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ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

This study examined and evaluated the impact of a Neighbourhood Watch program on reducing the occurrence of residential property crime within a selected residential area in the city of Thunder Bay.

Comparative victim history data was obtained longitudinally from the Test Site and from a Control Site during the evaluation phase of the program in the Test Site.

The results of the study indicated that the program was successful in substantially reducing the occurrence of residential property crime and, in particular, eradicating the occurrence of household yard property theft - formerly the principal property crime problem.

Moreover, the findings suggest that the occurrence of residential property crime is directly related to the level of household and yard physical security which, in turn, was found to be directly related to the application of crime analysis and the acting upon of this information by the Neighbourhood Watch participants. The dramatic reduction in the victim experience of Test Site respondents suggests that they did indeed act affirmatively in response to the information.

Finally, the results of the study indicated that the willingness of residents to assume an active role in reducing the occurrence of residential property crime was largely dependent upon exposure to the Neighbourhood Watch Program as implemented in the City of Thunder Bay.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, property related crime or vandalism has received great deal of community concern throughout North America giving rise to government funded research project's orientating toward reducing the occurrence of such crime.

Unfortunately, very little pressure has existed within the Canadian context to compel recipients of federal crime prevention funding to empirically demonstrate the effectiveness of a given crime prevention strategy. Rather, emphasis has been placed on program implementation, not evaluation.

It is not the purpose of this paper to debate the merits of funding practices, but merely to point out that the absence of a program evaluation component makes it very difficult to discern which approaches assist in reducing criminal opportunism - the very purpose of the research in the first place.

Moreover, the absence of a standard document format to communicate the findings of evaluative research earlier compounded the problem of "getting a handle" on effective crime prevention programming within the police community.

To make matters worse, universal measurement to evaluate the effectiveness or lack of regard in implemented strategies has not yet been established; thereby making it difficult to compare, interpret, and grasp the significance of similar studies.

During the winter of 1982, a research proposal designed to test the effectiveness of Neighborhood Watch as a crime prevention strategy was submitted to the Solicitor General of Canada for funding.
Unlike previous submissions, this proposal was designed to be longitudinal in its tura and include an implementation and evaluation phase. Out of necessity, the 1981 proposal suggested that funding be provided over a two-year period to coincide with fruitful findings. This approach resulted in receiving funding for both phases from the Sannicicar General of Canada and the Suname Voucher Program.

Historically, police agencies have conducted cost-benefit analyses and considered crime prevention strategies by comparing pre- and post-crime reports. Clearly, the incidence of reported crime is uncertain, but by measuring citizen reactions which had been reliable and objective, gauge the success or failure of a given strategy on reducing the occurrence of crime.

This study took into account consideration, particularly during the evaluation phase, whereby an examination and comparison of the following variables conducted:

(i) the pre and post viccifl experiences of races
(ii) the pre and post race of reporting crime to the police
(iii) the pre and post race at which people called in the telephone of the neighbour when they observed someone damaging or stealing the neighbour's property;

Civ) the pre and post race at which people talked to the offender after having observed damaging or stealing others' property;

(V) the pre and post household security scores;

(vi) the pre and post yard security scores;

(vii) the pre and post Level of social cohesion -
Neighbourhood Watch programs implemented elsewhere have been attributed with great success from time to time despite the absence of reasonably sophisticated research designs and/or devices to measure program performance. This study, in addition to making the pre and post comparisons noted above, will attempt to explain what variable(s) or mechanical aspects of the Neighbourhood Watch Program, as implemented in Thunder Bay, were paramount to its success or failure as a crime prevention strategy.

Generally, it has been theorized that the level of social cohesiveness increases following the introduction of a Neighbourhood Watch Program.

Natural outcomes of increased social cohesiveness are alleged to include a greater spirit of co-operation and the acceptance of responsibilities orientated toward watching out for both the neighbour and his/her property.

When coupled with a heightened awareness to properly secure the household and yard property, the Neighbourhood Watch Program functions to harden the target physically as well as socially.

In keeping with the above hypotheses were formulated:

1. Residents who have been exposed to a Neighbourhood Watch Program will have a higher level of social cohesiveness than residents who have not been similarly exposed.

2. The victim experience of residential areas previously exposed to Neighbourhood Watch will be lower than residential areas not exposed previously to this program.

3. A residential area exposed to a Neighbourhood Watch Program will subsequently exhibit a lower victim experience.

4. Neighbourhood Watch is an effective program to reduce the occurrence of residential property crime.
5. Neighbourhood Vacc h work s c o radue a ch e occurrar.e e e e f e ri= e
as a rasui ; o f ch e iscrea.s a d leve l QZ hom a an d yar d securit y
which occur s followi n g exposur e e zo ch e hem a securit y componer. c
of ch e Neighbourhood d Wacci i progam .

6. Maighbourhood d Uáce h vork s c o radue a ch a occuraac e o é c rla e as
a. resul c o £ ch a increas e d ac e a ? can e a o f a eighbours vi s a' via
all neighbourhood d propert y followi n g exposur e e c o aa d acepcaac a
of LapLia d socia l rssponaibilicie s vhic h exten d oucsid a ch e l s
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BACKGROUND

Funding was obtained in 1982 and 1983 from the Solicitor General of Canada through the Summer Youth Employment Program to conduct a research project designed to test the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch as a crime prevention strategy. The research project was divided into two phases; the first involved the implementation of the program in a pre-selected residential area whereas the second phase dealt with the evaluation of the program.

For each phase, a Project Director and six interviewers were hired. The same director was used throughout the one year longitudinal study to provide continuity.

THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

The City of [Redacted] was divided into sixty-eight (68) police patrol and crime reporting areas.

A site consisting of two hundred (200) households in one of the sixty-eight areas exhibiting a relatively high rate of reported crime was selected to test the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Watch Program. An additional control site was determined and would be examined one year later during the evaluation phase of the study. The Project Director and interviewers were involved in the site selection process.

Following selection of the residential test and control sites, the Director and Project Workers were requested to take part in the construction of a survey questionnaire designed to obtain data relating to victim experience,
physical household property security and a host of other variables.

At the commencement of each casework, the project workers were directed to make a second visit to each of the two hundred households for the purposes of:

(i) conducting a victim survey
(ii) conducting a house check
(iii) explaining and introducing the concept of Neighborhood Watch to each household
(iv) identifying potential block captains
(v) laying the groundwork for implementation of the Neighborhood Watch concept

Active incar-iation began in the first week of June 1982 and was completed by the end of August of the same year. A total of 162 households responded to the questionnaire. The responses on the questionnaire were coded, transferred and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

33 variables and 34 variables were coded and analyzed to display the relative importance of the variables with respect to obtaining a measure of household/yard security and social cohesion, compositional variables were constructed using the computational function of the program. The computation function algebraically adds the values of the variables specified in the equation. An equation is provided in Appendix A.

At the conclusion of the sampling, block units consisting of 20 households each were ascertainment. Measures of accuracy of household/yard security and social cohesion were obtained near the library at which the block members selected block captains by the block members.

The Crime Control Office and agencies of the project were assisted by a later date. The purpose of the survey was to assess the level of social cohesion, the purpose of the survey was to assess the level of social cohesion, the purpose of the survey was to assess the level of social cohesion, the purpose of the survey was to assess the level of social cohesion.
Following the selection of the block captains, the Crime Prevention Officer invited the appointed block captains to attend at Headquarters to select their section leader. (See Appendix "C").

Throughout the course of the year, between the implementation and evaluation project phases, one meeting was held monthly to accommodate the needs of the block captains and one meeting a month was held to meet the needs of the section members. Block captain meetings were held at Headquarters and Section meetings took place at the local library.

Meeting content involved discussions regarding security programs, methods of responding to criminal behaviour, neighbourhood responsibilities, and criminalistics. The Crime Prevention Officer attended all meetings to provide information and advice.

In the early stages of the program, it was decided that Neighbourhood Watch was not a program that should be police administered. Rather, the need was stressed to develop a sense of program ownership amongst Neighbourhood Watch household members. Therefore, a spirit of independence was fostered through the deliberate involvement of the program members in the decision making with respect to the direction the program should take immediately following its implementation. A natural consequence of this approach was the establishment of a monthly news bulletin by the section leader and directed towards the membership. (See Appendix D)

Finally, Neighbourhood Watch signs were posted in February of 1983 indicating the existence of a neighborhood involved in a Neighbourhood Watch Program. It was believed that this would help to create a sense of community and assist to sustain the program over time. (See Appendix E).

