convicted of a violent crime?
29. Have you spent time in jail or prison? If so, how many times and how long? <input type="checkbox"/> Jail _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Prison _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Neither	30. [<i>If yes</i>] Did you spend time in jail or prison for a crime committed with a gun or for possession of a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
31. Since your last arrest, have you stopped doing what you were arrested for? Can you tell me why or why not?	
<i>The next few questions ask about violent activity you may have engaged in over the past year. We are not interested in any details, just want to know generally speaking if you engaged in any of the following activities, whether or not you were arrested. Again, your responses will be kept confidential.</i>	
32. At any point during the past year, did you engage in violence against another person, regardless of whether or not you were caught? (For example, physical or sexual assault, robbery, manslaughter, attempted murder, or murder) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	32a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you engage in a violent act against another person in the <i>last year</i> , regardless of whether or not you were caught?
33. At any point during the past year, did you carry a gun, regardless of whether or not you were caught? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	33a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you carry a gun in the <i>last year</i> ?
34. At any point during the past year, did you carry a knife or other weapon besides a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	34a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you carry a knife or other weapon in the <i>last year</i> ?
35. At any point during the past year, did you engage in any illegal drug sales (buying or selling), regardless of whether or not you were caught? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	35a. [<i>If yes</i>] How many times did you engage in illegal drug sales in the <i>last year</i> ?
36. Do you use any drugs? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

36a. During the past year, how often did you use each of the following substances?

	Never	Only a few times	1-3 times a month	1-5 times a week	About every day
Alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Marijuana	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Cocaine or Crack	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Heroin	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Pills (pain pills, opiates, benzos)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				

The next few questions ask about other experiences in the past year and are not necessarily connected to anything you were arrested or convicted for. The information you share will be kept

confidential and will not be accessible to anyone but the researchers, but please DO NOT provide specific details about events in the past, such as names or dates of the incidents.

In the past year....	Never	1-2 times	3-4 times	5 times or more
37.... how often were you threatened with physical harm?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38. ... how often did you threaten someone else with physical harm?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39.... how often were you slapped, punched, or hit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.... how often did you slap, punch, or hit someone else?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41.... how often were you beaten up or mugged?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.... how often did you beat up or mug someone else?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43...how often were you threatened with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44... how often did you threaten someone with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45...how often were you attacked with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46.... how often did you attack someone with a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47... how often was the weapon you used from the questions above a gun?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48. Violent incidents that I have committed or been a victim of in the last year have occurred... <i>[Be sure to check all that apply.]</i>				
<input type="checkbox"/> in my home. <input type="checkbox"/> on the block near my home/in my building. <input type="checkbox"/> on Pitkin Ave or another shopping area. <input type="checkbox"/> where I work/go to school or nearby. <input type="checkbox"/> on rival gang territory/apartment building. <input type="checkbox"/> in a park/other recreation facility. <input type="checkbox"/> outside of Brownsville/East New York. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:				

III. Attitudes about Violence

CHECK IN: How are you feeling? I know those were some tough questions but I really appreciate your responses.

The following questions are about when you feel the use of violence is appropriate. Please answer as honestly as possible.

49. Suppose someone was trying to start a physical fight with you. What is most important in deciding whether or not you would get in a physical fight? <i>(Open ended)</i>			
<i>For the following statements, tell me if you always agree with the statement, sometimes agree, or never agree.</i>			
	Always	Sometimes	Never
50. Threatening to use a weapon is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

51. Avoiding or walking away from someone who wants to fight you is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52. Carrying a weapon is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53. Apologizing (saying you're sorry) is an effective way to avoid a physical fight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54. If someone hits me first, my family/friends would want me to hit them back.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55. If someone attacked me, my family/friends would want me to defend myself even if it meant using a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56. If one of my friends or family members were hurt or killed, I would find the person responsible and retaliate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57. If I was going to be in a physical fight, I'd feel safer if I had a knife.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58. If I was going to be in a physical fight, I'd feel safer if I had a handgun.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59. I would fight someone if they disrespected me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IV. Attitudes about the Law and the Criminal Justice System