Evaluation Phase

This part of the research project commenced one year later in the month of May 1983. A project director and six workers were hired and directed to
The concrote sicca d ca n (1 0) alia sawa y :r e m ch a lzp Lamar. a:ic n Sara an d i s rough ly c wic a a s Larg a i n gaegrphi c ara a a s sh e cas e si - e. rr.is accoun c s 50 r cr. e - nac h large r ruaba r o i rscaive d quisccionna ir a s (i.e . 252).
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CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

Presentation Format

In the majority of cases the reader will be provided with a sec of three data tables. The first of these three tables will contain information relative to the Westfort Test Site prior to the implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch Program. The second table will display information regarding the Westfort Test Site following the implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch program, while the third table of the sec will contain comparative Control Site data.

TABLE 1

WESTFORT TEST SITE HOUSEHOLDS VICTIMIZED PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

VICTIM EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>(162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(131)</td>
<td>(162)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 162
TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICTIM EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4S 92.6</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10) (125)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H - U 5

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICTIM EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(L9.6) C236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X - 23 6
The data provided in Tables 1 and 2 indicate that victim experience or the actual occurrence of property crime in the Westfort Test Site decreased substantially (67.7%) following the implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch Program. This suggests that Neighbourhood Watch is effective.

When we examine Tables 1 and 3 collectively we discover a victim experience rate in the control site which is approximately the same as that previously experienced by the Westfort Test Site respondents prior to the implementation of the program.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA VICTIMIZED IN THE WESTFORT TEST SITE PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 31
USL 55

AREA OF THE HOUSEHOLD VICTIMIZED D: FOLLOWING INSTALLATION OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

- ST EQUIPPED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>GARAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IA3LES

THIS ASSOCIATION OF THE HOUSEHOLD VICTIMIZED S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>TAIlD</th>
<th>GARAGE</th>
<th>GARDEN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>42-6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA VICTIMIZED

AREA OF THE HOUSEHOLD VICTIMIZED D

?rior ch a inPlasaencasio n o f ch e ^eignbouratoo d Mace h ?r3gra a ch a or.i.ici - nil" carga c ara a inch e CJescfor c Tas c Si: a appeara- i z b a ch e housetioL d yar d -ten 43.4^; o fa i l propret y crtttn a raiacin g c o chi s aorcio n o f ch e household.
Kuilowing the implementation of the program not one occurrence relating to damaged or stolen yard property was reported to the researchers to have occurred. The house proper and the family auto still appear to be victimized although the frequency of occurrence with respect to the household has decreased by 75% as indicated in Tables 4 and 5.

In comparison, the findings presented in Table 6 indicate that the majority of crime occurring in the Control Site relates primarily to the household yard and car with 42.6% and 36.2% of all victims reporting crime to these areas respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME TYPE</th>
<th>THEFT FROM YARD</th>
<th>WILFUL DAMAGE</th>
<th>BREAK &amp; ENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THEFT FROM AUTO</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE THEFT</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N * 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

CRIMINAL OFFICE TYPES RELATING TO WESTFORT T3S SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft From Auto</td>
<td>30.0Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.0Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0Z</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9

CRIME TYPES RELATING TO HOUSEHOLDS VICTIMIZED IN THE VESSEFOR T SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft From Yard</td>
<td>40.4£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilful Damage</td>
<td>23.4£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break &amp; Enter</td>
<td>10.0Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.0Z</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICE TYPES

Aaa aaaanica. inc a Table 4 , 5, an d 6 ch e d iic a praseacec t in Table 7, 8, and 9 provi de camparaciv a i.afl aacio n regardin g offac ic a cypea . Thy c of property fro m ch e yard , wh il ea cr quen cac. s cyp e pri o r; o ch eLa pia- nac tion of Neighbourhoo d Vacc h in ch e Vescfor c Tes t Slca , di d r o c occ u.
following implementaCion. Thi s offence type, however, appears to have occurred frequently in the Control Site as indicated in Table 9. Thi same holds for wilful damage and theft from auto in the Control Site.

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF VICTIMS IN THE WESTFORT TEST SITE REPORTING A CRIME AGAINST THEIR PROPERTY TO THE POLICE PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED TO THE POLICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N - 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF VICTIMS IN THE WESTFORT TEST SITE REPORTING A CRIME AGAINST THEIR PROPERTY TO THE POLICE FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED TO THE POLICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N - 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORTING 3EHAVIOUR : CRIME S AGAINST TOWN PROPERTY

A comparison of Tables 1 and 1 reveals a large percentage of victims for the "Teal: Sec all of the crimes occurred following.racial.changes in the neighborhood program. This suggests a decrease in the frequency with which crimes are reported against town property when a neighborhood watch program is present. Table 1 indicates a decrease in the percentage of victims when a neighborhood watch program is present. This decrease appears to be dependent upon exposure to a neighborhood watch program.
### TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHEN VICTIMS IN THE WESTFORT TEST SITE REPORTED A CRIME AGAINST THEIR PROPERTY TO THE POLICE PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEN REPORTED CRIME TO POLICE</th>
<th>ALMOST IMMEDIATELY</th>
<th>WITHIN 4 HRS</th>
<th>THE NEXT DAY</th>
<th>A FEW DAYS LATER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>N - 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHEN VICTIMS IN THE WESTFORT TEST SITE REPORTED A CRIME AGAINST THEIR PROPERTY TO THE POLICE FOLLOWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEN REPORTED CRIME TO POLICE</th>
<th>ALMOST IMMEDIATELY</th>
<th>THE NEXT DAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>N - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WH2S VICTIMS IN THE CONTROL SITE P.ECRTZO
A CRIME AGAINST THEIR PROPERTY TO THE POLICE

WHEN SE2ORTH3 CRIME TO POLICE

ALMOST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WH2S VICTIMS IN THE CONTROL SITE P.ECRTZO</th>
<th>WHEN SE2ORTH3 CRIME TO POLICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATELY WITHIN 71.1%</td>
<td>J 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2S) (8) (3) (39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SWIFTNESS OF aE?oaTI.VC T O POLICE N-39

Tablas 1 3 an d l. 4 wha n janpara d indicac s cha c a graaca r 3arcar::ag a Q C Vast fort Tsis c Sic a vic-i:n s canca d e o raecor t crin a 222ir.s c chai r prac. a zy alaosc imadiael y c o th e Polic a followin g g i jnJSnenca a n o c'c'n e. "'nigh-bourrioood Watc h Program . Th e e c Igura s ar a 43.0 l an d 35.7 l raspeccfuii y , suggescins cha c ch a progra m ha.d a signiz1car. s effac e o n ch e raporcia g behaviour o f ch a "i cacfor c cas t sic a ra3p0ndan.es .
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VESTFORT Tzs T St T PES?OMOENT SWH O OBSEavE D A^ D RE?ORTE 3 CHCI E UKIC K OCCURRED U TAZ ::EIICH30UREO0 D T OTH E POC IC H PRIO R T OTH E ^PLEM^aA T^ON OF THE LNZICIM SOURHOO O V A T 3 PROGR A M

OBSERVED car-t E A:: D REPO RTE D T O `POLIC Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YESNP</th>
<th>^ TOTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.01 %</td>
<td>50.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) (3)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y=15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17
WESTFORT TEST SITE RESPONDENTS WHO OBSERVED AND REPORTED CRIME WHICH OCCURRED IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD TO THE POLICE FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVED CRIME AND REPORTED TO POLICE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O TOTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(0) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 18
CONTROL SITE RESPONDENTS WHO OBSERVED AND REPORTED CRIME WHICH OCCURRED IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD TO THE POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVED CRIME AND REPORTED TO POLICE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O TOTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.6% 36.4</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(8) (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSE TO OBSERVED CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR
Prior to the implementation of the program, only 50.1% of Westfort test site respondents who observed criminal behaviour reported it to the Police, compared to 100% following the implementation of the program. Granted, the sample size is rather small. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that the Neighbourhood Watch program is effective in causing respondents to phone the Police when criminal behaviour is observed.

In the accompanying Table 18 the data indicates that 63.6% of the Control Site respondents contacted the Police when criminal behaviour was observed. This finding lends support to the idea that reporting
frequency range e deperid. e upon nch e prasanc a of jair. c Police/ 1 Public prover. on program s dasi. e c a generac s afiir=aciv a action.

FOLLOW? TO AFTISMAUTIVE AFTION

As a follow up to preceding action of aerials of cable s casoadeitc s vее e asked co indicac a with a course e of action channel you did ask a call a Lcha y uее t c a observe e someone coming again to another neighbor's property.

TABLE 1.9

AFTISMAUTIVE AFTION RESPONSES OF WEST70RT TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD TALK TO YOU</th>
<th>D PHONE WOULD BE HEIGH</th>
<th>D PHONE OTHER</th>
<th>R TOTAL</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFENDER POLICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niz 34.0</td>
<td>z 3-?r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) (136)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(162)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=162

TABLE 2.0

AFTISMAUVUE AFTION RESPONSE S O F WEST70RT TESTS SIT T "ER..." ENTS T FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF E NEICEBCRHOO OACAT K PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD TALK TO YOU</th>
<th>D PHONE WOULD BE MEICK30U</th>
<th>D R TOTA</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFENDER POLICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) CIT</td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>M-135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION RESPONSES OF CONTROL SITE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>WOULD TALK TO OFFENDER</th>
<th>WOULD PHONE POLICE</th>
<th>WOULD PHONE NEIGHBOUR</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(220)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the purpose of Neighbourhood Watch is to instill, within the minds of the program participants, the idea that they must share in the responsibility of dealing with the social problem of crime. One of the ways this acceptance of responsibility is acted out is through intervention, direct or indirect, whenever a criminal act is observed. Moreover, it is held by the proponents of the Neighbourhood Watch Program that the heightened awareness and social cohesiveness derived from organized neighbourhoods might function to influence the way in which the intervention is manifested. To determine the impact of Neighbourhood Watch in influencing the way in which program participants would socially intervene, each respondent was asked what course of action they would take whenever they observe an act of criminality being committed against their neighbour's property.

The finding presented in Tables 14, 20 and 21 indicate that the program had very little impact on which course of social intervention would actually be taken. Phoning the Police was the preferred avenue, with little impact on the selection of either talking to the offender or phoning a neighbour about the victimized. Similar results were
caccordad a r Ch e Canera i Sic arasaqadancs.

**TABLE 2.2**

NUMBER OF NEIGHBOURS: S: N O Y NAM E 3 Y RESPONDENT S III TH E WEST FOR T T ZS: 
SITE PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBERS OF NEIGHBOURS KNOWN BY NAME 3 Y RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 7-10</td>
<td>17.9Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN</td>
<td>25.3Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2.3**

NUMBER OF NEIGHBOURS KNOWN BY NAME: E 3 Y RESPONDENT S I N TH E WEST FOR T TH E NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF FAMILIES KNOWN BY NAME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 55</td>
<td>17.5Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN</td>
<td>13.5Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>MORE THAN 11</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.9Z</td>
<td>49.4,</td>
<td>(162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.3Z</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5Z</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.62</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 24

NUMBER 01 NEIGHBOURS KNOWN BY NAME BY RESPONDENTS IN THE CONTROL SITE

NUMBER OF NEIGHBOURS KNOWN BY NAME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS THAN 3 4-</th>
<th>6-7</th>
<th>1-8</th>
<th>MORE THAN 10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.2% (38)</td>
<td>29% (70)</td>
<td>13% (44)</td>
<td>29.8% (83)</td>
<td>63% (236)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 indicates that 67.3% of all respondents in the Wesfort Test Site prior to the implementation knew the names of seven (7) or more neighbours compared to 74.1% following the program's implementation, thereby suggesting that Neighbourhood Watch assists in sponsoring social contact.

In the Control Site only 54% of the respondents knew seven (7) or more neighbours by name.

TABLE 25

NUMBER OF NEIGHBOURS VISITED BY RESPONDENTS IN THE WESCORT TEST SITE PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

NUMBER OF FAMILIES VISITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS THAN 4-6</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>MORE THAN 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.5% (111)</td>
<td>20.4% (33)</td>
<td>7.4% (12)</td>
<td>3.7% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(162)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 26

**Number of Neighbours Visited by Respondents in 73 Street Following the Implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Families Visited</th>
<th>Less Than 3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>More Than 10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.2X</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td>6.2Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2S</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.9X</td>
<td>Z1.2Z</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5X</td>
<td>(172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Families Visited in the Control Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Families Visited</th>
<th>Less Than 3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>More Than 10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.62</td>
<td>6.2Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2S</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked about their regular visits to neighbours; the results are indicated in Table 25 and 26. This response was more than expected (368), which compared to the control group at 35.3%.
This again suggests that the program assists in fostering social contact.

Comparatively, only 27.1% of respondents in the Control Site indicated that they visit three (3) or more neighbours on a regular basis.

### TABLE 2.8

SOCIAL COHESIVENESS OF WESTFORT TEST SITE RESPONDENTS PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SOCIAL COHESIVENESS</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.1X</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>(162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K=135

### TABLE 2.9

SOCIAL COHESIVENESS OF WESTFORT TEST SITE RESPONDENTS FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SOCIAL COHESIVENESS</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>(135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K=135
### Table 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL COHESIVENESS OF CONTROL SITE RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SOCIAL COHESIVENESS OF TESTING SITE RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF SOCIAL COHESIVENESS</strong></td>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF SOCIAL COHESIVENESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHCO</td>
<td>W TOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.3Z</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL COHESION N**

Social cohesion was assessed by combining several variables: the number of acquaintances and the number of neighbors known, wishes of neighbors, participation in community activities, and the level of cohesion as evidenced by the comparative figures in Table 23 and 29. The findings in the Control Site indicate no contrary evidence to previous program findings, and support the theory that the program has the ability to increase the level of cohesion.

**Za21z 3 1**

| IS THERE ENICHBOURHOO O SPIRI T **NEIGHBOURHOOD SPIRIT PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION?** |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| XES SOMSKHA                                    | 33.3                                        |
| 11.67.                                         | 25.2Z                                       |
| (36) (35) (-11)                                | (1) (6)                                    |
TABLE 32

PERCEPTION OF WESTFORT TEST SITE RESPONDENTS REGARDING THE PRESENCE OF NEIGHBOURHOOD SPIRIT FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS THERE NEIGHBOURHOOD SPIRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES SOMEWHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.3% *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N-135

TABLE 33

PERCEPTION OF CONTROL SITE RESPONDENTS REGARDING THE PRESENCE OF NEIGHBOURHOOD SPIRIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS THERE NEIGHBOURHOOD SPIRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES SOMEWHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.9% 11.4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(158)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N-236

Neighbourhood Spirit

When asked about the presence of neighbourhood spirit, 74.7% of the Westfort Test Site respondents indicated yes to somewhat of a presence prior to the implementation of the program compared to the post implementation percentage of 90.4%. The Control Site distribution is reminiscent of the pre implementation Test Site data, with 78.3% indicating yes or somewhat with regard to the presence of neighbourhood spirit.
TABLE 34

PERCEPTION OF VISITORS TO TEST SITE RESPONDENTS REGARDING THE OCCURRENCE OF PROPERTY CRIME IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD WITHIN THE LAST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASED</th>
<th>SAME</th>
<th>DECREASED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(162)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *

N=16

TABLE 35

PERCEPTION OF VISITORS TO TEST SITE RESPONDENTS REGARDING THE OCCURRENCE OF PROPERTY CRIME IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD WITHIN THE LAST YEAR FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASED</th>
<th>SAME</th>
<th>DECREASED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=135
TABLE 3.6

PERCEPTION OF CONTROL SITE RESPONDENTS REGARDING THE OCCURRENCE OF PROPERTY CRIME IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD OVER THE PAST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY CRIME INCREASED OVER THE PAST YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCEPTION OF FREQUENCY OF PROPERTY CRIME

Next, program participants were asked whether the occurrence of property crime in their neighbourhood had increased over the past year.

Without question, the responses in Table 35 suggest that a complete turn around occurred with respect to the respondents' perceptions of the frequency of property crime in their neighbourhood.

Specifically, 35.1% more respondents indicated that they believed the occurrence of property crime had decreased following the implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch program. It is significant to note that the perception of the resident regarding property crime levels correspond to the victim experience data provided in the first table of this chapter.
TABLE 3

"KAJTVSTFOR T T13 T SITZ RESPONDENT S THOUGH T rNLC V RESPONDENT S i/cE E uGTY C
TO ASSIS T 1 N REDUCIN G TH E OPPORTUNIT Y T O COMM T PROPERT Y CRIM E I N TH E
AREA PRIOR T O TH E IMPLEMENTATIO N NO F TH E NEIGHBOURHOOD DWATC H PROGRA M

RESIDENT METHOD S O F REDUCIN G OPPORTUNIT I Y T O COMMIT PROPERT Y CRIM E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOOK AFTE R NEIGH - SECCE a</th>
<th>ETAL</th>
<th>X TO PHON</th>
<th>EPHON</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30UR'S PROPERT Y PROPERT</td>
<td>Y OFTIND ER</td>
<td>S NEIGHBOUR</td>
<td>S POLIC E</td>
<td>OTHE R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.22</td>
<td>5.7*</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.5::</td>
<td>7.5S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TASU 3