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about your perceptions about the law and the criminal justice system, including the police and the courts. When I read a statement, tell me on a scale from 1 to 5 how much you agree with the statement, 1 being that you strongly disagree and 5 that you strongly agree.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
60. Laws are intended to protect people.	1	2	3	4	5
61. Laws do not protect people like me. <i>(This can mean whatever you want it to)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
62. Laws protect only white people.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Laws only protect rich people.	1	2	3	4	5
64. Laws provide me with freedom to do many of the things I want.	1	2	3	4	5
65. Laws prevent me from doing what I want.	1	2	3	4	5
66. I believe that all laws are good laws.	1	2	3	4	5
67. Laws are enforced more when some people break them than when others do.	1	2	3	4	5
68. People should obey the law even if it goes against what they think is right.	1	2	3	4	5
69. Anything can be fixed in court if you have the right connections.	1	2	3	4	5
70. Bankers, lawyers, and politicians get away with breaking the law every day.	1	2	3	4	5
71. This country's justice system was designed to treat everyone equally.	1	2	3	4	5
72. Nothing you do is going to make a difference in the way you are treated.	1	2	3	4	5
73. Breaking the law is no big deal as long as you do not physically harm someone.	1	2	3	4	5
74. Prosecutors often tell witnesses to lie in court.	1	2	3	4	5
75. Most police in Brownsville treat people with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
76. Most police in Brownsville treat some people better than others.	1	2	3	4	5

77. Most police in Brownsville are dishonest.	1	2	3	4	5
78. Most police in Brownsville are trying to protect the public from violent crime.	1	2	3	4	5
79. Most police in Brownsville have a good reason when they arrest people.	1	2	3	4	5
80. Most police in Brownsville are interested in understanding the needs of the community.	1	2	3	4	5
81. The local prosecutor is interested in understanding the needs of people in this community.	1	2	3	4	5
82. Most police in Brownsville don't take the time to talk to community residents and organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
83. People who work for the local prosecutor don't take the time to talk to community residents and organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
84. The police in Brownsville know who in this community has committed a gun crime in the past.	1	2	3	4	5
85. The police in Brownsville know who has committed violent crimes in the past.	1	2	3	4	5
86. The police in Brownsville know who in this community is on probation or parole.	1	2	3	4	5
87. The police in Brownsville want to help people get the services and other help for their problems.	1	2	3	4	5
88. Most Brownsville residents want people who commit crimes with a gun to be locked up.	1	2	3	4	5
89. Most Brownsville residents want people who commit other kinds of violent crimes to be locked up.	1	2	3	4	5

CHECK IN: You are doing great! Do you need some water or anything?

The following questions are about your interactions with law enforcement and the court system.

<p>90. Have you been stopped and frisked by the police within the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>90a. →If yes, how many times?_____</p>	<p>91. Have you been the victim of any crime in the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>91a. →If yes, how many times?_____</p>
<p>92. Have you been the victim of a <i>violent</i> crime such as attempted murder, rape, assault, or robbery in the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p> <p>92a. →If yes, how many times?_____</p>	<p>93. Have you sought help from the police in the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p> <p>93a. →If yes, how many times?_____</p>
<p>94. Have you witnessed a crime in the last 12 months? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p> <p>94a. →If yes, how many times?_____</p>	<p>94b. If yes, did you report it to the police? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>94c. Why or why not?</p>
<p>95. Have you had a positive experience with a police officer in the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p>	<p>96. Have you had a negative experience with a police officer in the last year? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p>
<p>97. In the last year, have you been to court for something you did wrong or for something that you was told you did wrong. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p>	<p>98. If yes, did you feel that you were treated fairly by... Police <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No The judge <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Prosecution <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

<input type="checkbox"/> Every six months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a year <input type="checkbox"/> Never or very rarely	
126. In your opinion, does Brownsville feel more or less violent from the past year? <input type="checkbox"/> More violent <input type="checkbox"/> About the same <input type="checkbox"/> Less violent <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	
127. What are the major causes of gun violence in your neighborhood? (ex: drugs, gangs, etc.).	
128. Do you feel safe in your neighborhood? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	128a. Why or why not?
129. Do you think others feel safe in the neighborhood? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	129a. Why or why not?
130. If Brownsville feels more or less dangerous than before, why & when do you think that this happened?	
131. How many of your friends and family members own a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> A few <input type="checkbox"/> Less than half <input type="checkbox"/> About half <input type="checkbox"/> More than half <input type="checkbox"/> Almost all <input type="checkbox"/> All	132. Of your friends and family members who have a gun, how often do they carry the gun with them? <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> About half the time <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently <input type="checkbox"/> Almost always <input type="checkbox"/> Always
133. Do you own a gun? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No response 133a. If yes, why do you own a gun?	

For the following questions, please tell me if you think something is a big problem, a minor problem or not a problem in Brownsville.

	Big problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
134. How big of a problem do you think gun violence is in Brownsville?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
135. How big of a problem is violence between people in a romantic relationship?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
136. How big of a problem are assaults?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
137. How big of a problem are sexual assaults?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
138. How big of a problem is robbery?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
139. How big of a problem is gang violence?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
140. Do you have any friends or family members who have been injured by a gun? If yes, how many?				
140. Do you have any friends or family members who have been killed by a gun? If yes, how many?				

141. Why do you think people are committing violent gun crimes in Brownsville?
142. If you get arrested again and sent to jail, what sort of impact will that have on your family? 142a. If you have spent time in jail before, what impact did it have on your family last time?
143. What role do you play in your community?
144. Are there any community members speaking out about gun violence in the community? Who are they?