WHAT KESSTtAR X TES T SIT E RESPONDENT S THOUGH T FELLO W RESICE NT S VA'S E DOIN G
TO ASSIS T 1 N REDUCIN G TH E OPPORTUNIT Y T O COMMIT PROPERT Y CRIM E I N TH E
AREA FOLLOWIN G TH E IMPLEMENTATIO N NO F TH E NEIGH 3 OURHOOD DWATC H PROGRA M

RESI3E2tt METHOD S O F REDUCIN G OPPORTL'MIT Y T O COMMIT PROPERT Y CRIM E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCK AFTE R NEIGH - SECUR</th>
<th>ETAL</th>
<th>X TO PHON</th>
<th>EPHON</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOUR'S PROPERT Y PROPERT</td>
<td>T 0F7ENDER</td>
<td>S STEICH30UR</td>
<td>S POLIC E</td>
<td>OTHE R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.32 13-I</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(92) (17)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(130)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N-L30
TABLE 3.9

WHAT CONTROL SITE RESPONDENTS THOUGHT FELLOW RESIDENTS WERE DOING TO ASSIST IN REDUCING THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMIT PROPERTY CRIME IN THE AREA

RESIDENT METHODS OF REDUCING OPPORTUNITY TO COMMIT PROPERTY CRIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS PERCEIVED TO BE EMPLOYED</th>
<th>TO REDUCE OPPORTUNITY</th>
<th>TO COMMIT PROPERTY CRIME IN THEIR AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOOK AFTER NEIGHBOUR'S PROPERTY</td>
<td>E TAL</td>
<td>K TO PHON E PHON E OTHE R TOTA L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECUR Y OFFENDER</td>
<td>75.7% 9.8</td>
<td>9% 1.3% 11.9% .4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUR'S PROPERTY</td>
<td>(178) (23)</td>
<td>(2) (3) (28) (1) (236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERT Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Westfort Test Site respondents were first contacted prior to the implementation of Neighbourhood Watch, they indicated that up to that point neighbours primarily looked after neighbours' property and phoned the Police to assist in reducing the occurrence of neighbourhood property crime. Following the implementation of the program an even greater percentage - 70.8% - felt that neighbours were looking after their neighbour's property, and another 13.1% of the respondents believed that neighbours were more diligent in securing their worldly possessions. In any event, a shift occurred whereby phoning the Police was no longer viewed to be occurring as frequently - suggesting that phoning the Police was no longer proactively viewed as a practical nor effective method of dealing with neighbourhood crime. More significantly, this finding further suggests that a change in the attitude may have taken place regarding the need for the resident to accept as his/her responsibility the taking of affirmative action rather than sitting back and
defining criteria and general aspects falling within the scope of the Police Force.

to some extent, the crime rate in a particular area (La ch e correspondin g Coacral Sica cab the support tch e above, with h127a) or the residential indicator indicating that assistance could effectively reduce crime in the vicinity provided by the Police. This suggests that belief is that the prevention of crime falls within the domain of the Police - the public.

Furthermore, a significantly greater number of residents - 75.7% - indicated in the Coacral Sic e dac a cable, perceive their residence to be assisting in reducing crime by looking after their neighbour's property. This figure is also higher than the equivalent in several other areas. Therefore, the contract is effective in providing the public with this particular service specifically for the purpose of reducing crime in the neighbourhood. The cable will provide the residents with an increased awareness of the program, thereby facilitating the social response of participants to occurrences of property crime in their neighbourhood.

THE DECREE TO WHICH REFERENCE IS CURR 3 THIS: HOOTSHOLD AND YARD PROPERTY

To that end, the analysis has focused on the impact of the Neighbourhood Watch Program in shaping the social response of program participants to occurrences of P. crime in their neighbourhood. The cable will provide the residents with an increased awareness of the program, thereby facilitating the social response of participants to occurrences of property crime in their neighbourhood.
TABLE 4.0

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE DECREE TO WHICH HOUSEHOLDS INCLUSIVE OF THE CO Porsche YARD PROPERTY WERE PHYSICALLY SECURED IN THE CONTROL SITE AND IN THE WESTFORT TEST SITE PRIOR TO AND FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARATIVE AREAS</th>
<th>DEGREE TO WHICH HOUSEHOLDS/PROPERTY PHYSICALLY SECURED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTFORT PRIOR TO PROGRAM</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTFORT FOLLOWING PROGRAM</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL SITE</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(129)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before we discuss the significance of table 4.0, a description of what is meant by "physically secure" is in order. In the methodology chapter it was mentioned that composite variables were constructed to measure social cohesion, yard security, and household security. All the component variables comprising the yard and household security composite variables were added together to create a global security composite variable. Items such as fencing, locking mechanisms, the securing of recreational and yard equipment, household and shed lighting, door types, window types, the presence or absence of trees and shrubs in front of basement windows, and a host of other security items were included in the construction of the global security component variable (See Appendix A).
The data displays very strongly that residents responded positively to changes in the Westfort Tasc Sic resident's response program. Residents are more comfortable in an area that has a sense of security following exposure to a program. This finding is supported by a Control Sic data which described similar improvements to preprogram implementation of Westfort Tasc Sic.

**Table 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTION OF WESTFORT TASC SIC SITE RESPONDENTS' REACTION TO THE IMPACT OF MEICK30LF RHQCD WATCH AS A PROPERTY CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGY FOLLOWING ITS IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT OF SIGHTENING SCSO TOTAL TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY MUCH IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.62 54.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES REGARDING WHETHER WESTFORT TASC SIC SITE RESPONDENTS WOULD RECOMMEND NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH AS A CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGY FOLLOWING ITS IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD RECOMMEND RHQCD WATCH SCSO TOTAL TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.52 1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To complement the evaluation phase of the study, the Westfort Test Site program participants were asked to indicate the degree to which Neighbourhood Watch assisted in reducing the opportunity to commit crime in their neighbourhood, and whether or not they personally would recommend the program to other citizens.

As indicated in Tables 41 and 42, well over 95% of the respondents believed the program had very much to somewhat of an impact on reducing the opportunity to commit crime in their neighbourhood. Moreover, the distribution of responses relating to recommending the program indicates that over 98% of the residents believed the program should be recommended as a preventative strategy for other interested neighbourhoods.

**SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS**

**VICTIM EXPERIENCE**

The findings presented in this chapter suggest that the way in which the Neighbourhood Watch program was implemented in Thunder Bay was effective in reducing the victim experience of the Westfort Test Site residents. In fact, there was a 67.7% reduction in the occurrence of all property crime. Not one respondent following the implementation of the program reported or indicated a theft of property from the yard had occurred throughout the year. This is a significant finding, given that almost all related crime prior to the program involved the theft of property from a yard. Similarly, not one incident of wilful damage was reported or indicated to have occurred following the implementation of the program.

The principal crime related problems in the control site included theft from the yard (40.4%), wilful damage (23.4%), and theft from the household auto (21.3%).

These findings support the concept that Neighbourhood Watch as implemented, was effective in reducing the occurrence of theft from yards and wilful damage.
A slight increase in the percentage of Westfort and Sic residents who contact the Police to report a crime against their own property cache, following the implementation of the program. However, it would appear that the program was effective in causing persons who do report a crime against their property to do so quickly, which is indicative of the program being effective. In comparison, 45% of those Westfort residents who reported a crime against their property prior to the implementation of the program, the hypothesis that impact is supported by the data, with 63.5% of such respondents reporting an observed criminal act to the Police.

As a follow-up question, all respondents were asked what they would do if they observed someone committing a crime against their neighbour's property, indicating that the findings suggest that residents would change their reporting behaviour, with 85% of those Westfort and Sic respondents reporting an observed criminal act to the Police, compared to 45% of those who observed a crime being reported to the Police following the implementation of the program. This suggests that the hypothesis that the program had an impact is supported by the data.
level of interaction similarly increased, indicating that the social cohesiveness was heightened as indicated by the associated comparative tables. A significant impact of the program appears when the data regarding whether a feeling of neighbourhood spirit had developed over time, with over 90% indicating such was the case following the implementation of the program compared to 74.7% of the Test Site respondents prior to program exposure, and 78% of the Control Site respondents.

**PERCEPTION OF THE CRIME LEVEL**

Again, the findings are significant, with a complete reversal of perceptions occurring in the Westfort Test Site respecting the level of neighbourhood crime following implementation of the program. Forty-two point two percent (42.2%) of the Test Site residents perceived the level of neighbourhood crime to have decreased, compared to 3.1% of Westfort Test Site respondents prior to the program, and 3% of the Control Site respondents.

**PERCEIVED APPROACHES UTILIZED BY FELLOW RESIDENTS TO ASSIST IN REDUCING THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMIT PROPERTY CRIME**

The data displayed in the relevant tables indicate that a greater percentage of Westfort Test Site respondents following the implementation of the program believed neighbours were assisting to reduce the opportunity to commit neighbourhood crime by looking after their neighbour's property, 70.6% compared to 57.2%, and securing one's own property, 13.1% compared to 5.7%. The Control Site respondents perceive neighbours to be assisting to reduce the occurrence of neighbourhood crime primarily by looking after their neighbour's property, 75.7%, and phoning the Police, 11.9%.

The major finding here is the down playing of phoning the Police by Westfort Test Site respondents as a resident method to reducing the opportunity to commit neighbourhood property crime. Prior to the
program, 23.2 of the respondents perceive this to be highly utilized compared to pro-
gram 4.5.
This signal suggests a possible change in the attitude of residents towards neigh-
bourhood policing, where residents perceive their involvement in dealing with issues of crime.

PHYSICAL SECURITY OF HOUSEHOLD/PROPERTY

There is some evidence to suggest that the program has had a significant impact on increasing the level of household and yard security (Table 40) in the area, which may largely explain the decrease in the occurrence of property crime through Neighborhood Watch, particularly of yard property, and explain the relative high occurrence of property crime in the Control area.

SUCCESS TESTS PAYS HOME OWNED NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Over 95% of the Westminster and Tasman respondents perceive the program to have had a very significant impact on reducing neighborhood property crime. Further, 98.5% of the residents would recommend the program to other neighborhoods as a crime prevention strategy.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DISCUSSION

This research project was divided into two phases; the first involved the implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch program in a pre-selected residential area, whereas the second phase dealt with the evaluation of the program a year later. An additional control site was determined and similarly examined one year later during the evaluation phase of the study.

Data was extracted from 162 Test Site households during the implementation phase, and 135 Test Site households throughout the evaluation portion of the study. Comparative data was obtained from 236 Control Site households from a residential area located ten (10) miles away from the Test Site.

The data was then analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences to produce bivariate and multivariate contingency tables.

Clearly, the data indicates that the collective victim experience of Westfort Test Site respondents decreased substantially following the implementation of the Neighbourhood Watch program.

The decrease in the victim experience of Westfort Test Site respondents can largely be accounted for by the virtual absence of yard theft - which contributed 54.8% to the total victim experience prior to the program exposure. This suggests that the program was particularly effective in reducing the occurrence of this crime type.

Still, we have yet to determine what aspect of the program was particularly significant with respect to reducing the occurrence of theft from household yards.

The respondents of the Westfort Test Site indicated through their responses that the level of social cohesion was heightened moderately as a result of
cha pr o gran , an d Ba y i n par ? ax ? Iai n ch e succes s o r ch a pr o 5 ran . Thi s cheory i s sataawha c supporte d b y ch e Contro l Sic a dat a whic h indic ate s chat che y hav e a ralacivel y la w Lave l o f socia l cohesio n an d hig h vicci a axaerienca raca . However , ch a chang a i n ch e Lava l o f socia l cohesio n in . che Vestfort T as t Sic a wa s o o 3ligh t c a explai n full y ch e mecha nica l aspect o f ch e pragras i d irectl y responsible f or r reducin g ch e occurrence o f propert y c ria a , an d in particular , chef s o f propert y fro s t c h a y a r d .

Ih« answe r i s relati val / siatpl a - respondent s i n ch a Wastfort Tes T Sic a oeraiy incraraa d ch a la va l or yar d an d househol d s«curicy , as  indicaca d by sh e signifi can e percentag e differen ce o f ch e a disribucio a arasanca d in ta b l a 40 . Thi s become s ave n cor e signifi can t v h e n v « conside r Tab l e 1 simultaneous !/, v hareb y v « ar a abl a c o dra v a direc t relationshi p bee * uesn ch e la va l o f physique l s«curicy y an d v i c ti a axparienca .

Having establishe d ch e ab o ve , i t st i ll regain s fo r u s c o determin e wha c aspect o f ch e progra m contribute d t o activatin g ch e Vascfort T as t Sic a respondents t o "bee f up " ch a la va l o f physique l s«curicy .

A portio n o f ch e a intervie w wa s restricte d d c c li -fyir ; t» a potenti al vulnerabil y o f faac h househol d C o ch a occurranc a o f propert y crime - Mor * i oport a i , a praliisin a y anal/s i 3 o f ch e victi m surve y dat a conduct e d la - iMdiata ly aita r th e e samplin g g o f ch e Wastfort T as t Sic a durin g ch e ispl exMa - cacian pha s e revela d ch a aajo r propert y crim e probl e m s raiatin g c o th a Tast Sica . Thi s informatio n wa s conve y e d c o Section an d 31oci c Captains followin g g ch e establishe m t o f chas e positions , whic h i n cur n wa s the n coionunicata d d c o a l l Haighbourhood W a c h respondents . Th e aachod s by whic h , th e informatio n wa s conve y e d d c o a l l Vascfort T as ; Sic a raspoad - ar.es include d Ch e repetitio n o f criainaliscic s vi a a neigbourhood d l tews Lacce r and , verbally , r- %\ Moc k seeiag s (Se e Appendi x X A ) .

Specifically, chaf e o f propert y va s cita d a s ch e principa l probl a , an d respondents wer e encourage d d c o cu m thei r oucsid a light s o n an d s acur e cheir outdoo r racreacio a lquir?men t an d cools/aachin ery .

ic woul d appea r then , th a t ch e appli catio n o f cri a e analysi s an d ch a utiliz a tion o f ch i s informatio n b y yaoa-polic a personne l s«curcura d inc o a n
organization such as Neighborhood Watch can be extremely effective in dealing with specific crime related problems.

Without the Neighborhood Watch structure, which in essence creates a formal citizen organization within residential areas previously exhibiting informal or loosely knit social ties, the application of crime analysis would in all probability fail. The newly created Neighborhood Watch organization is endowed with a purpose to prevent the occurrence of neighborhood crime, and philosophically maintains that all have a responsibility to act in concert in order to realize the organization's purpose.

Undoubtedly such organizations assist to create a greater level of social control within our neighborhoods by working with a common definition of deviant behavior and set of responses to deal with observed acts of criminality, and as such, should be considered when explaining victim experience.

In any event, the findings indicate that a Neighborhood Watch Program can effectively reduce the occurrence of property crime, suggest that the program was largely responsible for causing residents to acknowledge and accept the role of assuming a proactive stance in partnership with the Police - giving substance to the expression "Working Together To Prevent Crime."
DUPLICATIONS

1. Neighbourhood Watch Programs can be very effective in reducing the occurrence of residential property crime.

2. To be effective, crime analysis based upon vicissitudes experience data richer than a read crime statistics and disaster shared with which the bureaucracy of the citizen Neighbourhood Watch organization.

3. The utilization of a community communicator specific crime problems based upon vicissitudes data as an effective scaffold for generating an active response of Neighbourhood Watch particpants.

4. The heighten level of physical security of the task force due to the application of criminalistics and directly related to the reduction of residential property crime.

5. The introduction of a Neighbourhood Watch organization inc a neighbourhood as a measure of social cohesion as measured by frequency of social contacts.

6. Neighbourhoods which have been exposed to a Neighbourhood Watch program will exhibit lower level of social cohesion, physical security, and higher vicissitudes experience rates.

7. Exposure to a Neighbourhood Watch program causes citizens to acknowledge their responsibilities vis a vis crime, and do so assume a proactive stance in partnership with the Police.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That HazgkbowAood ttlatck o"gayUzatioru be AponAozzd and KZ4>OUA.CZA appioprUoXzLy pKavivzdzd at thz mwh.eA.pal Izvzl.

2. That identical btudca be conducted in otkzn. cities/towns and thz n.z£uZtb a f/th-4anz compa/izd uriXk thz ^A.n.dinq^ G& thu study.

3. Tkaz v-lectim expe/u.eewc £ AuAvzy*b e conductzd to determine e tspcifac cumz Kzlatzd ptioibznu of a g<Lyzn nzigkbowA- kood.

4. Tkat thz cAAjniyuzZatZic information kouAzd by Poticz FQA.CZA and ba&zd upon victim xpiniznce*b e ^keuzd viith thz Hziqk- bowJikood Watch Organizations.

5. Tkat victim xpzAizncz data be uXitizzd to zvaJUiatz tkz zihzctivznA* oh att c/Umez pJizvzention htMXzgiZA ion. tkz pwipotz oh dzvZoping a mznanghuJL and compa/urfivz universal performance measurement.
APPENDICES
GROUP 1

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH MEETING

DATE: Wednesday August 25, 1982
PLACE: Mary J. L. Black Library
TIME: 7:30

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Connors
Crime Prevention Officer

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Richmond (Project Leader)
Joan Alkenbrack (Project Worker)
Marcia Bevilacqua
Alda dos Santos
JoAnn Raynak

NUMBER OF GROUP MEMBERS. PRESENT: 4 ( 3 guests present)

BLOCK CAPTAIN: 131 Mary Street
ASSISTANT BLOCK CAPTAIN:
GROUP 2

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH MEETING

DATE: August 3, 1982
PLACE: Mary J. L. Slack Library
TIME: 7:30 pm.