VII. Collective Efficacy

CHECK IN: We are nearing the end! How are you feeling?

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about the relationships between people in your neighborhood. For the following questions, would you say it is very likely, likely, neither likely nor unlikely, unlikely, or very unlikely that your neighbors could be counted on to intervene in various ways.

<i>Informal Social Control</i>	Very Likely	Agree Likely	Neither Likely Nor Unlikely	Unlikely	Very Unlikely
145. If children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
146. If children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
147. If children were showing disrespect to an adult.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
148. If a fight broke out in front of your house.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
149. If the fire station closest to your home was threatened with budget cuts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For the following questions, tell me how strongly you agree with the following statements. You can say Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.

<i>Social Cohesion and Trust</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
150. People around here are willing to help their neighbors	<input type="checkbox"/>				
151. This is a close-knit neighborhood	<input type="checkbox"/>				
152. People in this neighborhood can be trusted	<input type="checkbox"/>				
153. People in this neighborhood generally don't get along with each other	<input type="checkbox"/>				
154. People in this neighborhood do not share the same values.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

VIII. Community Mobilization

155. During the last 12 months, have you seen or heard of people or groups in the neighborhood who are doing anything to try to stop or reduce gun violence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
156. If yes to question 155, what were they doing to try to stop or reduce gun violence? (Mark all that apply.) <input type="checkbox"/> Talking to people on the street <input type="checkbox"/> Mediating a potential conflict <input type="checkbox"/> Holding a gun buy-back program <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsoring a sporting event (e.g., youth basketball tournament) <input type="checkbox"/> Hosting or participating in a block party <input type="checkbox"/> Holding a vigil for someone lost to violence <input type="checkbox"/> Holding a “call-in” with people coming out of jail or prison <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsoring a concert <input type="checkbox"/> Coordinating or participating in an anti-violence protest <input type="checkbox"/> Holding a community meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsoring an anti-violence art exhibit
157. If yes to question 156, what was the name of the individual or group trying to stop violence?
158. During the last 12 months, have you noticed any kind of public awareness campaign in the neighborhood about reducing violence, stopping shootings, or increasing peace? For example, posters, signs, buttons, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

159. If yes to question 158, can you remember where you saw them and what they said?
160. In the last 12 months, have you participated in any efforts or campaigns to reduce gun violence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
161. Have you heard of “Brownsville Stronger Together” or seen it written anywhere? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
161a. If yes, where?

IX. Exposure to BVP intervention

162. Have you ever been invited by your parole officer or did you receive a letter asking you to come in to a meeting with prosecutors, police and social service providers to discuss avoiding violent crime? (This would have taken place at the Stone Avenue Library in Brownsville) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, continue to the following questions. If no, skip to 165.</i>
163. Please describe what you remember about the meeting:
164. What do you remember about the message delivered at the meeting?
165. What was your reaction to the meeting?
166. Do you know of anyone else who has attended such a meeting? Please describe. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Thank you so much for your time! I will now give you your incentive for participating and explain how you can recruit other people to the study.

Appendix C.

List of Scales with Items

Scale ¹	Items
Deterrent Effect (alpha ² =.67)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you owned a gun, how likely is it that you would get caught if you used it? • If you committed a crime with a gun, how likely is it that you would be arrested? • If you committed a crime with a gun, how likely is it that you would be sent to jail or prison? • If you committed a crime with a gun, how likely is it that your sentence would be much harsher than if you had committed the same crime without a gun? • If you threatened someone with a gun, how likely is it that they or someone else would turn you in to the police? • If you committed a gun crime, how likely is it that local and federal law enforcement will both be after you? • If you got arrested for a violent gun crime, how likely is it that you would be prosecuted by both state and federal authorities?
Legitimacy (alpha=.61)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most police in Brownsville treat people with respect. • Most police treat some people in Brownsville better than others. • Most police in Brownsville are dishonest. • Most police in Brownsville are trying to protect the public from violent crime. • Most police have a good reason when they arrest people. • Most police in Brownsville are interested in understanding the needs of the community. • Most police in Brownsville don't take the time to talk to community residents and organizations. • The police in Brownsville want to help people get the services they need and other help for their problem. • The local prosecutor is interested in understanding the needs of the community. • People who work for the local prosecutor don't take the time to talk to community residents and organizations.
Police Effectiveness (alpha=.71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The police in Brownsville know who in this community has committed a gun crime in the past. • The police in Brownsville know who has committed violent crimes in the past. • The police in Brownsville know who in this community is on probation or parole.

¹ All scales were based on a 5-point Likert scale (from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”).

² The alpha is a scale reliability measure that refers to how closely the items in the scale are related.