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Conners (Crime Prevention Officer)

STAFF present: Andrea Richmond (Project Leader)
Joan Alkenbrack (Project Worker)
Marcia SeviTacqua (Project Worker)
Suzanne Oesmoulin (Project Worker)
Aldo Santos (Project Worker)
Rod Etheridge (Project Worker)
JoAnn Raynak (Project Worker)

NUMBER OF GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT: 6

LOCK CAPTAIN: 12 3 E. Christina Street
ASSISTANT LOCK CAPTAIN: 13 3 E. Christina Street
GROUP#3 NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH MEETING

DATE: August 5, 1982
PLACE: Mary J. L. Black Library
TIME: 7:30

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Connors
Crime Prevention Officer

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Richmond (Project Leader)
Joan Alkenbrack (Project Worker)
Marcia Bevilacqua " "
Suzanne Desmoulin " "
Alda dos Santos " "
Rod Etheridge " "
JoAnn Rawiak, " "

NUMBER OF GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT: 7

BLOCK CAPTAIN: 195 Mary street
ASSISTANT BLOCK CAPTAIN: 193 Mary Street
GROUP#5 NEIGHBOURe

DATE: August 9, 1982

PLACE: Mary J. L. Black Library

TIME: 7:30

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Connors
   Crime Prevention Officer

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Richmond (Project Leader)
   Joan ADcenbrack (Project Worker)
   ftircia Bevilacqua
   Alda dos Santos
   Rod Etheridge
   JoAnn Raynak

NUMBER OF GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT: 10

BLOCK CAPTAIN: 140 East Mary Street

ASSISTANT BLOCK CAPTAIN: 132 East Mary Street
DATE: Monday August 23, 1932
PLACE: Mary J.L. 31acJc Library
TIME: 7:30

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Connors
  Crime Prevention Officer

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Richmond (Project Leader)
  Joan Alkenbracfc (Project Workar)
  Marcia Bevliacqua
  Suzanne Qesmoulin
  Hod Etheridga

MEMBER OG C3OCP MEMBERS PRESENT: S

BLOCK CAPTAIN: 14 7 EasS 3rocic Straec

ASSISTANT 3LCCK CAPTAIN: 177 East 3rocic Straet
GROUP: 7

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH MEETING

DATE: Tuesday August 24, 1982
PLACE: Mary J. L. Black Library
TIME: 7:30

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Connors
Crime Prevention Officer

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Richmond (Project Leader)
  Joa n Alkenbrack (Project Worker)
  Marcia Bevilacqua " "
  Suzanne Desmoulin " "
  Alda dos Santos " "

NUMBER OF GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT: 6

* ELOC X CAPTAIN: 1212 Edward Street

ASSISTANT BLOCK CAPTAIN: 113 Brock Street
DATE: Monday August 23, 1982
PLACE: Mary J. L. Slack Library
TIME: 7:30

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Connor

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Ricunon (Project Leader)
Joan Alkenbrack (Project Worker)
Marcia Bevilacqua
Suzanne Desmoulins
JoAnn Rayna
Rod Etieridge

NUMBER OF GZOW9 MEISERS PRESENT: 3

3LOCX CAPTAIN: 1733 Rock Street

ASSISTANT 3LOCX CAPTAIN: 140 Rock Street
GROUP: 9

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH MEETING

DATE: Tuesday August 24, 1982

PLACE: Mary J. L. Black Library

TIME: 7:30

POLICE PRESENT: Constable Peter Connors
   Crime Prevention Officer

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Richmond (Project Leader)
   Joan Alkenbrack (Project Worker)
   Marcia Bevilacqua " "
   Suzanne Desmoulin " "
   Alda dos Santos " "

NUMBER OF GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT: 11

BLOCK CAPTAIN: 199-1 Francis Street

ASSISTANT BLOCK CAPTAIN: 163 Francis Street
To all neighbours in the Neighbourhood Watch Program in the Westfort Community, the following is a NEWSLETTER which will keep you up to date on what has been happening in the area since August of 1982.

The Neighbourhood Watch Program is now officially in effect as of January 29, 1983. This day our sljui u-rt unveiled. The captain and assistant captains, who joined in the effort of putting up signs, since the data we are on our own. What we do, «te, is entirely up to us as a community. Our community of some 200 homes plus, has been sectioned off into 10 (CSN) groups. Each group has its own Block Captain and Assistant Captain. Tow will attend and serve as our captains and assistants at our first meeting on March 16, 1983.

In November of 1982, all Block Captains and Assistances were called for our first meeting with Constable Connors, our Police Co-ordinator. At this meeting, the positions of Section Leader and Our Group Leader were filled. The Mechanics of the Neighbourhood Watch Program is as follows:
This is CS 8y le morlu: for «JIM»L, if there is a suspicious
lookng vehicle driving slowly or ad lovn' love? !e nd /ou
decide to contact the police, this 8 till La ran sood of f Mole
function 8f «sho?» sails, unless 8f ?surs, /ou can j rave
the necessary information yourself. per,
description of vehicle and perhaps even a description of the driver
or accused's). H toe. ac «Uc» dummit, coaten «a art nov
ta full apraelaa. 8 till sance: 8h Sceian LAMar and «» far 8M
above Lofannelaa fraa ;M lammataj, 8m s:tan kow or La can
«» «» «» sr raw# 1?4ers, «» to cum c neau â€œ; 8 neighbour in
their individual sections.

As this same meeting we were also informed that through the survey
conducted on each individual home last August, that 87% of the crimes in
our neighbourhood were outside the home. Fifty-four percent (54%) of
our ICO «» lw» joer Sack yard security. Before August at least
year there were:

4 scenes broken into
1 icy « la scalfl
J bb-fey av. 100
3 8? jr ANM Lma

Essentially what we must do is improve our backyard security. We
the k?«d our fence and tack fences during; Sa nhije «4 «how
our fhaMs lack«d.

"A 8k ta« cns« neighbours «Ce have notice growing either in «
8til (vone or 9?ek af cmair bo»8, 8?«84, Iety «hou ... as a
reasonable flagfl jiff cheenkness.

Our Diana Cattane and Alsiwara found it difficult to actually
hold an individual "crime meeting" those that did from the turn
out were very msite. Therefore, at the time Cattane meeting of
February 16, 1983, le «as decided that w* would try and hold a

**CONCERT MEETING**. This include* «v=v-keys In that Neighbourhood
Vac eh Prograf from Ease Christina to Fraeae N*erxe. Thia aeeing
vill b* a quealon and anawr aeeing, tf* will (Maeus tha content)
of ehia Newsletter la detail ac chat clav. Conacabl*. Connors «U:
bm chara to anaver any of your nsasdons.

---

**General Neighbourhood Hatch Meeting**
March 16, 1993
7:30 p.m.
Kary J. L. Black library

Al chough «· ar«, ac prtsane, a non-profit program and ra« vicwuc a
budgtc p= a>, unfareuactlr Chart ia and vill b* txp=mx*a. Unfort-
unae=17, th* Mary J. L. Black Library lb* **WILL BE**. If th*rc ia MM*
on* who knova of • plaea vh-ra wa can gather aa a eooaawaly, which ia
frva or chaaper, paaM advaa ac th* March 16th saceing,

Th* Library ia charginf $5.00 far th* largt *udieorlu* plus S3.00 For
Ch* J*s of echtr 100 " - " - . Tha cef=ra optional. V* will
dlaeus* chl at chs March 16th a*<clng. It haas b*m auggaad
that v* donaca SOx p=r neetlt (ach person) eo co*ar costa of the
hall and coffa*. Thia of course 1* mhjct Co chang* and will also
be discuaad at th* March 16th "•••ting. Ths* may b* aww brokkaep-
ln( tvovlad her* and ac tha owceing «* win hav* co find a eraasurtr.
If th*rc Is anyon* in eh= coiaauRier Ineretaad 1B chia position,
pl*aas= lac ua know ac th* March 10th ass*ting.

If you Ilk* cha Idaa of a N*wsst*tcar, it will b* up to you EO daeldt
how of tan ,v «=u *: k# ona. Eventually we will hav* to pay for
ehs copying of ths* Mvalateer. Thia will hav* to ha kept In and aa
an expene*.

Saw of you were contacted ac ch* beginning of Febraury regarding a
red and white van hac waa seen crutaling the Mary SC*<t area.
Although It waa a false al*m, (try* two fallows were delivering for
Che owner of th* van and vert given che wrong address), Che system
did work. Uelchln several hours of condacC with the Section Leader,
Che police had « description of Che Van. Che OJ* fellows driving le
And che Licence plats number.
OB 74/5 ERR 1a, 1MJ, SM Use Cipangia and Autacaats MC far GBMr avoed a «<la«. & in each Caanor Lofonaff use »»c la Qe«a+er ﬁ 19«2 et» Yallowing «rta» «+» seaascad ni Sur u «
1 car damped m t. franca
1 tank over $3000.00 - L ChUelM
1 stealife - S. Marr
1 huk «s» bear - S«swi Se«c
AS w« iwwral SB—mitye M-clat La -tarsh, «« dy» e 4laeva
possible idaa «m ss Aoc is adeuce oursalna igaitac crtu. ^is
following art «fav *u=za-tianc and <»m ne« ia o«*in + /** aor
from you <c ifia meeting.
1. J*duhet - daonoeTaca 'itiewa lacks.
MV »a sacura your beacs a
aears.
2. Alarm Tyremme = cununetrarians.
3. TLG in "Jfesa S-curier"<
4. Pile "Lady Square".
5. Rec tamahuff = Tax Teroa en Fammelian.
6. Pallet**** niX en aur cauma?? "nd child?«ti
ear. a more personal levels - new to walk care
«jik»a - ant blerelo ^y «e aiyie »=4
Lack a».
If you have any further suggestions we would like to hear from a
(as the need meeting.

AS TSI sail! stot or new::s TITEIT is wr rtr unot,TO •ITH m«
M'MMac-jam 'P'Tea PTOC-U<. «« ASY » c= stdin stag M.E» »C:4
OUR SIGHTING ON MARCH 13.
1981 so rhrar rao CAM :}

BECOME PART OF OUR PROGRAM.

Judy Hughes
Section Leader
Westford Area
Neighbourhood Watch Program
In November 24, 1982, Constable Peter
was called to block captains and the
Section Leader. The Section Leader,
and four Group Leaders were informed. The
fjll-vlr. is what transpired:

**Police Co-ordinator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dicks</th>
<th>Waddy</th>
<th>Salmea</th>
<th>Trelwill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block Captains</td>
<td>Block Captains</td>
<td>Block Captains</td>
<td>Block Captains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call neighbors

If something suspicious is noticed, a neighborhood search is conducted, etc.,
Tell: Notify neighbors, the police only make or...

The Section Leader called the four Group Leaders; the Section Leader calls the designated Block Captains and assistants. These 12 people call the individual homes in their particular group. This saves the police from making unnecessary phone calls and saves a lot of precious time.

If you see or hear anything suspicious, you are not to hesitate to call the police.

were informed, through the survey, each home last August, that
57.2% of the crime in our neighborhood are outside the home. 5 of our 200 homes
had poor back yard security. There have been in the past year:

- 18 thefts broke n int o
- 5 bicycle stoks n
- 3 thefts ove r £ 20
- 3 car s broke n int o
Basically what we must do new is improve your backyard's security. Keep your front and back lights on. Your streetlights weren't sufficient. Edward, you will see that almost all neighbors are careful with their lights on. Kara fence trees, place stakes near your house, and treat your yard as a fortress.

The Neighborhood watch signs were to be up some time in December. Unfortunately this did not come about.

"It was decided that this will see some progress. The group was adjourned until a person who has new ideas for the individual plan pair to relay what happens. spirals at this seatings to their neighbors. Also the neighborhood watch to the rest of the community - (not only the unit but the children as well) - and participation so that we can educate ourselves against crime.

Groups and 5 were notified of the first neighborhood watch setting. We sent to all concerned. Although he has a total of 9 (nine) households, we did accomplish a great deal. The rest of the community - (not only the unit but the children as well) - and participation so that we can educate ourselves against crime.

The first neighborhood watch was held at the local school library. The rest of the group gathered at Bob's for the rest of their food and further plans.
th2"L 3Ir.c e w o (a t th e presen t t Lre)h2v & no f-i-d s available , v/e'woul d al l pa y ,0.; o perxt- - tiiff (whic h hi d onc e a month; jus t to cove r th e cos to f th e hall . Coffe e a t this pcir. ti s optional . Jil l t discusse d d

2\,: r.ir.t - JOTC * represente d d agree d t o o :ct'. ^:.-. ia ^or,. t., a t th e beginnin g o f eac h north (s'ojec L t o change ) s.&d th e floc k ^a^tai; . a t th e en d o f eac h month . Ou r next riehborhoc d .. 'atch Meetin g will b e scheduled fo r th e beginnin g g o f February .

'\, c discusse d ho w w e wer " roin g t o educate ourselve s aga in s t Crime . Th e group cam e up , wi th th e followin g suggest -ions: *

1. Locksmit h - demonstrat e Tariou s
   lock techniques
2. :Oen Hoshkoff - Task Force on
   Vandalism
3. ^7.7 . - ^ y Bewar e - Const . Connor s
4. Tolicexa n tal k t o ou r childre n -
   Const. Connor s - loc k u p tikes , et c.
5. Sel f Defens e seaina r
6. Thunde r Ha y.(ap e Centr e - semina r
7. Firs t Ai d arou n d th e hom e

basically th e at co v e i s wha t trans -pired a t ou r firs t meeting . ' e d o hop e th at perhap s th e nex t meetin g in F ebruar y will attract a fe w mor e families .

**January 11, 1983**

Constable Connors called. Th e signs will be foinf up on'January 21, 1983 *-e invite the neighborhood watch community to join us on January 21 1983 at 2:00 p.m. (Saturday) along with the press, Alderman let lan e and Lysr.es, Constable Connors, Ker. Boshkoff, at the corner of Christina and Kir.esway for a group picture. Pleas e tell your neighbors.

Judy Hughes
**Action Leade**

D7
A By-law to regulate neighborhood watch program.

Whereas Section 21041 provides that By-law may be for prohibiting or regulating signs and other advertising devices the posting of notices on buildings or vacant lots within any area or area or a defined highway or part of highway;


WHEREAS Section 194(5) of The Municipality Act provides that councils may pass By-laws providing for the use by the public lands of which the Corporation is the owner and the regulation of such use and the protection of such lands;


WHEREAS Section 104 of The Municipality Act provides every council may pass such By-laws and make such regulations as may be deemed expedient and are not contrary to law;


WHEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF THUNDER BAY SAY ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This By-law applies to the whole of the City of Thunder Bay.

2. Signs in the form of the sign shown in Schedule "A" may be erected with the authority and in accordance with the directions of a member of the Thunder Bay Police Force as part of Neighbourhood Watch Program.

3. Except as provided in Section 2 hereof, no person shall erect, post, place, or use any sign that is likely to cause a person to believe that it is a sign authorized hereunder.

4. Any person violating the provisions of this By-law shall be subject to a penalty of not more than Twenty-five (25) dollars, exclusive of costs, and all such penalties shall be recoverable under The Provincial Offences Act.

5. This By-law shall come into force and take effect upon final passage hereof.
NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH COMMUNITY

Working Together To Prevent Crime
THUNDER BAY POLICE FORCE

CO-OPERATION PREVENTS CRIME

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Any information that you provide us with will be kept strictly confidential.

CASE NUMBER 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PART I

HOME SECURITY SURVEY

FIRST, WE WOULD LIKE TO EXamine AND ASK A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT THE WAY YOU SECURE YOUR HOUSEHOLD, OUT BUILDINGS, AND YARD IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR PERSONS TO DAMAGE OR STEAL YOUR PROPERTY.

(TO BE READ BY INTERVIEWER)
PART I

HOME SECURITY SURVEY

1. Are the house numbers
   (X) small ?
   (2> large ?

2. Are the house numbers
   (1) the same colour as the background?
   (2) contrast in colour from the background?

3. Are the house numbers
   (1) not visible from the street?
   (2) visible from the street?

4. Are the shrubs/bushes (under 8 feet) blocking the view of any of the windows or doors?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

5. Are there trees (over 8 feet) blocking the view of any of the windows or doors?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

6. Is there an operative front door light?
   (1) no
   (2) yes
7. If yea, is it a 40 watt covered bulb:
   (1) r.o
   (2) yes

8. is there a window(s) in the front door or immediately beside the door?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

9. Is yes, is the window laminated glass?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

10. describe the front door lock:
    (1) Mortise dead lock
    (2) Key in the kr.c b
    (3) Mortise dead lock
    (4) Rim lock
    (5) Dead latch bolt
    (6) High security rim lock
    (7) Dead bolt single cylinder
    (8) Dead bolt double cylinder

11. (a) Describe the front door hinges
    (1) Exterior not pinned
    (2) Exterior pinned
    (3) Interior

12. (b) Is the front door
    (1) Solid corr
    (2) Solid core
12. Is there a door viewer in the front door?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

13. Is there a patio door on the household?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

14. If yes, is there a lock stick or Charlie Bar?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

15. If yes to question 13, are there screws in the top track?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

16. Is there an operative back/side door light?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

17. If yes, is it a 60 watt covered bulb?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

18. Is there a window in the back/side door or immediately adjacent to it?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

19. Is the back/side door
   (1) Hollow core
   (2) Solid core
19. Zt yes, is the window laminated glass?
   (CD) r-o
   (2) yes

20. -escribe the back/side door lock
   (1) Mo lock k a t all
   (2) Kay in eh «taob
   (3) Morzisa d loc k
   (4) Sia locJe
   (5) Jiatn y proof
   (6) Hig h security ria lock
   (7) O«a d latch bolt
   (8) Caa d bol e 3in?If t c/I^Ada r
   (9) Dea d bolt douol e cylinde r

21. Describe the door hinges
   (1) Sxario r :o c 3i nr e c
   (2) Exrario r pinne d
   (3) Incario r

22. Is there a door viewer in the back door?
   (CD) n o
   (2) yes

23. Are there sliding windows on the house?
   (D ye s
   (2) n o

24. If yes, have locks or lock sticks been installed in all such windows?
   (CD) no
   (2) yes

25. Is yes so question 23 have screw? Seen? lac ad in the to9 track s in all such windows?
   (CD) s o
   (2) ye s
26. Are there double hung windows on the house?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

27. If yes, have all such windows been pinned?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

28. If yes to question 26, have all of the double hung windows been pinned for ventilation?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

29. Are there casement windows on the house?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

30. If yes, have latches or bolts been installed on any windows?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

31. Are there basement windows?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

32. Are there bars on all the basement windows?
   (1) no
   (2) yes
33. Is there a stair gauge in the basement?

CD yes
(2) no

34. Is there a garage on the property?

(1) yes
(2) no

35. Is there an operational outdoor light on the garage?

(1) no
(2) yes

36. If yes, is it a SC watt covered bulb?

(1) no
(2) yes

37. Is the vehicle door to the garage locked or bolted from the inside?

(1) no
(2) yes

33. Describe the pedestrian garage door lock.

(1) Master lock a c a l l ( S )
(2) A m o n t e g r o o i o r
(3) Key in the knob ( b )
(4) Bolt s d t a u ( w i t h g l a t s a n d p a d l o c k k)
(5) Dea d b o l t ( b )
(6) H i g h s e c u r i t y r i a l c k
(7) Mor-cise d l o c k ( k )
(8) Dead bolt Singl e cy l i n d e r
(9) C e d b o l t d c i u i a c y l i n d e r

39. Describe the pedestrian garage door hinges.

(1) External r hinge s no t pinne d
(2) External r hinge s f+ r. n e d
(3) Interio r hinge s
40. Does anyone in your household own a bicycle?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

41. If yes, are all the bicycles licensed?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

42. If yes to question 40, is it marked for identification (Social Insurance Number) or is the serial number recorded?
   4 * (1) no
   (2) yes

43. If yes to question 40, are all the household bicycles locked or stored in a locked area?
   (1) no
   (2) yes

44. Is there a storage shed on the property?
   (1) yes
   (2) no

45. If yes, is the door
   (1J wi . i.Gr.ved at all
   (2) Padlocke d - (Has p not secured)
   (3) Has p secured and padlocked

46. Are all household recreational items and outdoor tools
   (1) no t secured at all
   (2) chaine d or locked
   (3) store d in a locked structure
47. Are the household valuable items (star90s, cameras, etc.) identified with an identification number or are the serial number recorded?

(1) No
(2) Yes

48. Is there a racetrack adjacent to the backyard property lane?

(1) Yes
(2) No

49. If yes, is the house nxsatas displayed in the 2nd yard and visible from zhm lana?

(1) No
(2) Yes

50. s thmmracin e aratai d th e front yard?

(1) No
(2) Yes

51. If yes, is the Sattezaq around the front yard?

(1) Partial
(2) Complete

52. Is there fencing around the backyard?

(1) No
(2) Yes

53. If yes, is the fencing

(1) Partial
(2) Complete
PART II

VICTIM EXPERIENCE

NEXT, WE ARE SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT PROPERTY CRIMES IN THIS AREA. THIS INCLUDES SUCH THINGS AS MARKING UP PROPERTY, STEALING FROM GARDENS, SLASHING TIRES, BREAKING FENCES, ETC. WE ARE ESPECIALLY INTERESTED IN THE PROPERTY CRIMES THAT YOU PERSONALLY KNOW ABOUT AND IF ANY HAVE DIRECTLY HAPPENED TO YOU. (TO BE READ BY INTERVIEWER)

54. Has any of your property been stolen or damaged at this house/apartment in the last year?
   (1) Yes (2) No

55. If yes, state type of crime
   (1) Theft from yard
   (2) Vandalism
   (3) Burglary and Enter
   (4) Theft from auto
   (5) Auto theft
   (6) Other

Please specify

56. Area of structure victimized was:
   (1) House (2) Fence
   (3) Car (4) Apartment
   (5) Yard (6) Away from house
   (7) Garage (8) Other
   (9) Garden

57. Did you report it to the police?
   (1) Yes (2) No

58. If yes, how soon after did you report it to the police?
   (1) Almost immediately
   (2) Within four (4) hours after you noticed it
   (3) The next day
   (4) A few days later.
59. If you did not report it to the police, please explain why?

60. Have you observed anyone certifying claims in this neighborhood?
   (1) Yes  (2) No

51. Did you report it to the police:
   (1) Theft from yard
   (2) Vandalism (vandalism)
   (3) Trespass
   (4) Theft from automobile
   (5) Other
   (please specify)

52. Did you report it to the police:
   (1) Yes  (2) No

PART III

The relationships among the police may have to be changed. (They are)
May ZZXTZZXCTHETHATSOFSCPE3TYCSIME1NTHISARSA.(T03E3EA0
3YIMTE3WIZWES)

63. How many of your neighbors on this street would you know by name?
   (1) Less than 3
   (2) Between 4 and 5
   (3) More than 10
64. How many do you visit in their homes?

(1) Less than 3 (2) Between 7 and 10
(3) Between 4 and 6 (4) More than 10

74

5. Do you feel a part of this neighbourhood?

(1) yes (2) no (3) somewhat

75

66. Do you think that there is any neighbourhood spirit?

(1) yes (2) no (3) somewhat

76

67. For example: If a stranger was hanging around your house, would your neighbours do anything about it?

(1) yes (2) no (3) I'm not sure

77

68. What do you think your responsibility is when you think some kind of crime is going on?

(1) Phone police (2) Phone neighbour (3) Talk to offender (4) Other (please specify)

78

69. What would you actually do if you saw someone damaging or stealing your neighbour's property?

Would you: (1) talk to the offender (2) phone police (3) phone your neighbour (4) ignore it and not report it
70. Have you ever done any of the above?
   (1) Yes (2) No

71. 1. If yes, did you:
   (1) Phone the police
   (2) Phone your neighbours
   (3) Talk to the offender
   (4) Ignore it and not report it.

72. How many people can you recognize on sight as being in your neighbourhood:
   (1) None (2) 1 to 20
   (2) 1 or 2 (3) 21 to 50
   (3) 3 to 5 (4) More than 50

73. How many of your neighbours do you know well enough to ask a favour of:
   (1) None (2) 1 to 20
   (3) 1 or 2 (4) 21 to 50
   (5) More than 50

74. In general, how easy or difficult is it for you to call someone who lives in your neighbourhood:
   (1) Very easy
   (2) Easy
   (3) Difficult
   (4) Very difficult
   (5) Never gave much thought.


80. Do you think you have more contact with your neighbours than before the Neighbourhood Watch Program began?
   (1) Yes (2) No

81. If yes, in what way has greater contact occurred:
   (1) by telephone
   (2) over the fence or on the street conversations
   (3) Neighbourhood Watch Meetings/Activities
   (4) Other (Please specify) ________________________________

82. Do you think Neighbourhood Watch has had any impact on decreasing the occurrence of crime in your neighbourhood?
   (1) Very much
   (2) Somewhat
   (3) Not at all

83. Would you recommend Neighbourhood Watch to people living in other neighbourhoods?
   (1) Yes (2) No

34. Sex of the respondent:
   (1) Female
   (2) Male

85. Status of the respondent:
   (1) Owner
   (2) Renter
S3. How interested would you be in acting as a neighbourhood block captain?

(1) Very interested
(2) Somewhat interested (maybe)
(3) Not interested at all.

34. Sex of the respondent

(1) Female
(2) Male

85. Status of the respondent

(1) Owner
(2) P<em>-i>